

REGULAR SELECTIVE INFORMATION FLOW

for the attention of the National Human Rights Structures

Issue#

[1 – 30 April 2016]

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 NHRSS \(p.5\)](#)

[2. Other judgments \(p.11\)](#)

[B. Decisions on admissibility \(p.17\)](#)

[C. Communicated cases \(p.17\)](#)

[§2 - European Committee of Social Rights \(p.20\)](#)

[A. Resolutions & Decisions \(p.20\)](#)

[B. Other information \(p.20\)](#)

[§3 - Recommendations & Resolutions \(p.21\)](#)

[A. Recommendations \(p.21\)](#)

[B. Resolutions \(p.21\)](#)

[§4 - Other information of general importance \(p.26\)](#)

[A. Information from the Committee of Ministers \(p.26\)](#)

[B. Information from the Parliamentary Assembly \(p.26\)](#)

[C. Information from the Commissioner of Human Rights \(p.26\)](#)

[D. Information from the Council of Europe monitoring mechanisms \(p.26\)](#)

[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 (Paris Saclay). It is entrusted to Valentine Decoen, Léa Guémené, Camille Joly, Pavlos Aimilios Marinatos, Quentin Michael, Clara Michel, Guillaume Verdier and Manon Wagner under the supervision of Laure Clément-Wilz, Ph.D, European Law Associate Professor.

Index by Country

ALBANIA, 9, 27	LUXEMBOURG, 45
ARMENIA, 28	MOLDOVA, 11, 46
AUSTRIA, 9, 29	MONTENEGRO, 24, 47
AZERBAIJAN, 30	NETHERLANDS, 3, 4, 48
BELGIUM, 24, 31	NORWAY, 49
BULGARIA, 5, 9, 24, 32	POLAND, 11, 16, 24, 50
CROATIA, 9, 15, 24, 33	PORTUGAL, 53
CYPRUS, 9, 16, 24	ROMANIA, 12, 13, 17, 54
ESTONIA, 10, 24, 34	RUSSIA, 7, 8, 13, 15, 17, 22, 55
FRANCE, 1, 2, 35	SAN MARINO, 56
GEORGIA, 15, 36	SERBIA, 57
GERMANY, 10, 15, 16	SLOVAK REPUBLIC, 58 , 59
GREECE, 10, 37, 38	SWITZERLAND, 60
HUNGARY, 4, 10, 21, 39 , 40	THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA, 11, 61
ITALY, 10, 41	TURKEY, 5, 7, 8, 14, 17, 21, 24, 62
KOSOVO, 42	UKRAINE, 14, 17, 22, 24, 65
LATVIA, 11, 43	UNITED KINGDOM, 15, 66
LITHUANIA, 11, 16, 44	

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 April 2016) by the European Court of Human Rights, the European Committee of Social Rights, the Committee of Ministers, the Parliamentary Assembly and other Council of Europe monitoring mechanisms.

PartOne

§1 - EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

A. Judgments

1. Judgments deemed of particular interest to the NHRs

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

Some judgments are only available in French.

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

Note on the Importance Level:

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

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

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

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

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

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

MURRAY V. THE NETHERLANDS (No. 10511/10) - Importance 1 - 26 April 2016 - Violation of Article 3 - Domestic authorities’ failure to guarantee a life prisoner to realistic prospect of release

The case concerned the complaint by a man convicted of murder in 1980, who consecutively served his life sentence until being granted a pardon in 2014 due to his deteriorating health. The applicant notably maintained that he was not provided with a special detention regime for prisoners with psychiatric problems. Although a legal mechanism for reviewing life sentences had been introduced shortly after he lodged his application with the Court, he argued that, de facto, he had no perspective of being released since he had never been provided with any psychiatric treatment and therefore the risk of his reoffending would continue to be considered too high to be eligible for release.

The Court first recalled that the imposition of a sentence of life imprisonment on an adult offender is not in itself incompatible with the Convention.

In this case, the Court considered that the applicant's detention in a prison rather than in a custodial clinic could not have superseded the need for treatment, which had been identified by the psychiatrist who had examined him in the context of the criminal proceedings. Furthermore, the Court underlined that States were under an obligation to provide detainees suffering from mental health problems with appropriate medical care. Based on several reports of the CPT, the Court found that the mental health care in the applicant's prison was insufficient.

Moreover, the Court noted that the opinions of the domestic court advising against his release showed that there was a close link between the persistence of that risk on the one hand and the lack of treatment on the other. Therefore, the applicant's life sentence had not de facto been reducible, as required by the Court's case-law under Article 3.

This conclusion was sufficient for the Court to find, unanimously, that there had been a violation of Article 3.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that in the circumstances of the case the finding of a violation of Article 3 constituted sufficient just satisfaction.

The Court also held that the Netherlands were to pay the applicant's son and his sister EUR 27,500 in respect of costs and expenses.

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

R.B. V. HUNGARY (No. 64602/12) — Importance 1 — 12 April 2016 — Violation of Article 8 — Domestic authorities' failure to properly investigate racial threats and insults

The applicant, of Roma origin, complained that she had been subjected to racist insults and threats by participants in an anti-Roma march organised by a right-wing political party. She also complained that the authorities had failed to investigate the racist verbal abuse after she had lodged a criminal complaint.

First of all, the Court found that the threats towards the applicant and necessarily affected her private life within the meaning of Article 8.

Despite the fact that the applicant had lodged a criminal complaint for verbal abuse and threats against a member of a group, and harassment, the law-enforcement authorities had only concentrated on harassment, even when she requested to have the scope of investigation extended.

