



REGULAR SELECTIVE INFORMATION FLOW

for the attention of the National Human Rights Structures

Issue#125

[1-30 November 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.17)

C. Communicated cases (p.18)

§2 - European Committee of Social Rights (p.21)

A. Resolutions & Decisions (p.21)

B. Other information (p.21)

§3 - Recommendations & Resolutions (p.22)

A. Recommendations (p.22)

B. Resolutions (p.22)

§4 - Other information of general importance (p.25)

A. Information from the Committee of Ministers (p.33)

B. Information from the Parliamentary Assembly (p.33)

C. Information from the Commissioner of Human Rights (p.34)

D. Information from the Council of Europe monitoring mechanisms (p.34)

PART II - INFORMATION BY COUNTRY (p.28)

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, Camille Joly, Alix Motaïs de Narbonne, Mahaliana Ravaloson, Mariella Sognigbé, Pavlos Aimilios Marinatos, Guillaume Verdier and Manon Wagner, with the technical help of Quentin Michael and under the supervision of Thibaut Fleury Graff, International Law Professor at Rennes University (France).

Index by Country

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

[ARMENIA](#), **29**
[AUSTRIA](#), 18, **30**
[AZERBAIJAN](#), 12, **31**
[BELGIUM](#), 8, 12, **32**
[BULGARIA](#), 12, **34**
[CROATIA](#), 12, 18, **36**
[CYPRUS](#), **37**
[CZECH REPUBLIC](#), 7, 26, **38**
[DENMARK](#), **39**
[ESTONIA](#), 19, **40**
[FINLAND](#), 7, **41**
[GEORGIA](#), **42**
[GERMANY](#), 12, 17, 19, **43**
[GREECE](#), 13, **44**
[HUNGARY](#), 13, 17, 19, 31, **45**
[IRELAND](#), **46**
[ITALY](#), **47**
[LATVIA](#), 13, **48**
LIECHTENSTEIN, 19

[LUXEMBOURG](#), **49**
MALTA, 14
[MOLDOVA](#), 14, **50**
[MONTENEGRO](#), **51**
NETHERLANDS, 5, 6, 26
[POLAND](#), 11, 14, 19, **52**
[PORTUGAL](#), **54**
[ROMANIA](#), 14, 15, 26, **56**
RUSSIA, 7, 9, 15, 20
[SLOVAKIA](#), 15, **58**
[SLOVENIA](#), 17
[SPAIN](#), 10, 26, **59**
[SWEDEN](#), 10, **60**
SWITZERLAND, 6, 7, 15
THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF
MACEDONIA, 19
TURKEY, 15, 16
[UKRAINE](#), 16, **61**
[UNITED KINGDOM](#), 16, 20, **62**

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 November 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)**

JALOUUD V. THE NETHERLANDS (No. 47708/08) - Importance unspecified - 20/11/2014 – Application of Article 1 – Operational control of a foreign officer by domestic authorities – Violation of Article 2 – Failure of the domestic authorities to carry out an effective investigation into the death of the applicant's son

The case concerned a national who was gunshot in an incident involving the domestic's army.

Article 1 – Jurisdiction

The Court noted that the domestic authorities were not divested of its jurisdiction solely because it had accepted the operational control of a foreign country's officer. It was clear by a letter of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs and of Defence to the Parliament of the defendant state of June 2003 that it had retained full command over the military personnel in the warring country. Moreover, the Memorandum of Understanding for MND-SE ruled that the drawing up of distinct rules on the use of force had remained in the domain of individual sending States. The checkpoint where the shooting happened had been manned by the warring country personnel supervised by officers from the coalition forces.

Considering that the applicant's son died when the car in which he took place was passing through a

checkpoint manned under the command of a national officer, the Court found that his death had occurred within the jurisdiction of the domestic authorities within the meaning of Article 1.

The facts giving rise to the complaints derived from alleged acts and omissions of the national military personnel and of the investigative and judicial authorities, which were capable of giving rise to the responsibility of the domestic authorities under the Convention.

Article 2

The Court observed in particular that the investigation has been characterised by a number of shortcomings. Notably, the Military Chamber of the Court of Appeal had confined itself to establishing that the gunman had acted in self-defence to friendly fire. But it had not taken interest to the proportionality of the force used or the fact that more shots had been fired than necessary. The Court observed that documents containing relevant information to those questions, which had been submitted by the parties before the Court, had not been made available to the judicial authorities, in particular an official record of statements and a list of the names of the persons who had fired their weapons.

Moreover, the fact that the gunman was questioned more than six hours after the incident and that no measures had been taken to reduce the risk of him colluding with other witnesses amounted to a shortcoming in the investigation. Furthermore, the autopsy of the victim's body had been carried out without any qualified domestic official being present and the pathologist's report was brief, lacked detail and did not include any pictures. Finally, fragments of metal identified as bullet fragments had been lost in unknown circumstances.

The Court recognised that the domestic investigators, being engaged in a foreign hostile country, had worked in difficult conditions. Nevertheless, the shortcomings in the investigation, which had seriously impaired its effectiveness, could not be considered inevitable. The Court therefore concluded that the investigation had not fulfilled the standards required under Article 2.

Just satisfaction (Article 41)

The Court held that the Netherlands was to pay the applicant 25,000 (EUR) in respect of non-pecuniary damage and 1,372.06 (EUR) in respect of costs and expenses.

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

Tarakhel v. Switzerland (No. 29217/12) – 04 November 2014 – Importance unspecified - Violation of Article 3 - Domestic authorities' decision to send back the applicants, a family of asylum seekers with children, to Italy without information about the reception facility they would be sent to

The case concerned the refusal of the domestic authorities to examine the asylum application of an Afghan couple and their six children and the decision to send them back to Italy.

Article 3

The Court reiterated that, as a "particularly underprivileged and vulnerable" population group, asylum seekers required "special protection", particularly when the persons concerned were children, even when they were accompanied by their parents.

The Court noted that, according to the Italian authorities, families with children were regarded as a particularly vulnerable category and were normally taken charge of within the SPRAR network. However, the Italian authorities had not provided any further details on the specific conditions in which the authorities would take charge of the applicants.

Without detailed and reliable information about the specific reception facility to which the applicants would be sent, the Court considered that the Swiss authorities did not have sufficient assurances that, if returned to Italy, the applicants would be taken charge of in a manner adapted to the age of the children. Therefore, there had been a violation of Article 3 of the Convention.

Article 41 (just satisfaction)

The Court held that domestic authorities were to pay the applicant EUR 7,000 in respect of costs and expenses.

DVOŘÁČEK V. CZECH REPUBLIC ([IN FRENCH ONLY](#)) (No. 12927/13) - Importance 2 - 06 November 2014 - No violation of Article 3 – No ill-treatment on account of domestic authorities' decision to impose a psychiatric treatment to the applicant and effective investigation in that respect

The case concerned the applicant's admission to a psychiatric hospital to undergo protective treatment.

The Court first observed that the protective treatment imposed on the applicant could not be considered as a punishment within the meaning of Article 3 but a way to protect him. It then had to examine the conditions to which the latter had been subjected at the psychiatric hospital and found that the restrictions complained of by the applicant had been justified by his state of health. Therefore, there had been no violation of Article 3 concerning conditions of detention.

As to the applicant's complaint about his medical treatment, the Court found that anti-androgen treatment was necessary. It was not convinced that the applicant had been pressured into undergoing it. Furthermore, it took the view that domestic authorities had not failed to protect the applicant's health given that physicians had endeavoured to tailor the treatment to each difficulty.

The Court agreed that a specific form setting out the applicant's consent and information about his treatment with his right to withdraw that consent at any stage, would have clarified the situation. However, the failure to use such form could not be interpreted as a violation of Article 3.

Finally, the Court had to examine whether there had been a violation of Article 3 concerning the investigations. It noted that there had been a civil action brought by the applicant for the protection of his personality rights. He had had the opportunity to secure an assessment of the acts by the hospital staff which he had considered illegal. He had lost his civil action. According to the Court, domestic authorities had fulfilled their obligation to conduct an effective investigation; and the police could not be accused of having merely referred to the outcome of these proceedings. Therefore, there had been no breach of Article 3.