The Court noted that, as the acts had not been isolated as they happened during an anti-Roma rally, domestic authorities should have conducted the investigation in that specific context and have taken all reasonable steps to establish the role of racist motives. Moreover domestic law would have made this investigation possible. The Court thus considered that the fact that the law-enforcement authorities had found an objective element of the crime of violence against a member of a group could not be established and there were no grounds to pursue the investigations into that offence amounted to preventing any adequate investigation.

Hence there had been a violation of Article 8.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that Hungary was to pay the applicant EUR 4,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 3,717 in respect of costs and expenses.

IVANOVA AND CHERKEZOV V. BULGARIA (No. 46577/15) — Importance 2 — 21 April 2016 — Violation of Article 8 — Domestic authorities’ failure to take into account the applicants’ situation concerning the demolition of an illegally built residential house — No violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 — Domestic authorities’ legally justified order of demolition

The applicants lived in a house, which had been built without any building permit. This house was located on a plot of land, which belonged to her at 77%. Domestic authorities found the house had been constructed illegally and decided that it was to be demolished. The applicants’ appeals had been dismissed.

Article 8

The Court noted that the order of demolition amounted to an interference to the applicants’ right to respect for their home. Nevertheless, this interference was lawful and aimed at implementing the requirement that buildings could not be constructed without permit. Nevertheless, the Court noted that domestic courts only pondered over whether the house had been built without a permit and whether it was exempt from demolition under a transitional rule of the domestic law. At no time did they take into consideration the fact that the applicants had no other home, because under domestic law, it was not open to the authorities to refrain from demolishing a house on the basis that this would cause disproportionate harm to those affected by the measure. The applicants could, moreover, not have obtained a proper examination of the proportionality of the demolition under any other provision of the domestic law.

In conclusion, the applicants had not had available a procedure to obtain comprehensive review of the proportionality of the intended demolition of the house.

Accordingly, there would be a violation of Article 8 if the order for the demolition of the house were to be enforced without such a review.

Article 1 of Protocol n° 1

As it had already been said, the Court found that the order of demolition had a legal basis and that the interference with the applicants’ right to respect for their home aimed at protecting the general interest. Moreover it would act as a deterrent for other potential lawbreakers. As domestic authorities had a wide margin of appreciation on this point, the measure did not breach Article 1 of Protocol n° 1.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that the finding of a violation of the Convention was sufficient just satisfaction for any non-pecuniary damage suffered by the applicants. The Court further held that Bulgaria was to pay the applicants EUR 2,013.73 in respect of costs and expenses.

- **Freedom of thought, conscience and religion (Art. 9)**

İZZETTİN DOĞAN AND OTHERS V. TURKEY (No. 62649/10) - Importance 1 - 26 April 2016 - Violation of Article 9 - Domestic authorities’ failure to be neutral and impartial by recognizing the religious nature of the Alevi faith - Violation of Article 14 in conjunction with Article 9 - Disproportionate difference of treatment between two faiths

The case concerned the applicants' complaint about the refusal of their requests seeking to obtain for the followers of the Alevi faith, to which they belong, the same religious public service provided exclusively to citizens adhering to the Sunni branch of Islam.

Article 9

The Court first considered that the authorities' refusal of the applicants' requests amounted to an interference with their right to freedom of religion, as it had the effect of denying legal protection to Alevi places of worship and religious leaders, and entailed numerous consequences for the organisation, continuation and funding of their religious activities.

First, the Court noted that this interference was prescribed by law and that it had a legitimate aim, namely the protection of public order.

As to determine whether this interference was necessary in a democratic society, the Court examined in turn the reasons thus relied on by domestic authorities as grounds for refusing the applicants' requests for recognition, in order to ascertain whether they were "relevant and sufficient" and whether the refusal in question was "proportionate to the legitimate aims pursued". The Court reiterated that, in accordance with the principle of autonomy for religious communities established in its case-law, only the highest spiritual authorities of a religious community, and not domestic authorities, could determine to which faith that community belonged. The Court then observed that the Alevi community had significant distinguishing characteristics and rejected the domestic authorities' argument that the community in question was simply a "Sufi order". Or, this entailed a number of prohibitions punishable by a term of imprisonment and a fine. The Court further noted that Alevis faced numerous problems with regard to the organisation of their religious life, the rights of Alevi parents with children attending primary and secondary schools, and the fact that Alevi religious leaders had no legal status.

Although the States enjoyed a certain margin of appreciation with regard to the forms of cooperation with the different communities, the Court considered that in the present case the State had overstepped its margin of appreciation. The Court reiterated that, according to its case-law concerning Article 9 of the Convention, the State's duty of neutrality and impartiality was incompatible with any power on the State's part to assess the legitimacy of religious beliefs or the ways in which those beliefs were expressed. The Court therefore held that the authorities' interference with the right of the applicants, as Alevis, to freedom of religion had not been necessary in a democratic society.

It considered that the attitude of the domestic authorities towards the Alevi community in this case was incompatible with the State's duty of neutrality and impartiality and with the right of religious communities to an autonomous existence.

Accordingly, the Court found a violation of Article 9 of the Convention.

Article 14 taken in conjunction with Article 9

The Court considered that, with regard to their need for legal recognition and for a religious public service pertaining to their Alevi faith, the applicants could claim to be in a comparable situation to other citizens who had received such recognition and benefited from the religious public service. The Court noted that the State provided religious services pertaining to the Muslim religion as a public service, in particular by granting that religion a status within the State administration. However, the applicants, as Alevis, received less favourable treatment than the beneficiaries of the religious public service despite being in a comparable situation.