[SENCHISHAK V. FINLAND](#) (No. 5049/12) - Importance 3 - 18 November 2014 - No violation of Article 3 - Applicant's failure to prove the lack of access to medical care in Russia - Article 8 not applicable – No factors of dependence justifying the applicability of article 8 to a relationship between elderly parents and adult children

The case concerned the threatened removal from Finland of a 72-year-old Russian national and her complaint that she would not have access to medical care in Russia.

No violation of Article 3

The Court had examined whether the applicant was at risk of ill-treatment in case of expulsion to Russia. It agreed with domestic authorities that she had not provided any evidence to prove her allegation that she had no access to medical treatment in Russia. Indeed, there are private and public care institutions there.

It also found, concerning her actual removal, that her state of health would be taken into account and that appropriate transportation would be organised. Then, she would not be exposed to a real risk of being subjected to inhuman degrading treatment, within the meaning of Article 3, if she were expelled to Russia.

No violation of Article 8

The Court had reiterated that relationships between elderly parents and adult children do not fall within the scope of Article 8 unless it has been proven that the former are dependent on the members of their family. However, the Court found no additional factors of dependence other than normal ties of affection between the applicant and her daughter. Moreover, the distance between the daughter's place of residence in Finland and their hometown in Russia is short. Article 8 is therefore not applicable in this case.

PERRILLAT-BOTTONET V. SWITZERLAND ([IN FRENCH ONLY](#)) (No. 66773/13) - Importance 3 - 20 November 2014 - No violation of Article 3 – Justified use of force by domestic authorities

The case concerned the applicant's complaint that the applicant had been subjected to a disproportionate use of force during an identity check by the police and that he had been subjected to ill-treatment while he was detained.

The Court noted that the statements of the applicant and the gendarmes were different. In fact, the applicant held that he had not been drunk on that night and had not resisted arrest. It found that the applicant's friend had said that he had been drinking with the applicant that night and that he had tried to calm tensions between the gendarmes and the latter. Then, the Court was convinced that the gendarmes had been faced with a risk of violence, which justified the recourse to coercive measure.

It found that the use of an arm lock, in that context, did not in itself disclose conduct contrary to Article 3. In addition, the gendarmes had not used any other coercive measure; and the expertise of the applicant's medical history showed that the injury to his right shoulder could have been caused by any minor use of force.

Therefore, there had been no disproportionate use of force, no breach of Article 3.

Besides, the Court had rejected the applicant's complaint about the conditions of his detention in the sobering-up cell because he had not directly challenged this issue before domestic court.

Moreover, as regards the investigation, the Court observed proceedings had been opened at the origin of the application. There had been expert reports and the statements of the applicant and the gendarmes had been examined. Consequently, domestic authorities could not be criticised for not having promptly examined the applicant's allegations of ill-treatment.

Furthermore, the Court took the view that domestic authorities' decision not to re-examine the gendarmes and the applicant's friend had been justified given that it could not see how such further examination could have invalidate the medical experts' conclusions.

In conclusion, there had been no violation of Article 3.

VASILESCU V. BELGIUM ([IN FRENCH ONLY](#)) (No. 64682/12) - Importance 2 - 25 November 2014 - Violation of Article 3 - Domestic authorities' failure to challenge the reports of "mediocre" situation in cells – Application of Article 46 – Recommendation made to domestic authorities to adopt general measures to guarantee conditions of detention compatible with Article 3

The case concerned the poor conditions of detention of the applicant in Antwerp and Merksplas Prisons (Belgium).

Violation of Article 3

The Court noted that the problem of prison overcrowding, the bad sanitary conditions, particularly concerning the access to running water and toilets, had been reported by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Punishment (CPT).

It also found that the applicant had been confined to individual space of less than 4 sq. m for several weeks, which was below the standard recommended by the CPT for shared cells. Furthermore, the latter had to sleep on a mattress on the floor and had been exposed to passive smoking.

Those situations were described as "mediocre" by the CPT, which had implied the taking of urgent measures by domestic authorities. However, sixteen days later, the Court noted that the situation had not improved.

According to the Court, there was no reason to doubt those allegations in so far as domestic authorities had failed to adduce evidence to the contrary.

Therefore, there had been a violation of Article 3.

Article 46

The Court observed that the problems arising from prison overcrowding and problems of unhygienic and dilapidated prison institutions in Belgium were structural in nature and did not concern only the applicant. Therefore, it recommended that domestic authorities envisage adopting general measures in order to guarantee prisoners conditions of detention compatible with Article 3; and to provide them with a remedy capable of putting an end to an alleged violation or permitting them to obtain an improvement in their conditions of detention.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that Belgium was to pay the applicant EUR 10,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 800 in respect of costs and expenses.

AMIROV V. RUSSIA (No. 51857/13) - Importance 2 - 27 November 2014 - Violation of Article 34 - Domestic authorities' failure to comply with the interim measure indicated by the Court - Violation of Article 3 - Domestic authorities' failure to provide the applicant with complete treatment and sufficient medical supervision - No violation of Article 5 - Domestic authorities' diligence in handling the case – Application of Article 46 – Indication of individual measures

The case concerned the complaint by a politician who had been convicted of conspiring to organise a terrorist attack that he was left without appropriate medical care in spite of his illnesses while in detention.

Violation of Article 34

The Court observed that domestic authorities had submitted two expert reports by doctors from a Moscow hospital. However, the aim of the interim measure had been to obtain an independent medical expert assessment of the state of the applicant's health and the adequacy of the conditions of his detention for his medical needs. Then, the two reports submitted by domestic authorities had not provided any answers to the Court's questions. In fact, those doctors had not assessed whether his condition required his placement in a hospital. Nor had they paid any attention to the quality of the medical care he had been receiving while detained. Therefore, those reports had little relevance as regards the interim measure indicated by the Court.

The Court had reiterated that interim measures had to be strictly complied with. However, domestic authorities had replaced a medical expert opinion with their own assessment of the applicant's situation. Moreover, they had not demonstrated any objective impediment preventing them from complying with the interim measure.

So the Court concluded that they had failed to comply with the interim measure indicated, in breach of their obligation under Article 34.

Violation of Article 3

The Court took the view, following its findings under Article 34, that domestic authorities had failed to demonstrate conclusively that the applicant was receiving effective medical treatment in detention for his illnesses. Therefore, it concluded that the applicant had been left without medical assistance and kept in unsanitary conditions, which had endangered his state of health whereas his immune system was already weakened, in breach of Article 3 of the Convention.

No violation of Article 5

The Court had been convinced that there had been a reasonable suspicion that the applicant had committed the offences with which he had been charged. It observed that the latter had significant financial resources, influential connections, leading to a risk of absconding.

So, as domestic authorities had brought forward relevant reasons to justify the applicant's detention and given that they had not shown a lack of diligence in handling the case, there had been no violation of Article 5.

Article 46

The Court considered it necessary to indicate individual measures for the execution of this judgment in order to redress the effects of the breach of the applicant's rights. Therefore, domestic authorities were to admit him to a specialised medical facility where he would be provided with adequate medical services corresponding to his needs. However, they also can also choose to place him in another specialised prison medical facility as long as it guarantees the requisite level of medical supervision and care. In addition, they were to re-examine his situation regularly, including the involvement of independent doctors.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that Russia was to pay the applicant EUR 15,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 850 in respect of costs and expenses.

- **Prohibition of slavery and forced labour (art. 4)**

DEV V. SWEDEN (No. 7356/10) – Importance 2 - 27 November 2014 - Violation of article 4 of Protocol no. 7 - Domestic authorities' failure to ensure the right not to be tried twice for the same offence – No violation of Article 6 – Fairness of tax proceedings

The case concerned a woman who claimed that she had been tried and punished twice for the same offence in tax and criminal proceedings instituted against her.

Article 4 of Protocol no. 7

The Court noted in particular that, having regard to earlier cases, proceedings involving tax surcharges were to be considered “criminal” for the purposes of Article 4 of Protocol No. 7. Thus, in this case both the tax and the criminal proceedings fell within the ambit of that provision.

To the question whether the criminal offences for which the applicant had been prosecuted and the tax surcharges she had been imposed had been the same, the Court responded that Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 prohibited the prosecution or trial of a second offence if it arose from identical or substantially identical facts. In the applicant's case, the facts underlying the indictment for the tax offence were at least substantially the same as those to the imposition of tax surcharges. However, the Court found that the convictions had been sufficiently separate to conclude that she had not been punished twice for the same offence. Indeed, the fact that she could have supplied the Tax Agency with reliable material on which it could base its tax assessment, her submission of the incorrect bookkeeping material in support of her tax return and her failure to provide other reliable documentation had constituted important elements which had not been part of her conviction for criminal offence.

The Court then examined whether there had been a “final” decision in the applicant's case, as it was the aim of Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 in order to prohibit the repetition of criminal proceedings. On 16 December 2008, the District Court had acquitted the applicant of the charges relating to a tax offence. As she had not lodged an appeal against that judgment, it had acquired legal force on 8 January 2009.

Finally, dealing with the question of the duplication of proceedings, the Court first reiterated that Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 was not confined to the right not to only be punished but to be tried twice for the same offence. The applicant's case concerned two parallel and separate sets of proceedings, which had been examined by different authorities without being connected, and become final at different times. This duplication of proceedings didn't violate Article 4 of Protocol No. 7.

However, the tax proceedings had not been terminated and the tax surcharges had not been quashed after the criminal proceedings had become final and continued for nine and a half months. Therefore, the Court concluded that the applicant had been tried “again” for an offence for which she had already been finally acquitted and concluded that there had been a violation of Article 4 of Protocol No. 7.

Article 6

The Court found that the national tax system was, provided that the national courts made a nuanced assessment in each individual case, compatible with Article 6. It also noted that individuals were not left without means of defence and that there was no indication that the applicant had not had a fair hearing in the tax proceedings. Consequently, the Court rejected her complaint under Article 6.

Just satisfaction (article 41)

The Court held that the defendant state was to pay the applicant 2,000 (EUR) in respect of costs and expenses.

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

Sociedad Anónima del Ucieza v. Spain (No. 38963/08) – Importance 2 – Violation of Article 6§1 – Deprivation of the applicant's right to access the domestic supreme court – Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No.1 – Applicant's inability to challenge a Roman Catholic Church's property

The case concerned a dispute over ownership of a medieval church between the applicant company, which had purchased and registered a plot of land, in which the church had formed an enclave, and the Diocese of Palencia, which had registered the same church in its own name in the land register sixteen years later. The applicant company therefore considered that it had been unfairly deprived of part of its property for no reason of public interest and without any compensation.

Article 6 § 1

The Court noted that the Supreme Court had declared inadmissible the appeal on points of law lodged by the applicant company. The Supreme Court had held that the estimated value of the property, namely EUR 600,000, was insufficient to contradict the initial description of the property in issue by the applicant company as “invaluable”. The Court held that this was no mere problem of interpretation of the law, but rather an issue of interpreting a procedural requirement which had prevented the consideration of the merits of the case. This particularly strict interpretation of a procedural rule had deprived the applicant company of its right of access to the court having jurisdiction to consider its appeal on points of law. There had therefore been a violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention.

Article 1 of Protocol No.1

The Court held that the registration of the church had been arbitrary and more or less unforeseeable. Therefore the applicant company had found itself unable to defend itself against the effect of the registration at issue. Furthermore, the Court pointed out that the domestic courts had interpreted national legislation as authorising the Diocese of Palencia to use its right of registration on the basis of general historical considerations. Lastly, the Court found that the church in issue, because of its status as a parish church, had been regarded by the domestic courts as having always belonged to the Diocese of Palencia, but that the applicant company had found it impossible to obtain any kind of redress. The Court concluded that the applicant company had been a victim of the exercise of the right of registration granted by the Roman Catholic Church’s internal legislation without any apparent justification. Therefore, the applicant company had borne an excessive burden. There had therefore been a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that the question of compensation for the damage suffered was not ready for decision and reserved that question, having regard to a possible agreement between the respondent State and the applicant company.

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

BRAUN V. POLAND (No. 30162/10) – Importance 3 – 04 November 2014 – Violation of Article 10 – Domestic authorities’ failure to give sufficient reasons to the requirement of a higher standard than that of due diligence.

The case concerned the complaint by a historian and film director that he was ordered to pay a fine and to publish an apology for having damaged the reputation of a professor to whom he was referred as an informant of the secret political police during the communist era, in a radio debate about lustration in 2007.

The Court first observed that it was undisputed that the proceedings against the application had constituted an interference with his right to freedom of expression. It had had a legal basis and had pursued the legitimate aim of protecting the reputation or rights of others.

The Court had then to examine whether it had been necessary in a democratic society. It observed that domestic authorities had made a distinction between the standards applicable to journalists and those applicable to other participants in the public debate. In particular, journalists were to prove diligence and good faith; and the others were to prove the veracity of their allegations. The applicant was considered as a participant in the public debate and given that he had been unable to prove the truth of his statement, domestic authorities had concluded that he had breached the professor’s personal rights.

The applicant’s status as a journalist or not under domestic law was not relevant to the Court. What mattered was that he had been involved in a public debate on an important issue. The Court observed that he was a specialist on the matter and had been invited to talk about that issue in a radio programme. That is why the Court was not convinced by domestic authorities’ approach to require the applicant to prove the veracity of his allegations and thus to fulfil a higher standard than that of due diligence. So, there had been a violation of Article 10.

Under Article 41 (Just satisfaction), the Court held that Poland was to pay the applicant EUR 8,000 euros in respect of pecuniary damage, EUR 3,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 3,000 in respect of costs and expenses.

2. Other judgments issues in the period under observation

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

For more detailed information, please refer to the cases.

STATE	DATE	CASE TITLE	IMP.	CONCLUSION	KEY WORDS
AZERBAIJAN	13 November 2014	ISLAM-ITTIHAD ASSOCIATION AND OTHERS (No. 5548/05)	3	Violation of Art. 11	Unlawful interference with the applicants' right to freedom of association, given that the condition of foreseeability had not been satisfied
BELGIUM	18 November 2014	GYBELS (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 43305/09) HECHTERMANS (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 56280/09) KHALEDIAN (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 42874/09) YIMAN (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 39781/09)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1 (in all cases)	Lack of reasoning in the jury's verdict and in the judgement of the assize court
BULGARIA	4 November 2014	MANOLOV (No. 23810/05)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (systematic use of handcuffs, applicant's placement in isolation)
				Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Domestic authorities' failure to ensure that the incarceration conditions and that the prison regime are such as to make it possible for a life prisoner to endeavour to reform himself with a view to being able one day to seek an adjustment of his sentence
CROATIA	13 November 2014	STARCEVIC (No. 80909/12)	3	Violation of Art. 2 (procedural)	Domestic authorities' lack of diligence in conducting the criminal investigation into the death of the applicant's father
	27 November 2014	HRVATSKI LIJECNICKI SINDICAT (No. 36701/09)	2	Violation of Art. 11	Domestic courts' decisions had effectively prevented the applicant union from holding a strike for a period of approximately three years and eight months
GERMANY	6 November 2014	EREREN (No. 67522/09)	2	No violation of Art. 5 § 3	Reasonable length of applicant's pre-trial detention, given the complexity of the case while no lack of diligence attributable to the domestic authorities had been found in handling the case

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

GREECE	13 November 2014	BIBI (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 15643/10)	3	Violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1	Domestic authorities' refusal to examine the applicants' request to adjust the amount of the expropriation compensation and the referral of their case to another domestic court had impaired the adequacy of the compensation, as the sum they had been given fifteen years after the date of the judgment which had fixed the provisional amount did no longer represent the real value of the expropriated property due to inflation
		MD (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 60622/11)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention in police premises (overcrowding, lack of meals, lack of recreational activities)
				No violation of Art. 5 § 1	Lawful detention pending deportation
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Lack of an effective judicial review concerning the lawfulness of the applicant's detention pending deportation and the conditions of his detention
	27 November 2014	PAPAKONSTANTINO (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 50765/11)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (overcrowding)
		A.E. (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 46673/10)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention in police premises (overcrowding, lack of meals, lack of recreational activities)
				Violation of Art. 5 § 1	Unjustified prolongation of applicant's detention pending deportation
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Lack of an effective judicial review concerning the lawfulness of the applicant's detention pending deportation
		KOUTALIDIS (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 18785/13)	3	Violation of Art. 5 § 3	Excessive length of pre-trial detention (more than 11 months) without taking into consideration the applicant's serious health problems while no attempt had been made in order to find alternative measures to detention
				No violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	No failure of the domestic authorities to provide the applicant with adequate medical care
HUNGARY	25 November 2014	PAKOZDI (No. 51269/07)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Lack of a public hearing which deprived the applicant of the opportunity to present her arguments
LATVIA	18 November 2014	EMARS (No. 22412/08)	3	Violation of Art. 2 (procedural)	Lack of a sufficiently independent investigation into the death of the applicant's daughter
	25 November 2014	LIEPINS (No. 31855/03)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Unfairness of proceedings on account of the applicant's inability to participate in the proceedings