As to the justification for this difference in treatment, the Court already observed that religion was almost entirely subsidised by domestic authorities. Moreover, domestic law made no provision for any compensatory measures to remedy that marked discrepancy. In the Court's view, whatever form was chosen, the State had a duty to put in place objective and non-discriminatory criteria so that religious

communities which so wished were given a fair opportunity to apply for a status which conferred specific advantages on religious denominations. Hence, the Court considered that the choice made by the State appeared manifestly disproportionate to the aim pursued. It found that the difference in treatment to which the applicants, as Alevi, had been subjected had no objective and reasonable justification, and held that there had been a violation of Article 14 of the Convention taken in conjunction with Article 9.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held, unanimously, that the finding of a violation constituted in itself sufficient just satisfaction in respect of any non-pecuniary damage sustained by the applicants. It ruled that Turkey was to pay EUR 3,000 to the applicants jointly in respect of costs and expenses.

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

NOVIKOVA AND OTHERS V. RUSSIA (Nos. 25501/07, 57569/11, 80153/12, 5790/13 AND 35015/13) — Importance 2 — 26 April 2016 — Violation of article 10 — Domestic authorities' disproportionate reaction towards solo demonstrations

The applicants had lodged five different complaints. Three of them had separately taken part to solo demonstrations but had been arrested and convicted of breaching the statutory procedure for the running of a public event without prior notification. Another had been arrested without any reason after a solo demonstration and brought civil proceedings seeking compensation. The last one had been found guilty of minor hooliganism for having staged a demonstration during a visit of the president.

As the applicants had taken part to solo demonstrations, the Court decided to examine the case under Article 10 while still taking into account the case-law related to article 11. The Court also chose to consider that the applicants' arrests had been proportionate and had a lawful basis and a legitimate aim, namely prevention of crime and prevention of disorder.

All applicants had chosen "solo static demonstrations" to express their opinion, because that was the only form of public event which did not require prior notification to the authorities. It appeared that the applicants' demonstrations complied with the definition of solo static demonstrations and concerned matters of public interest. Thus it had constituted a form of political expression. Domestic authorities qualified those demonstrations of public group events, thus requiring prior notification.

The Court considered the quick termination of the demonstrations had not been justified, as the demonstrators were not violent or numerous enough to threaten public order. Likewise, their arrests had been disproportionate as they had only committed an administrative offence and had not been violent. Furthermore, the Court was not satisfied that the applicants' right to exercise their freedom of expression had been duly taken into consideration in the examination of the administrative offence charges against them as domestic law was blurred on solo static demonstration qualification.

The Court did not see sufficient reasons for convicting demonstrators for the non-observance of the notification requirement who had merely been standing in a peaceful, non-disruptive manner at a distance of some fifty metres from each other, as no compelling consideration relating to public safety, prevention of disorder or protection of the rights of others was at stake. The Court found that the competence to reclassify an event, after the fact, as a "group event" rather than a solo demonstration had constituted a disproportionate reaction to the situation. Moreover the burden of proving that the demonstration was planned as a public group event should lie on domestic authorities.

Finally, the Court noted that the fines for breaches of the procedure for organising or running a public event were so high that they would create a deterrent effect on legitimate recourse to protest.

The Court concluded that the swift termination of the events followed by the applicants' being taken to police stations and their prosecution for an administrative offence had constituted a disproportionate interference with the applicants' right to freedom of expression, in violation of Article 10.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that Russia was to pay, in respect of non-pecuniary damage, EUR 7,500 each to three of the applicants, and EUR 6,000 to another. Furthermore, Russia was to pay EUR 120 to one of the applicants in respect of pecuniary damage and EUR 6,000 to two applicants in respect of costs and expenses.

- **Freedom of assembly and association (Art. 11)**

CUMHURİYET HALK PARTİSİ V. TURKEY (No. 19920/13) - Importance 1 - 26 April 2016 - Violation of Article 11 - Unclear domestic law regarding the notion of “unlawful expenditure” for a political party

The case concerned the confiscation of a substantial part of the assets of Turkey’s main opposition party, ordered by the domestic Constitutional Court following an inspection of its accounts. The party complained that this confiscation had put a substantial financial strain on its political activities.

The Court first recalled that Political parties are a form of association essential to the proper functioning of democracy.

It then examined whether it was an interference with the applicant’s right to freedom of assembly. For that purpose, the Court took the view that requiring political parties to subject their finances to official inspection did not in itself raise an issue under Article 11, as it served the goals of transparency and accountability. Moreover, member States had relatively wide margin of appreciation in inspecting political parties’ finances and choosing sanctions for irregular financial transactions. However, the Court noted that the confiscation orders had obliged the applicant party to curtail a significant number of its political activities, particularly at local branch level. The confiscation orders had therefore interfered with the applicant party’s right to freedom of association.

It then found that this interference had had a basis in national law but that it lacked precision as regards the scope of the notion of “unlawful expenditure”. Furthermore, the Court noted that the Constitutional Court decisions resulted to an inconsistent and unpredictable interpretation and application of the law to the detriment of the applicant party’s need to be able to regulate its expenditure in order to avoid facing sanctions in the future. Having regard to the ambiguity of both the scope of the notion of unlawful expenditure under the relevant legal provisions in force at the time, as well as the applicable sanctions for unlawful expenditure, the Court concluded that the high standard of foreseeability required as regards laws that govern the inspection of the finances of political parties had not been satisfied in the applicant party’s case.