MALTA	6 November 2014	AZZOPARDI (No. 28177/12)	3	Violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1	Domestic authorities' failure to compensate the applicant for the expropriation of his property 40 years after the taking of the land
				Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Denial of access to court (30 years) and excessive length of compensation proceedings (10 years)
MOLDOVA	4 November 2014	TOCARENCO (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 769/13)	3	Violation of Art. 8	Domestic authorities' failure to take the necessary measures in order to allow the applicant to have a regular contact with her son
POLAND	25 November 2014	K.C. (No. 31199/12)	3	Violation of Art. 5 § 1	Unlawful continuation of applicant's confinement in a social care home
				No violation of Art. 5 § 4	Existence of available procedure to have the lawfulness of the applicant's continued confinement examined
ROMANIA	13 November 2014	LAZARIU (No. 31973/03)	3	Violation of Art. 5 § 1 (b)	Arbitrary detention of the applicant on the premises of the prosecutor's office for several hours
				Violation of Art. 5 § 1 (e)	Unlawful confinement of the applicant to a psychiatric institution as it had been ordered without seeking a medical opinion
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Lack of a judicial review of the lawfulness of the applicant's confinement to a psychiatric institution
				No violation of Art. 6 § 1	Reasonable length of proceedings
				No violation of Art. 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c)	No failure of the domestic courts to hear the applicant in person as her behaviour during the proceedings had prevented the domestic appellate courts from hearing her in person
				No violation of Art. 6 § 1	Fairness of proceedings
	4 November 2014	BOSNIGEANU AND OTHERS (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 56861/08 AND 33 OTHER APPLICATIONS)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Excessive length of criminal proceedings (6 years)
			3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (overcrowding)

ROMANIA (CONTINUED)	13 November 2014	FLAMINZEANU (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 12717/09)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (procedural)	Ineffective investigation into the applicant's allegations of ill- treatment
				No violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Absence of sufficient evidence to confirm the applicant's allegations of ill-treatment in police custody
		BAHNA (No. 75985/12)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (overcrowding)
RUSSIA	27 November 2014	KARSAKOVA (No. 1157/10)	3	Violation of Art. 2 (substantive)	Domestic authorities' failure to protect the life of the applicant's brother as denying him access to medical care and leaving him in solitary confinement in the absence of sufficient and appropriate monitoring or supervision while in police custody put his health and life in danger
				Violation of Art. 2 (procedural)	Domestic authorities' failure to carry out an adequate investigation into the circumstances of the death of the applicant's brother
		KHARAYEVA AND OTHERS (No. 2721/11)	3	No violation of Art. 2 (substantive)	Absence of sufficient evidence suggesting that the domestic authorities had been responsible for the disappearance of the applicants' brother
				Violation of Art. 2 (procedural)	Domestic authorities' failure to carry out an effective investigation into the circumstances of the disappearance of the applicants' brother
SLOVAKIA	25 November 2014	BOROVSKA AND FORRAI (No. 48554/10)	2	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Unfairness of proceedings on account of the lack of certainty to which the applicants had been exposed with regard to the case-law pertaining to their standing sue (contradictory conclusions had been reached by the domestic courts on the same legal matter)
		MRAZ AND OTHERS (No. 44019/11)	3		
SWITZERLAND	18 November 2014	M.A. (No. 52589/13)	3	Violation of Art. 3	Real risk of ill-treatment in case of the applicant's removal to his country of origin
TURKEY	13 November 2014	AKTURK (No. 70945/10)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Ill-treatment of the applicant while in police custody
				Violation of Art. 3 (procedural)	Ineffective investigation in that respect
	13 November 2014	ALI RIZA KAPLAN (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 24597/08)	3	Violation of Art. 5 § 3	Excessive length of pre-trial detention (8 years)
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Domestic authorities' failure to provide a copy of the domestic public prosecutor's opinion thus depriving the applicant of the possibility to respond
	13 November 2014	CUNEYT POLAT (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 32211/07)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Excessive and unjustified use of force during the applicant's arrest
				Violation of Art. 3 (procedural)	Ineffective investigation in that respect

TURKEY (CONTINUED)	13 November 2014	DINC AND OTHERS (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 34098/05)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Excessive length of civil proceedings (8 years and 6 months)
		DURMAZ (No. 3621/07)	3	Violation of Art. 2 (procedural)	Domestic authorities' failure to carry out an effective investigation into the death of the applicant's daughter
	18 November 2014	ARAS (No. 2) (No. 15065/07)	2	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
		ELINC (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 50388/06)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Domestic authorities' refusal to grant the applicants legal aid had deprived them of the opportunity to have their case heard by a court
	25 November 2014	FATMA NUR ERTEN AND ADNAN ERTEN (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 14674/11)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Unfairness of proceedings on account of the applicants' impossibility to adjust the amount of the pecuniary loss they had sustained after the expert report which suggested an amount higher than that which had originally been claimed by them
		SEVKET KURUM AND OTHERS (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 54113/08)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Excessive length of administrative proceedings (5 years and 8 months)
UKRAINE	27 November 2014	ADNARALOV (No. 10493/12)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Ill-treatment of the applicant while in police custody
				Violation of Art. 3 (procedural)	Ineffective investigation in that respect
		KHOMULLO (No. 47593/10)	2	Violation of Art. 5 § 1	Unlawful detention pending extradition (absence of legal basis in domestic law)
				No violation of Art. 5 § 1	Lawful detention pending extradition
THE UNITED KINGDOM	4 November 2014	DILLON (No. 32621/11)	3	No violation of Art. 5 § 1 (in both cases)	No failure of the domestic authorities to grant the applicants a real opportunity for rehabilitation by providing them access to assessments and courses
		DAVID THOMAS (No. 55863/11)			

B. The decision on admissibility

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

STATE	DATE	CASE TITLE	ALLEGED VIOLATION	DECISION
GERMANY	2 September 2014	FIRMA EDV FÜR SIE, EFS ELEKTRONISCHE DATENVERARBEITUNG NG DIENSTLEISTUNGS GMBH (No. 32783/08)	Art. 8 and 9 (exposure and publication of the religious affiliation of the applicant company's employees and management), Art. 1 of Protocol No. 1 (the publication tarnished the applicant company's reputation and ruined its goodwill)	Partly inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded (concerning claims under Art. 8 and Art. 1 of Protocol No. 1), partly incompatible <i>ratione personae</i> with the provisions of the Convention (concerning claim under Art. 9)
HUNGARY	30 September 2014	BUDAHAZY (No. 15854/13)	Articles 10 and 11 (domestic authorities refusal to release the applicant from house arrest to celebrate the national day), Art. 6 (lack of a fair trial), Art. 13 in conjunction with Articles 10 and 11 (lack of an effective remedy in this respect)	Partly inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded (concerning claims under Articles 6, 10 and 11), partly incompatible <i>ratione materiae</i> with the provisions of the Convention (concerning claim under Art. 13 in conjunction with Articles 10 and 11)
SLOVENIA	23 September 2014	IP-OMEKOM INVALIDSKO PODJETJE D.O.O. (No. 69584/11)	Art. 6 (excessive length of the civil proceedings), Art. 1 of Protocol No. 1 (lack of sufficient compensation after being deprived of its property)	Partly inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies (concerning claim under Art. 6), partly incompatible <i>ratione personae</i> with the provisions of the Convention (concerning claim under Art. 1 of Protocol 1)

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.

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
AUSTRIA	17 April 2014	<u>LEITNER II</u> (No. 55740/10)	The applicant was discriminated, on the ground of his gender, against the mother of his child regarding the granting of sole custody of the latter to the former
		<u>KÜLEKCI</u> (No. 30441/09)	The applicant claims that his expulsion violated his right to respect for his private and family life as he had no ties with his home country anymore, spent the majority of his life in his welcoming state and spoke its language better than any other.
	12 May 2014	<u>LORENZ</u> (No. 11537/11)	The applicant complains about the procedure for the review of his detention in an institution for mentally ill offenders as the wrong article was invoked
CROATIA	08-14 April 2014	<u>BAJIĆ AND OTHERS</u> (No. 56602/12) <u>DAMJANOVIĆ</u> (No. 5306/13) <u>GRUBIĆ AND 7 OTHER APPLICATIONS</u> (No. 56094/12) <u>HRKALOVIĆ AND NARANČIĆ</u> (No. 80573/12) <u>IVANČIĆ AND DŽELAJLIJA</u> (No. 62916/13) <u>LONČAR</u> (No. 12744/13) <u>LOVRIĆ AND OTHERS</u> (No. 57849/13) <u>OBAJDIN</u> (No. 39468/13) <u>REPAC AND 1 OTHER APPLICATION</u> (No. 12992/13) <u>STOJAKOVIĆ</u> (No. 6504/13) <u>VESELINOVIĆ</u> (No. 27115/12) <u>Z AND OTHERS</u> (No. 57812/13) <u>ZJALIĆ</u> (No. 2140/13)	Inefficiency of the criminal law mechanisms as regards the killing of the applicants' relatives during the Homeland war and the domestic authorities did not investigate possible ethnic motives for their killing.

ESTONIA	10 April 2014	<u>LÜÜTSEPP</u> (No. 46069/13)	Failure of the domestic authorities to examine the applicant's complaint concerning the secret surveillance activities carried out towards him.
THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA	12 May 2014	<u>KITANOVSKA STANOJKOVIC AND OTHERS</u> (No. 2319/14)	Robbers who killed a man and injured his daughters and wife didn't start serving his prison penalty and still lived close to this family despite the fact that his conviction became final.
GERMANY	14 April 2014	<u>KLINKENBUSS</u> (No. 53157/1)	Unjustified detention in a psychiatric hospital, which has been executed for more than twenty-eight years and without therapy since 2005.
	12 May 2014	<u>LECOMTE</u> (No. 80442/12)	As the applicant's unlawful detention served the purpose of preventing her from expressing her views in demonstrations, her freedom of expression was equally disregarded.
HUNGARY	15 May 2014	<u>SZABÓ</u> (No. 11613/14)	The applicant complains that the action of two policemen, who fired warning shot in her direction, amounts to an unjustified interference with her right to personal security.
LIECHTENSTEIN	12 6 May 2014	<u>GLOTAR ESTABLISHMENT</u> (No. 49538/12)	The order for the absorption of the applicants' assets was based on legal provisions, which were adopted after the commission of the alleged offences.
POLAND	7 April 2014	<u>B.J. AND S.J.</u> (No. 52520/12)	The victim was questioned on three occasions without regard to the specific arrangements provided by law in cases of sexual abuse of a minor and without due regard for her particular vulnerability in the light of her age and the type of crime committed. Failure of the domestic authorities to conduct proceedings appropriate to the situation.
	14 April 2014	<u>JOLKIEWICZ</u> (No. 14426/13)	Ineffective investigation about the death of the applicant's husband which occurred after treatments provided by two emergency service teams whereas the domestic authorities were aware of the practice of killing of patients by employees of this emergency service and providing information about the cases of death to funeral companies against payment of a fee.
	12 May 2014	<u>T.T.</u> (No. 3090/13)	The applicant complains that he was placed in a social care home by his guardian against his will and that it has not been possible for him to change this decision and return living outside
		<u>A.K.</u> (No. 6068/12)	During the applicant's detention cameras were installed in the shower area.

RUSSIA	5 May 2014	AKHATOV (No. 19476/05)	The applicant complains that by sentencing him under two separate domestic codes for the same acts he was punished twice.
	15 May 2014	KOPYTOK (No. 48812/09)	Violation of the applicant's right to peaceful enjoyment of her property as the domestic courts granted the right to use her property to unrelated third parties.
UNITED KINGDOM	6 May 2014	KOLI (No. 58671/12)	The presumption of innocence was violated because the prosecution alleged that he had committed a series of crimes with which he had not been charged and the custodial sentence was unfair as he had already been recalled to prison for similar terms.
		BAGNALL (No. 54241/12)	The applicant complains that the confiscation proceedings were based on the assumption that he had committed a serious criminal offence, which was not proved according to law.

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

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

§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	18 November 2014	2022	Measures to prevent abusive use of the Convention on the Transfer of Sentenced Persons	PACE called on States to conclude ad hoc arrangements in the course of negotiating transfers in which the administering State should confirm its commitment to the object and purpose of the convention. (Read more)
PACE	18 November 2014	2023	Measuring and fostering the well-being of European citizens	PACE calls on States to develop subjective measures of individual well-being which could help track collective progress, and to act in order to align national strategic priorities with efforts to meet key global challenges. (Read more)

PACE	18 November 2014	2024	Social exclusion: a danger for Europe's democracies	PACE calls on States to help the very poorest to improve access to education and training, and to guarantee a minimum family income. They should take targeted measures for groups in need of special protection, and make determined efforts to bring marginalised people into the democratic mainstream. (Recommendation 2058 - Read the Report)
PACE	18 November 2014	2025	Resettlement of refugees: promoting greater solidarity	PACE called on States to create a dialogue with international and national partners to find sustainable solutions about the refugees' resettlement, and to pay attention to their integration. Moreover, PACE called on the CM to ensure that European Union and non-European Union member States work together on this issue of resettlement. (Recommendation 2059 - Read the Report)
PACE	18 November 2014	2026	Alternatives to Europe's substandard IDP and refugee collective centres	PACE calls on member States to take stock of the situation of IDPs and refugees in collective centres and to find alternative solutions in order to make easier for the occupants of such centres to acquire their own house. (Read the Report)

PACE	18 November 2014	2027	Focusing on the perpetrators to prevent violence against women	PACE calls on member States to set up preventive intervention and treatment programmes with appropriate financial resources for perpetrators of domestic violence and sex offenders in co-operation with support services for victims of violence, health and social services and law enforcement and judicial authorities. (Read the Report)
-------------	------------------	------	--	--

PartOne

§4 - OTHER INFORMATION OF GENERAL IMPORTANCE

A. Information from the Committee of Ministers

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

B. Information from the Parliamentary Assembly

■ Anne Brasseur: improved protection for journalists (03.11.2014)

PACE President recalled that the Committee of Ministers had this year decided to set up an Internet platform to promote the protection of journalism and the safety of journalists. ([Read more](#) - [Speech](#))

■ Children's Day: PACE rapporteur highlights 'hidden dangers' of online use (19.11.2014)

PACE rapporteur highlighted that the online use can be a danger for children. Therefore, PACE rapporteur calls to be vigilant and to ensure that children are not exposed to information which may be harmful for them. ([Read more](#) - [Parliamentary dimension of the Council of Europe's ONE in FIVE campaign](#) - [More on the Lanzarote Convention](#))

■ PACE President 'calibrates' human rights priorities with new EU leaders (20.11.2014)

PACE President has sought to "calibrate" human rights and democracy priorities between the 28-nation EU and the 47-nation Council of Europe during a series of meetings in Brussels with new EU leaders. ([Read more](#))

■ Istanbul Convention: putting an end to the cycle of violence against women (24.11.2014)

PACE President calls on the States to act, in order to have a more just and responsible society, by ratifying the Istanbul Convention. ([Read more](#) - [Istanbul Convention](#))

■ Anne Brasseur: "Globalisation must be humanised and democratised" (25.11.2014)

PACE president called on the representatives of all religions and secular movements to refute, together, all forms of violence and hatred. ([Read more](#) - [Pope Francis speech](#))

■ Promoting the democratic participation of migrant diasporas (28.11.2014)