Accordingly, the confiscation orders had not been "prescribed by law", in breach of Article 11.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that Turkey was to pay the applicant party EUR 1,085,800 in respect of pecuniary damage and EUR 5,000 for 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 judgment.

For more detailed information, please refer to the cases.

STATE	DATE	CASE TITLE	IMP.	CONCLUSION	KEY WORDS
ALBANIA	21 April 2016	TOPALLAJ (No. 32913/03)	2	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Excessive length of proceedings (9 years and 4 months)
				Violation of Art. 13	Lack of an effective domestic remedy in that respect
AUSTRIA	5 April 2016	BLUM (No. 33060/10)	2	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Lack of an oral hearing
BULGARIA	21 April 2016	CHENGELYAN AND OTHERS (No. 47405/07)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Breach of the principle of legal certainty on account of the quashing of the final judgement in the applicants' favour
				Violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1	Unjustified interference with the applicants' possessions on account of the domestic courts' failure to recognise the <i>res judicata</i> effect of a final judgment delivered in contentious proceedings
CROATIA	26 April 2016	KARDOS (No. 25782/11)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Domestic Administrative court's failure to decide on the applicant's complaint deprived her of her right to access to court
		MERCEP (No. 12301/12)	3	No violation of Art. 5 § 3 (in both cases)	Justified extension of the applicants' pre-trial detention while no lack of diligence was displayed by the domestic authorities in the conduct of the criminal proceedings
		MILANKOVIC AND BOSNJAK (Nos. 37762/12 AND 23530/13)	2		
CYPRUS	26 April 2016	SEAGAL (No. 50756/13)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Ill-treatment of the applicant while in police custody
				Violation of Art. 3 (procedural)	Ineffective investigation into the applicant's allegations of ill-treatment
				Violation of Art. 5 § 1	Unjustified continuation of the applicant's detention with a view to deportation on account of the domestic authorities' failure to act with the required diligence

ESTONIA	26 April 2016	KASHLEV (No. 22574/08)	2	No violation of Art. 6 § 1 and 3 (d)	Fairness of proceedings given that the applicant had unequivocally waived his right to take part in the appeal proceedings, the defence had been able to question the witnesses before the first-instance court while the applicant's lawyer did not request the examination of any witnesses at the appellate court's hearing
GERMANY	28 April 2016	BUCHLEITER (No. 20106/13)	2	No violation of Art. 8	No failure of the domestic courts to strike a fair balance between the competing interests at stake while their decision to suspend the applicant's contact with his child did not overstep the margin of appreciation afforded
GREECE	7 April 2016	ALI CHEEMA AND OTHERS (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 7059/14)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (overcrowding)
				No violation of Art. 3 (concerning the seventh applicant)	Adequate conditions of detention
				Violation of Art. 13 in conjunction with Art. 3	Lack of an effective domestic remedy concerning the inadequate conditions of detention
	21 April 2016	HA.A. (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 58387/11)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (overcrowding)
				No violation of Art. 5 § 1	Lawful detention pending expulsion
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Lack of an effective judicial review of the lawfulness of the applicant's detention pending expulsion
HUNGARY	5 April 2016	KORTVELYESSY (No. 7871/10)	2	Violation of Art. 11	Unnecessary interference with the applicant's right to freedom of assembly on account of the domestic authorities' decision to put a ban on the peaceful assembly he intended to organise
ITALY	28 April 2016	CINCIMINO (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 68884/13)	2	Violation of Art. 8 (positive obligations)	Domestic court's decision to dismiss the applicant's request to have her parental responsibility restored was based on considerations made in previous expert reports which were 6 year old without taking into account the expert reports produced by the applicant or without seeking an independent expert opinion

LATVIA	28 April 2016	BALAJEVS (No. 8347/07)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Unnecessary and excessive use of police force
				Violation of Art. 3 (procedural)	Lack of an effective investigation into that respect
		CAMANS AND TIMOFEJEVA (No. 42906/12)	3	Violation of Art. 5 § 1	Unlawful detention of the applicant (absence of an arrest record)
				No violation of Art. 5 § 1	The applicant had not been compelled to remain present at the company's premises during the inspection by the domestic State Revenue Service
LITHUANIA	12 April 2016	DUNGVECKIS (No. 32106/08)	3	No violation of Art. 4 of Prot. No. 7	No duplication of proceedings
	19 April 2016	BAGDONAVICIUS (No. 41252/12)	3	No violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Adequate medical care during detention
THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA	28 April 2016	SULEJMANI (No. 74681/11)	3	No violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1	The confiscation of the applicant's vehicle in the context of the criminal proceedings against the vehicle's previous owner did not impose an excessive burden on the applicant
		VASILEVSKI (No. 22653/08)	3	Violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1	The confiscation of the applicant's lorry in the context of the criminal proceedings against the vehicle's previous owner imposed an excessive burden on him given that it was impossible for the applicant to seek any compensation
THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA	26 April 2016	CRISTIOGLO (No. 24163/11)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (overcrowding, poor hygiene)
POLAND	19 April 2016	KARWOWSKI (No. 29869/13)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Domestic authorities' failure to provide sufficient and relevant reasons in order to justify the extension of the dangerous detainee regime and the severity of the measures taken such as daily strip searches applied to the applicant for almost 8 years