The committee called on the governments of European countries to play a key role in engaging diaspora in decision-making policies, and to develop collaboration between governmental institutions in drafting diaspora-oriented programmes to ensure economic, social and cultural development. ([Read more](#) - [Provisional Report](#))

C. Information for the Commissioner for Human Rights

■ Ensuring the rights of migrants in the EU: from vulnerability to empowerment (10.11.2014)

Commissioner for Human Rights calls on member states to improve the protection of the human rights of migrants and to ensure their transition from the status of vulnerable outsiders to that of empowered members of the society. ([Read more](#))

■ Council of Europe Strategy for the Rights of the Child (13.11.2014)

Commissioner for Human Rights calls on member states to implement fully and effectively the rights of all children. ([Read more](#))

■ The Alarming Situation of Press Freedom in Europe (25.11.2014)

Freedom of the press is a principle that is difficult to implement on a global scale. Press freedom across the world has been deteriorating in recent years, with a clear acceleration over the last 12 months during which hundreds of journalists, photographers and camera operators have been killed, injured, kidnapped, threatened or sued. ([Read more](#))

D. Information from the monitoring mechanisms

■ CPT: November 2014 Plenary meeting (07.11.2014)

The CPT held its 85th Plenary meeting from 3 to 7 November 2014 in Strasbourg. During this meeting, it adopted the reports on its periodic visits to the Czech Republic (carried out in April 2014) and Romania (June 2014), and on its ad hoc visits to the Caribbean part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands (May 2014) and Spain (July 2014) ([Read more](#)).

■ The Committee visited Gibraltar (21.11.2014)

A delegation of the CPT carried out a visit to Gibraltar from 13 - 17 November 2014. This was the CPT's first visit to the British Overseas Territory of Gibraltar. The visit provided an opportunity to assess the conditions of detention and treatment of persons held in prison and to look at the safeguards in place for persons deprived of their liberty by the police ([Read more](#)).

■ GRETA: Council of Europe and OSCE recall the responsibility of businesses and governments to prevent exploitation and combat human trafficking (04.11.2014)

The Council of Europe and the OSCE organised a joint side event in Vienna on 4 November 2014 on measures that businesses, civil society and governments can take to prevent trafficking in human beings for labour exploitation ([Read more](#)).

■ President of GRETA addressed 3rd INTERPOL Global Trafficking in Human Beings Conference (from 12.11.2014 to 14.11.2014)

The 3rd INTERPOL Global Trafficking in Human Beings Conference took place on 12-14 November in Lyon, France. In a keynote address made at the opening of the conference, the President of GRETA, Nicolas Le Coz, said: "Victims not only need to be identified, but also protected, especially when they are testifying against their traffickers" ([Read more](#)).

■ GRETA's 21st meeting (from 17.11.2014 to 21.11.2014)

GRETA held its 21st meeting from 17-21 November 2014 at the Council of Europe in Strasbourg. ([Read more](#)).

■ MONEYVAL: Evaluator training seminar 2014 (from 03.11.2014 to 07.11.2014)

MONEYVAL held an evaluator training seminar from 3 to 7 November 2014 in Strasbourg. The seminar was attended by 28 experts from 21 countries evaluated by MONEYVAL. A representative from the World Bank also participated as a trainee (Read [more](#)).

■ A report encourages countries to develop financial inclusion policies (17.11.2014)

In a report, the MONEYVAL called on countries to develop financial inclusion policies and initiatives in order to strengthen financial integrity. Financial inclusion potentially impacts on two areas which underpin work in the Council of Europe: the promotion of human rights (in this case, arguably, the right to financial services); and the protection of the rule of law by the prevention of greater use of informal or underground banking and money transfer networks.

PartTwo

INFORMATION BY COUNTRY

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

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

Armenia

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Bayatyan (No. 23459/03)	7 July 2011	CM/ResDH(2014)225	Examination closed
Bukharatyan (No. 37819/03)	10 April 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)225	Examination closed
Tsaturyan (No. 37821/03)	10 April 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)225	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]

Austria

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: Preparation of a report on Austria (12.11.2014)

A delegation of the ECRI visited Austria from 3 to 7 November 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](#)).

Azerbaijan

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 condemns Azerbaijan's use of prisoner transfer treaty in 'Safarov case' (19.11.2014)

PACE condemned the use by Azerbaijan of a prisoner transfer treaty to justify the immediate release of an Azerbaijani soldier, convicted of murdering an Armenian soldier in Hungary. ([Read more](#) - [Resolution 2022](#))

Belgium

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Mubilanzila Mayeka and Kaniki Mitunga (No. 13178/03)	12 January 2007	CM/ResDH(2014)226	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ PACE President urged Belgian Parliament to look into implementation of the ECHR in domestic law (19.11.2014)

PACE President called on the Belgian Parliament to task a committee with looking into the implementation of judgments of the Strasbourg Court at national level. ([Read more](#))

Bosnia and Herzegovina

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Tokic and others (No. 12455/04+)	8 October 2008	CM/ResDH(2014)197	Examination closed
Halilovic (No. 23968/05)	1 March 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)197	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ PACE: Interethnic divisions are a key feature of the elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina (18.11.2014)

Despite an appropriate legal framework for holding democratic elections, and the fact that political parties, coalitions and independent candidates could campaign freely, “the interethnic divide was a key factor”. Therefore, PACE called on all politicians and political parties to find ways to regain public trust in the functioning of the democratic institutions in the country. ([Read more](#) - [Standing Committee to meet in Brussels](#) - [Election observation report](#))

■ ECRI: Round-table in Bosnia and Herzegovina (13.11.2014)

In co-operation with the Institution of the Human Rights Ombudsman of Bosnia and Herzegovina, ECRI organised a round table in Sarajevo on 19 November 2014 to discuss the follow-up given to the recommendations contained in its report on Bosnia and Herzegovina published in 2011 and the relevant conclusions published in 2014 (Read [more](#)).

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Dimitar and Anka (No. 56753/00)	12 May 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)198	Examination closed
Simova and Georgiev (No. 55722/00)	12 May 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)198	Examination closed
Koprinarovi (No. 57176/00)	15 April 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)198	Examination closed
Miteva (No. 60805/00)	12 May 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)198	Examination closed
Gyuleva and Others (No. 76963/01)	25 September 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)198	Examination closed
Vladimirova and Others (No. 42617/02)	26 May 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)198	Examination closed
Mihaylovi (No. 6189/03)	12 May 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)198	Examination closed
Georgievi (No. 10913/04)	7 April 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)198	Examination closed
Bachvarovi (No. 24186/04)	7 April 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)198	Examination closed
Panayotova (No. 27636/04)	2 October 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)198	Examination closed
Peshevi (No. 29722/04)	2 October 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)198	Examination closed
Madzharov (No. 40149/05)	2 December 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)198	Examination closed
Manova and Others (No. 32626/06)	3 February 2001	CM/ResDH(2014)198	Examination closed
Kayriakovi (No. 30945/04)	7 April 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)199	Examination closed
Yonkov (No. 17241/06)	2 December 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)199	Examination closed
Tadzhigul Sazakovna Begmedova (No. 34063/08)	6 May 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)200	Examination closed
Tsevetan Iliev Mladenov and Others (No. 38359/08)	6 May 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)200	Examination closed
Stefan Georgiev Rangelov	8 April 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)200	Examination closed

(No. 13809/08)			
<u>Mancheva</u> (No. 39609/98)	30 December 2004	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)201</u>	Examination closed
<u>Puleva and Radeva</u> (No. 36265/05)	14 February 2012	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)201</u>	Examination closed
<u>Yavashev and Others</u> (No. 41661/05)	18 March 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)202</u>	Examination closed
<u>Sadaykov</u> (No. 75157/01)	22 August 2008	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)203</u>	Examination closed
<u>Radeva</u> (No. 13577/05)	3 October 2012	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)227</u>	Examination closed
<u>Milen Kostov</u> (No. 40026/07)	3 December 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)248</u>	Examination closed
<u>Nasko Georgiev</u> (No. 25451/07)	3 December 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)248</u>	Examination closed
<u>Stamose</u> (No. 29713/05)	27 February 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)249</u>	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
Ana Lazic and Srdan Lazic (No. 32054/13)	12 May 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)204	Examination closed
Golubovic (No. 43947/10)	27 February 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)205	Examination closed
Bulfracht LTD (No. 53261/08)	21 September 2011	CM/ResDH(2014)228	Examination closed
Damjanac (No. 52943/10)	24 March 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)229	Examination closed
Lelas (No. 55555/08)	20 August 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)230	Examination closed
Saric and Others (No. 38767/07)	18 January 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)230	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