ROMANIA	5 April 2016	CAZAN (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 30050/12)	2	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Unnecessary use of police force
				Violation of Art. 3 (procedural)	Ineffective investigation in that respect
				No violation of Art. 5 § 1	The applicant had not been compelled to remain in the police officer's office
	5 April 2016	LUKATS (No. 24199/07) TEODORESCU (No. 33751/05)	2	No violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1 (concerning the first applicant)	No failure of the domestic authorities to strike a fair balance between the general and individual interest
				Violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1 (concerning the second applicant)	Unlawful interference with the applicant's right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions given that the interference was not foreseeable for the applicant who had reasonably expected that his claim for adjustment of compensation would be granted
	12 April 2016	ECATERINA MIREA AND OTHERS (No. 43626/13)	3	Violation of Art. 2 (procedural)	Domestic authorities' failure to carry out a prompt and effective investigation into the injuring of the applicants and the killing of their close relatives
				Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Breach of the applicant's right of access to court on account of the strict interpretation of the time-limit by the domestic court of last resort followed by the non-examination of the joined civil claim
		M.C. AND A.C. (No. 12060/12)	2	Violation of Art. 2 and 14 read together (procedural)	Ineffective investigation into the applicants' allegations of ill-treatment and failure to take into account possible discriminatory motives such as homophobic motives behind the attack
				PLES (No. 37213/06)	3
		GHEORGHE DIMA (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 2770/09)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (procedural)	Ineffective investigation into the applicant's allegations of ill-treatment by state agents
19 April 2016					

ROMANIA	26 April 2016	AMARANDEI AND OTHERS <u>(IN FRENCH ONLY)</u> (No. 1443/10)	2	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Ill-treatment of the applicants during a police operation
				Violation of Art. 3 (procedural)	Ineffective investigation in that regard
				Violation of Art. 5 § 1	Unlawful detention of the applicants
				Violation of Art. 8	Breach of the applicants' right to respect for private and family life on account of the house and body searches carried out, the seizure of their personal items and the broadcasting in the media of footage filmed during the police operation
		BERECZKI <u>(IN FRENCH ONLY)</u> (No. 25830/08)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Unfairness of proceedings on account of the lack of impartiality on the part of the domestic courts
COSTEL POPA (No. 47558/10)	3	Violation of Art. 11	Domestic authorities' refusal to register the applicant's association even before it had started operating		
S.C. BRITANIC WORLD S.R.L. <u>(IN FRENCH ONLY)</u> (No. 8602/09)	2	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Breach of the principle of legal certainty on account of the quashing of the final judgement in the applicants' favour		
RUSSIA	5 April 2016	SVETLANA VASILYEVA (No. 10775/09) TRAPEZNIKOV AND OTHERS (Nos. 5623/09, 12460/09, 33656/09 AND 20758/10)	2	Violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1 (concerning the first applicant)	Unjustified interference with the applicant's possessions on account of the quashing of the final domestic judgment in her favour
				No violation of Art. 6 § 1 (concerning the second applicant)	No breach of the legal certainty on account of the supervisory review procedure given that the quashing of the final domestic judgments in the applicant's favour was justified by the need to ensure uniform application of the domestic case-law
	19 April 2016	SERGEY DENISOV AND OTHERS (Nos. 1985/05, 18579/07, 21748/07, 21954/07 AND 20922/08)	3	Violation of Art. 5 § 3	Extension of the applicant's detention on insufficient grounds without considering alternative preventive measures
No violation of Art. 6 § 1	Fairness of the criminal proceedings				
No violation of Art. 6 § 1	Reasonable length of proceedings				

TURKEY	5 April 2016	VEDAT DOGRU (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 2469/10)	2	Violation of Art. 5 § 1	Unlawful detention of the applicant
				Violation of Art. 5 § 3	Lack of a prompt judicial review of the lawfulness of the applicant's detention
	26 April 2016	BASBILEN (No. 35872/08)	2	Violation of Art. 2 (procedural)	Domestic authorities' failure to carry out an effective criminal investigation into the circumstances of the applicant's son's death
				Violation of Art. 2 (substantive)	Unnecessary use of lethal force
				Violation of Art. 2 (procedural)	Domestic authorities' failure to carry out an effective investigation into the killing of the applicants' relatives
				No violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	The applicants' suffering did not have a dimension and a distinct character from the emotional distress which may be regarded as inevitably caused to any family member of a deceased person in a comparable situation
28 April 2016	BAGIYEVA (No. 41085/05)	3	Violation of Art. 8	Disproportionate interference with the applicant's right to respect for her home on account of the insufficient safeguards within the domestic law	
			Violation of Art. 13	Lack of an effective domestic remedy in that respect	

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 January 2016**. 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
CROATIA	5th January 2016	Budimir v. Croatia	Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 taken in conjunction with Art. 14 of the Convention (violation of the applicant's right to peaceful enjoyment of his possessions and discrimination in his rights to possession)	Rejected as incompatible <i>ratione materiae</i> (in respect to national law, the applicant could not be considered as having a sufficient proprietary interest on the flat)
GEORGIA	26th January 2016	Giorgadze v. Georgia	Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (breach of the applicant's property rights)	Rejected as incompatible <i>ratione temporis</i>
GERMANY	5th January 2016	Erdtmann v. Germany	Article 10 of the Convention (The applicant's conviction violated his journalistic freedom)	Rejected as ill-founded (the conviction of the applicant because he was carrying a weapon aboard an aeroplane cannot be linked to an obstruction to his freedom of expression)
RUSSIA	26th January 2016	Pavlov v. Russia	Article 6§1 of the Convention (The judge in charge of the case proved bias through his statements)	Rejected as ill-founded (the material proofs were not sufficient and concluding that the statements were issued from the judge would be going too far)
UNITED KINGDOM	12th January 2016	Kaiyam and others v. The United Kingdom	Article 5§1 of the Convention (the applicants were not provided with reasonable rehabilitation opportunities once out of prison)	Rejected as ill-founded (the applicants were given opportunities to undertake course to address their offending behaviour)

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 **covering the period from 1 to 28 of February 2016** 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
CYPRUS	9 February 2016	KAHADAWA ARACHCHIGE (No. 16870/11)	The applicants complain that, even though they were lawfully resident in Cyprus, they were deported without being informed about the decision and without any procedural safeguards.
GERMANY	3 February 2016	SOMMER (No. 73607/13)	The applicant complains that the public prosecution office collected information about his professional bank account and refused to hand the information over to him or to destroy it.
	3 February 2016	WERRA NATURSTEIN GMBH & CO KG (No. 32377/12)	According to the applicant, he did not receive any compensation for the costs of relocating its quarrying operation to another site due to the planning and construction of a motorway on its land by the domestic authorities.
LITHUANIA	24 February 2016	SELINA (No. 17969/10)	The applicant claims that she was deprived of peaceful enjoyment of her possessions as the State authorities refused to restore her property rights to a plot of land because it was within the territory of a State reserve.
		VALANČIENĖ (No. 2657/10)	According to the applicant, the national authorities unlawfully chose the form of restitution to be monetary compensation and inadequately calculated the value of the restored land.
POLAND	4 February 2016	BAKOWSKI (No. 49/12)	The applicants complain that they received half of their minimum wage for their work carried out while serving their prison sentences.

ROMANIA	9 February 2016	<u>CIUPERCESCU</u> (No. 41995/14)	The applicant complains about his impossibility to communicate on-line with his wife and about his obligation to provide the prison authorities with a list containing all the phone numbers he needed to call from prison.
	24 February 2016	<u>STANA</u> (No. 66640/12)	The applicant complains that the interception of his phone conversation was unlawful, in violation of his right to private life.
RUSSIA	22 February 2016	<u>ALIYEV</u> (No. 41830/15)	To the applicant, the expulsion by compulsory procedure was a disproportionate penalty, failing to take account of the circumstances of the case.
TURKEY	11 February 2016	<u>SÖNMEZSOY</u> (No. 22658/10)	The applicant argues that his property rights have been violated because he was not indemnified for the damages he suffered following an explosion.
UKRAINE	22 February 2016	<u>OVCHARENKO AND KOLOS</u> (Nos 27276/15 AND 33692/15)	The applicants claim that their dismissal was aimed at justifying the amendment of the domestic Constitution by way of a simplified procedure and showing the judges that their professional views may be used as a basis for their disciplinary liability.

PartOne

§2 - EUROPEAN COMMITTEE OF SOCIAL RIGHTS

A. Reclamations and 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]

PartOne

§3 - RECOMMENDATIONS & RESOLUTIONS

A. Recommendations

AUTHOR	DATE	TEXT NUMBER	SUBJECT MATTER	DECISION
CM	13 April 2016	(2016)5	Internet freedom	CM called on member states to ensure that individuals have access to judicial or administrative procedures that can impartially decide on their claims concerning violations of human rights online, in compliance with Article 6 of the Convention; to provide for the right to effective remedy in compliance with Article 13 of the Convention; to take appropriate steps to protect against human rights abuses with regard to the Internet by private-sector actors and to ensure that those affected have access to an effective remedy; to implement policies and measures to encourage all private-sector actors to respect human rights with regard to the Internet throughout their operations.
CM	13 April 2016	(2016)4	The protection of journalism and safety of journalists and other media actors	CM encouraged member states to review their national legislation and practice concerning media freedom to make sure they are in conformity with the European Convention of Human Rights. Thus, CM called on states to adopt specific measures to prevent violations of media freedom – including physical violence against journalists - to effectively protect journalism and journalists, and to prosecute crimes committed against them.
PACE	22 April 2016	2091	Recommendation regarding a Council of Europe legal instrument on involuntary measures in psychiatry	Involuntary placement and treatment procedures in the context of psychiatry give rise to a large number of human rights abuses. Since 2013, the Committee on Bioethics has been drawing up an additional protocol, aimed at protecting people with mental health problems (better termed “psychosocial disabilities”) from such abuses. PACE called on the Committee on Bioethics to withdraw the proposal for this additional protocol and instead focus its work on promoting alternatives to involuntary measures in psychiatry in accordance with the spirit of the CRPD.

B. Resolutions

AUTHOR	DATE	TEXT NUMBER	SUBJECT MATTER	DECISION
PACE	19 April 2016	2103	Preventing the radicalisation of children and young people by fighting the root causes	<p>PACE expressed that prevention was key to stopping young people being drawn to violent extremism, and should begin “at an early age when values and beliefs are formed”. Thus, PACE expressed that “prevention, de-radicalisation and rehabilitation strategies must target the individual in his or her specific context, be comprehensive and based on multi-agency local partnerships”</p>
PACE	19 April 2016	2104	Towards a framework of competences for democratic citizenship	<p>PACE expressed that the initiative to develop a European framework of competences for a culture of democracy and intercultural dialogue is to be commended.</p> <p>This framework should provide a common ground for building more cohesive societies, where all people are respectful of the human dignity of others and where European shared values are nurtured. It should guide policy makers in the Council of Europe member States in reviewing their education policies and should assist the teaching community in the development of new instruments for setting learning goals, for improving teaching methods and for assessing progress in learning.</p>
PACE	19 April 2016	2105	Evaluation of the partnership for democracy in respect of the Palestinian National Council	<p>PACE welcomed the fact that the Palestinian partner for democracy delegation to the Assembly makes full use of its possibilities to participate in the activities of the Assembly, but regretted that efforts to mobilise the Council of Europe’s expertise, with a view to contributing to the full implementation of democratic reforms in the Palestinian territories, have not yet produced practical results.</p> <p>PACE asked both the Council of Europe and the Palestinian National Council to step up efforts to fulfil the obligations taken upon themselves when becoming partners for democracy and proposed to continue to review the implementation of such commitments and to make a new assessment of the partnership when appropriate.</p>