[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: Cyprus ratified Lanzarote Convention (14.11.2014)

“The ratification of the Lanzarote Convention by the Republic of Cyprus is a continuation of our country’s commitment for the defence of children’s rights, said General Rapporteur on Children”, Stella Kyriakides. ([Read more](#) - [Key parliamentary vote in Cyprus kicks off drive to end child sex abuse](#))

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Dupova (No. 67981/10)	22 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)206	Examination closed
Havlicek (No. 40658/10)	22 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)206	Examination closed
Kolar (No. 8039/11)	26 March 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)206	Examination closed
Kotek (No. 26466/08)	27 November 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)206	Examination closed
Kubes (No. 55568//11)	22 January 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)206	Examination closed
Latal and 3 Others (No. 53043/09)	10 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)206	Examination closed
Minarik (No. 40289/09)	22 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)206	Examination closed
Mlatilik (No. 38425/09)	22 January 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)206	Examination closed
Petricek (No. 28826/11)	4 June 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)206	Examination closed
R.K. (No. 7883/08)	27 November 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)206	Examination closed
Saska (No. 2666/09)	4 June 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)206	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]

Denmark

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Edslev-Christensen (No. 51153/09)	5 November 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)250	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]

Estonia

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ ECRI: Preparation of a report on Estonia (27.11.2014)

A delegation of the ECRI visited Estonia from 17 to 21 November 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](#)).

■ MONEYVAL: Report on the 4th round assessment visit to Estonia (12.11.2014)

([Link to the report](#)).

Finland

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Lupala (No. 49676/11)	17 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)207	Examination closed
Sipiläinen (No. 15260/11)	22 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)207	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]

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
<u>Davtyan</u> (No. 73241/01)	27 October 2006	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)208</u>	Examination closed
<u>Danelia</u> (No. 68622/01)	17 January 2007	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)208</u>	Examination closed
<u>Ghavtadze</u> (No. 23204/07)	3 June 2009	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)209</u>	Examination closed
<u>Poghossian</u> (No. 9870/07)	24 May 2009	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)209</u>	Examination closed
<u>Irakli Mindadze</u> (No. 17012/09)	11 March 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)209</u>	Examination closed
<u>Jeladze</u> (No. 1871/08)	18 March 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)209</u>	Examination closed
<u>Ildani</u> (No. 65391/09)	23 July 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)209</u>	Examination closed
<u>Tariel Bakradze</u> (No. 3658/10)	20 May 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)210</u>	Examination closed
<u>Zurab Tibilashvili</u> (No. 16516/10)	27 May 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)210</u>	Examination closed
<u>Gocha Abzianidze</u> (No. 23715/09)	27 May 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)231</u>	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
Hümmer (No. 26171/07)	19 October 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)211	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]

Greece

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Mathloom (No. 48883/07)	24 July 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)232	Examination closed
Anonymous Touristiki Etairia Xenodocheia Kritis (No. 35332/05)	11 April 2011	CM/ResDH(2014)233	Examination closed
Housing Association of War Disabled and Victims of War of Attica and Others (No. 35859/02)	31 March 2008	CM/ResDH(2014)233	Examination closed
Theodoraki and Others (No. 9368/06)	11 April 2011	CM/ResDH(2014)233	Examination closed
Z.A.N.T.E. - Marathonissi A.E. (No. 14216/03)	6 Novembre 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)233	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
Janos Steigler (No. 2730/10)	15 April 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)212	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
D.G. (No. 39474/98)	16 August 2002	CM/ResDH(2014)234	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 supports Ireland in its commitment to preventing corruption among members of parliament, judges and prosecutors and to further strengthening their integrity (21.11.2014)

In a report, the GRECO assessed the Irish system for ensuring integrity and preventing corruption and misconduct among members of parliament, judges and prosecutors. GRECO noted that there is growing concern about corruption in Ireland, not least as a result of the enquiry and findings of the 2012 “Mahon Tribunal” ([Read the report](#)).

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Attena and Others and 2 Other applications (No. 49153/11+)	7 May 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)213	Examination closed
Celentano and 3 Other Applications (No. 64784/10+)	19 June 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)213	Examination closed
Napolitano and 23 Other Applications (No. 51977/10+)	19 June 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)213	Examination closed
Giacomelli (No. 59909/00)	26 March 2007	CM/ResDH(2014)214	Examination closed
Saadi (No. 37201/06)	28 February 2008	CM/ResDH(2014)215	Examination closed
Abdelhedi (No. 2638/07)	14 September 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)215	Examination closed
Ben Salah (No. 38128/06)	14 September 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)215	Examination closed
Bouyahia (No. 46792/06)	14 September 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)215	Examination closed
C. B. Z (NO. 44006/06)	14 September 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)215	Examination closed
Darraji (No. 11549/05)	14 September 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)215	Examination closed
Hamraoui (No. 16201/07)	14 September 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)215	Examination closed
O. (No. 37257/06)	14 September 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)215	Examination closed
Soltana (No. 37336/06)	14 September 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)215	Examination closed
Sellem (NO. 12584)	6 November 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)215	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
Longa Yonkeu (No. 57229/09)	15 February 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)251	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]

Luxembourg

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
<u>Schumacher</u> (No. 63286/00)	25 February 2004	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)216</u>	Examination closed
<u>Rezette</u> (No. 73983/01)	13 October 2004	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)216</u>	Examination closed
<u>Laghouti and Others</u> (No. 33747/02)	18 May 2007	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)216</u>	Examination closed
<u>Casse</u> (No. 40327/02)	27 July 2006	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)216</u>	Examination closed
<u>Jetzen</u> (No. 34471/04)	4 June 2008	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)216</u>	Examination closed
<u>Electro Distribution Luxembourgeoise (E. D. L.) S. A.</u> (No. 11282/05)	31 October 2007	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)216</u>	Examination closed
<u>Shore Technologies</u> (No. 35704/06)	31 October 2008	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)216</u>	Examination closed
<u>Kuhn</u> (No. 53869/07)	4 February 2011	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)216</u>	Examination closed
<u>Rausch</u> (No. 29733/08)	8 October 2010	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)216</u>	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]

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Nedelcu (No. 35149/10)	18 February 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)217	Examination closed
Tretiacov and Others (No. 28171/10)	18 February 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)217	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

[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: Round-table to support anti-trafficking efforts in Montenegro (13.11.2014)

A round-table meeting on the follow-up to be given to GRETA's first evaluation report and the Committee of the Parties' recommendation on the implementation of the Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings by Montenegro took place in Podgorica on 13 November 2014 ([Read more](#)).