PACE	20 April 2016	2106	Renewed commitment in the fight against antisemitism in Europe	<p>PACE recommended that the legislative framework on combating discrimination should also cover manifestations of antisemitism. PACE also considered that the public denial, trivialisation or praise of the Holocaust, of crimes of genocide and of crimes against humanity should be made a criminal offence. In addition, PACE encouraged member states to prosecute political figures and political parties for antisemitic statements and incitement to hatred, and to cease the public funding of organisations and political parties promoting antisemitism. Finally, PACE called on members of national parliaments and political leaders to publicly condemn antisemitic statements, and urged national parliaments to co-operate with the No Hate Parliamentary Alliance and the No Hate Speech Movement campaign.</p>
PACE	20 April 2016	2107	A stronger European response to the Syrian refugee crisis	<p>PACE called on European States, the European Union and the wider international community to do more, including through humanitarian pathways for admission of refugees, prioritising the most vulnerable and facilitating family reunification, if current efforts prove inadequate. Furthermore, PACE called for a generous response to UNRWA's emergency appeal.</p>
PACE	20 April 2016	2108	Human rights of refugees and migrants – the situation in the Western Balkans	<p>PACE expressed that increasingly restrictive border controls had led to a deteriorating humanitarian situation for refugees and migrants. Hungary's asylum and border policy appears to be incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights. Thus, PACE expressed that practical solidarity through collective action and responsibility-sharing, based on respect for human rights and international law, were the essential conditions for any long-term successful response.</p>
PACE	20 April 2016	2109	The situation of refugees and migrants under the EU-Turkey Agreement of 18 March 2016	<p>PACE called for international protection for Syrian refugees, either through tailored aid for neighbouring countries or "humanitarian pathways", such as resettlement and family reunification, which could permit the safe entry of substantial numbers of Syrian refugees.</p>

PACE	20 April 2016	2110	Intellectual property rights in the digital era	<p>PACE expressed that authors of creative works must have the right to use the potential of the Internet. In accordance with Article 10 of the Convention on Cybercrime, PACE called on member States to adopt legislative and other measures to establish the infringement of intellectual property rights as criminal offences under domestic law. Furthermore, PACE underlined that special attention should be given to operators of Internet-based social networks and platforms with user-generated content, which benefit financially from illegal content posted on their sites. Finally, PACE expressed that intellectual property rights must also be respected when member States negotiate, accede to, and implement international legal obligations in this field.</p>
PACE	21 April 2016	2111	Assessing the impact of measures to improve women's political representation	<p>PACE expressed that the representation of women in politics is still largely disproportionate in most Council of Europe member States. Thus, PACE recommended a global approach combining positive measures – particularly quotas – coupled with sanctions for non-compliance and accompanying measures enabling members of elected bodies to reconcile their activities with their private lives and providing for public funding to promote the representation of women in political parties. Furthermore, PACE advocated research and data collection on women's participation in political life at national, regional and local level, and suggested that there should be regular assessments of the impact of national legislation and policies aimed at increasing such participation.</p>
PACE	21 April 2016	2112	The humanitarian concerns with regard to people captured during the war in Ukraine	<p>PACE assessed the implementation of one of the cornerstones of the Minsk Agreement on the exchange of prisoners and release of hostages and persons illegally detained in the context of the war in Ukraine. Furthermore, PACE also called on the Russian Federation to release all Ukrainian prisoners who had been captured and imprisoned in the Russian Federation and in annexed Crimea on politically motivated charges. PACE added that the state should provide financial support to the families of those still being held captive.</p>

<p>PACE</p>	<p>21 April 2016</p>	<p>2113</p>	<p>After the Brussels attacks, urgent need to address security failures and step up counter-terrorism co-operation</p>	<p>PACE called on all Council of Europe member States to urgently draw conclusions and make a realistic assessment of possible security gaps. Furthermore, PACE called for a number of steps to be taken as a matter of priority, at national, European Union and international levels, to address security shortcomings revealed by the Brussels attacks.</p>
<p>PACE</p>	<p>22 April 2016</p>	<p>2114</p>	<p>The handling of international public health emergencies</p>	<p>PACE called for the creation of 'rapid response' forces to handle international health emergencies such as the Zika virus, Ebola or H1N1. Thus, PACE called for the designation of the WHO as the lead institution to handle such crises, with the powers and funding to deploy "rapid response" teams, working with national governments, other UN bodies, the EU or NGOs.</p>
<p>PACE</p>	<p>22 April 2016</p>	<p>2115</p>	<p>Forced migration : a new challenge</p>	<p>PACE pointed out that the flow of environmental migrants could reach 150 million by 2050 and noted that there is no agreed definition of victims of forced migration and no international instrument designed to protect them. Therefore, parliamentarians emphasised the need to "acknowledge the vulnerability of these groups" and recommended a review of the relevant international rules with a view to including a definition of these migrants and a revision of the 1951 Geneva Convention relating to the Status of Refugees by means, for example, of an additional protocol.</p>

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 President called for a common stand against terrorism (18.04.2016)