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Sosinowska (No. 10247/09)	18 January 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)218	Examination closed
Moskal (No. 10373/05)	1 March 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)219	Examination closed
Antoni Lewandowski (No. 38459/03)	2 January 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)219	Examination closed
Bryda (No. 1902/05)	25 March 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)219	Examination closed
Burczy (No. 43129/04)	11 February 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)219	Examination closed
Czaja (No. 5744/05)	2 January 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)219	Examination closed
Czyz (No. 21796/05)	11 February 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)219	Examination closed
Fraczek-Potega (No. 39430/04)	4 March 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)219	Examination closed
Franciszek Dabrowski (No. 31803/04)	4 March 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)219	Examination closed
Hajduk (No. 6210/05)	11 February 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)219	Examination closed
Helena Trznadel (No. 5970/05)	2 January 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)219	Examination closed
Kapel (No. 16519/05)	2 January 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)219	Examination closed
Kluska (No. 33384/04)	2 January 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)219	Examination closed
Kowal (No. 21913/05)	2 January 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)219	Examination closed
Kruszynski (No. 22543/05)	28 January 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)219	Examination closed
Krzyzek (No. 11815/05)	4 March 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)219	Examination closed
Kura (No. 17318/04)	2 January 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)219	Examination closed
Lasota (No. 6762/04)	2 January 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)219	Examination closed
Lew (No. 34386/04)	4 March 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)219	Examination closed

<u>Marek</u> (No. 54148/09)	28 January 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)219</u>	Examination closed
<u>Migalska</u> (No. 10368/05)	4 March 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)219</u>	Examination closed
<u>Misielak</u> (No. 35538/04)	4 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)219</u>	Examination closed
<u>Placzowska</u> (No. 15435/04)	2 January 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)219</u>	Examination closed
<u>Potok</u> (No. 18683/04)	4 March 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)219</u>	Examination closed
<u>Rusin</u> (No. 25360/04)	2 January 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)219</u>	Examination closed
<u>Sasor</u> (No. 6112/05)	4 March 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)219</u>	Examination closed
<u>Stepien</u> (No. 39225/05)	4 March 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)219</u>	Examination closed
<u>Swiatek</u> (No. 8578/04)	4 March 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)219</u>	Examination closed
<u>Szewc</u> (No. 31492/05)	4 March 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)219</u>	Examination closed
<u>Wegrzyn</u> (No. 29423/05)	28 January 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)219</u>	Examination closed
<u>Zofia Sikora</u> (No. 27680/04)	4 March 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)219</u>	Examination closed
<u>Kaperzynski</u> (No. 43206/07)	3 July 2012	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)235</u>	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
Ramos Ferreira and Others (No. 23321/11+)	9 December 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)236	Examination closed
Almeida Cabral and Almeida Cabral (No. 49628/13)	28 January 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)252	Examination closed
Alves Lourenço Martins de Brito and Brito de Lima (No. 13886/12)	28 January 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)252	Examination closed
Carvalho Teodoro (No. 42989/12)	4 March 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)252	Examination closed
Da Conceição (No. 41163/11)	28 January 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)252	Examination closed
Da Trindade Rodrigues (No. 42178/13)	28 January 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)252	Examination closed
De Jesus Oliveira Matias (No. 19424/13)	28 January 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)252	Examination closed
Defontaine (No. 62843/10)	28 January 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)252	Examination closed
Félix Henriques (No. 12861/13)	28 January 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)252	Examination closed
Gonçalves Ramos (No. 42102/11)	28 January 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)252	Examination closed
Guerreiro Carrasquinha (No. 14564/12)	4 March 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)252	Examination closed
Lopes Castanheira de Carvalho e Silva Da Conceição (No. 21520/12)	4 March 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)252	Examination closed
Mendes de Carvalho (No. 34179/12)	4 March 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)252	Examination closed
Pacheco Alves Da Costa (No. 42783/13)	28 January 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)252	Examination closed
Pina E Moura (No. 40881/12)	4 March 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)252	Examination closed
Reis Monteiro (No. 69566/11)	28 January 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)252	Examination closed

Sandinha and Others (No. 17876/12)	4 March 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)252	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]

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Bumbea (No. 807/13)	7 March 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)220	Examination closed
M.S. (No. 31511/11)	18 February 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)220	Examination closed
Vartic (no. 2) (No. 14150/08)	17 March 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)221	Examination closed
Hamvas (No. 6025/05)	9 October 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)237	Examination closed
Anderco (No. 3910/04)	29 January 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)237	Examination closed
Leontin Pop (No. 1956/06)	1 January 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)237	Examination closed
Gonta (No. 38494/04)	1 January 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)237	Examination closed
Moculescu (No. 15636/04)	2 June 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)238	Examination closed
Radovici and Stanescu (No. 68479/01+)	2 February 2007	CM/ResDH(2014)239	Examination closed
Anghelescu No. 2 (No. 14578/03)	4 February 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)239	Examination closed
Arsenovici (No. 77210/01)	7 May 2008	CM/ResDH(2014)239	Examination closed
Brumarescu No. 2 (No. 28106/03)	23 September 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)239	Examination closed
Burzo (No. 75240/01)	4 June 2008	CM/ResDH(2014)239	Examination closed
Dumitrescu Maria and Sorin Mugur Dumitrescu (No. 7293/02)	14 January 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)239	Examination closed
Dumitrescu No. 2 (No. 29517/02)	23 December 2008	CM/ResDH(2014)239	Examination closed
Jarnea and Others (No. 36268/02+)	31 May 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)239	Examination closed
Kerekes (No. 2736/02)	13 February 2009	CM/ResDH(2014)239	Examination closed
Oancea and Others (No. 5984/02)	29 October 2008	CM/ResDH(2014)239	Examination closed

<u>Popescu and Others</u> (No. 27086/02)	8 June 2007	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)239</u>	Examination closed
<u>Postolache</u> (No. 24171/02)	16 March 2009	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)239</u>	Examination closed
<u>Rosca Marcel</u> (No. 1266/03)	6 April 2009	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)239</u>	Examination closed
<u>Rotaru Rodica Michaela</u> (No. 34325/05)	10 February 2010	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)239</u>	Examination closed
<u>Schmidt</u> (No. 28777/03)	10 December 2005	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)239</u>	Examination closed
<u>Spanoche</u> (No. 3864/03)	10 December 2007	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)239</u>	Examination closed
<u>Tarik</u> (No. 75849/01)	7 May 2008	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)239</u>	Examination closed
<u>Trifu</u> (No. 1242/02)	25 February 2009	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)239</u>	Examination closed
<u>Vinatoru</u> (No. 18429/02)	14 January 2009	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)239</u>	Examination closed
<u>Botea</u> (No. 40872/04)	10 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)240</u>	Examination closed
<u>Jenita Mocanu</u> (No. 11770/08)	17 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)241</u>	Examination closed
<u>Niculescu-Dellakeza</u> (No. 5393/04)	26 June 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)242</u>	Examination closed
<u>Oprea</u> (No. 26765/05)	10 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)243</u>	Examination closed
<u>Potcova</u> (No. 27945/07)	17 March 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)244</u>	Examination closed
<u>Sancraian</u> (No. 71723/10)	14 April 2014	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)245</u>	Examination closed
<u>Teodor</u> (No. 46878/06)	7 October 2013	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)246</u>	Examination closed
<u>Rotaru</u> (No. 28341/95)	4 May 2000	<u>CM/ResDH(2014)253</u>	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
Laduna (No. 31827/02)	4 June 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)222	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 Slovak Republic (25.11.2014)

The CPT has published the report on its September/October 2013 visit to the Slovak Republic, together with the response of the Slovak authorities ([Read more](#)).

■ GRECO: Council of Europe warns Slovakia on risks of corruption amongst parliamentarians, judges and prosecutors (06.11.2014).

The GRECO underscores substantial corruption risks and vulnerabilities that parliamentarians, judges and prosecutors are prone to in the Slovak Republic ([Read the report](#)).

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
C.C. (No. 1425/06)	6 January 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)223	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
L. (No. 61204/09)	6 January 2010	CM/ResDH(2014)224	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]

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: Parliamentary elections in Ukraine are an important step in consolidating democracy (18.11.2014)

PACE considered that the early parliamentary elections in Ukraine mark “an important step in consolidating democratic elections in line with international commitments”. But some numerous cases were irregular, and PACE called on the authorities to investigate all cases thoroughly. ([Read more](#) - [Standing Committee to meet in Brussels](#) - [Election observation report](#))

■ PACE President called for urgent implementation of reforms agenda (21.11.2014)

PACE President stressed the need for urgent reforms in order to address the systemic shortcomings in Ukraine’s political and judicial systems. Therefore, the President called on the new elected parliament and newly-formed government to put in place reforms for the development of the country. ([Read more](#))

■ PACE: Improving the humanitarian situation of Ukrainian refugees and displaced persons (28.11.2014)

A PACE committee called on all sides in the conflict in Ukraine to fully respect the Minsk ceasefire and to refrain from the use of force and violence, particularly against civilians. ([Read more](#) - [Provisional Report](#))

United Kingdom

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Cheetham (No. 9877/10)	11 March 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)247	Examination closed
Gamble (No. 9885/10)	11 March 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)247	Examination closed
Scott Ashton (No. 15263/10)	10 June 2014	CM/ResDH(2014)254	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]