PACE President called for a common stand against terrorism. “Firstly, we need a strong political narrative: we must stand together and protect our freedom.” “Secondly, we must look into the root causes behind terrorism and extremism,” explained the President, pointing out that the promotion of freedoms and individual rights enabling all Europeans to live their daily lives without having their freedoms restricted by terrorist threats or conflicts was one of the priorities of his Presidency. ([Read more](#) - [Opening statement by Pedro Agramunt](#) - [Video: opening statement by Pedro Agramunt](#))

■ The need for closer co-operation with diaspora communities to improve integration policies (19.04.2016)

The Cultural Committee underlined the fact that the role of the educational and cultural networks of diaspora communities is not sufficiently recognised and used to its full advantage, particularly in the context of drawing up national and local strategies to improve social cohesion and the spirit of “living together”. A report approved by the committee put forward the idea of setting up national platforms to allow different ministries and specialised institutions to work transversally in the field of integration, by means of a permanent dialogue with organisations reflecting the opinions of diaspora communities. Furthermore, the committee stated that the public authorities should provide financial support programmes for diaspora associations to help them professionalise their activities and consolidate their networks. ([Read more](#) - [Adopted report](#))

C. Information for the Commissioner for Human Rights

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

D. Information from the monitoring mechanisms

■ CPT: The Committee announced visits to ten states in 2017 (14.04.2016)

The CPT announced its 2017 programme of periodic visits.

The Committee intends to examine the treatment of persons deprived of their liberty in the following ten countries: Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Montenegro, Poland, Slovenia, Turkey and Ukraine ([More information](#)).

■ CPT: The Committee calls upon states to review the treatment of life-sentenced prisoners (14.04.2016)

In its annual report, the CPT calls upon the 47 Council of Europe's member states to review their treatment of life-sentenced prisoners according to the individual risk they present, and to provide for their possible reintegration into society at some stage. "It is inhuman to incarcerate a person for life without any real prospect of release", said the CPT President Mykola Gnatovskyy. "This does not mean that every prisoner should necessarily be released at some stage, but individual plans and follow-up are essential to evaluate on a case-by-case basis whether and when the person can return to society". ([Read more](#)).

■ GRETA: "Ending the criminalisation and detention of victims of trafficking" (14.04.2016)

The Council of Europe and the OSCE organised a joint side event in Vienna on 12 April 2016 on identifying victims of human trafficking in places of detention ([Read more](#)).

■ GRETA: Forthcoming elections of the Committee's members (18.04.2016)

[More information](#)

■ GRETA: The Committee's first evaluation round visit to Belarus (25.04.2016)

A delegation of the GRETA carried out an evaluation visit to Belarus from 18 to 22 April 2016. The visit was organised in the context of the first round of evaluation of the implementation by Belarus of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings ([Read more](#)).

■ MONEYVAL: 50th Plenary meeting of the Committee on the Evaluation of Anti-Money Laundering Measures and the Financing of Terrorism (15.04.2016)

[More information](#)

■ ECRI: Preparation of reports on Andorra, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Iceland (11.04.2016)

In March and April 2016 the ECRI visited Andorra (7-9 March), Bosnia and Herzegovina (7-11 March) and Iceland (4-7 April) as the first step in the preparation of monitoring reports ([Read more](#)).

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.

Albania

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Mullai and Other (No. 9074/07)	18 January 2012	CM/ResDH(2016)80	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

Armenia

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ FCNM: Fourth Advisory Committee delegation visit to Armenia (from 05.04.2016 to 08.04.2016)

A delegation of the Advisory Committee on the FCNM visited Yerevan from 5-8 April 2016 in the context of the monitoring of the implementation of this convention ([Read more](#)).

Austria

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Wallishauser (No. 156/04)	19 November 2012	CM/ResDH(2016)40	Examination closed
Arco Von Kammersbründl Handels GMBH (No. 6652/09)	21 October 2014	CM/ResDH(2016)52	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]

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: Statement by PACE monitor, ending visit to Azerbaijan (12.04.2016)

PACE co-rapporteur for the monitoring of Azerbaijan, has expressed strong concern at the recent escalation of the situation along the contact line in Nagorno-Karabakh and the occupied territories and the reports of civilian casualties and deaths on both sides. ([Read more](#) - [Announcement of the visit](#))

■ CPT: Visit of the Committee to Azerbaijan (12.04.2016)

A delegation of the CPT carried out a periodic visit to Azerbaijan from 29 March to 8 April 2016. It was the Committee's fourth periodic visit to this country ([Read more](#)).

Belgium

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Muskhadziyeva and others (No. 41442/07)	19 April 2010	CM/ResDH(2016)41	Examination closed
Kanagaratnam and others (No. 15297/09)	13 March 2012	CM/ResDH(2016)41	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]

Bulgaria

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Dimitrova (No. 15452/07)	10 February 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)53	Examination closed
Rahmani and Dineva (No. 20116/08)	10 May 2012	CM/ResDH(2016)54	Examination closed
Putter (No. 38780/02)	2 December 2010	CM/ResDH(2016)55	Examination closed
Dzhevrie Hamdi Danash (No. 10759/11)	2 July 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)56	Examination closed
Andrey Viktorov Dimitrov (No. 34633/08)	2 July 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)56	Examination closed
Petar Nedelchev Stoyanov (No. 6062/11)	2 July 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)56	Examination closed
Kameliya Hristova Todorova (No. 55136/08)	2 July 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)56	Examination closed
Velyo Velez (No. 16032/07)	27 August 2014	CM/ResDH(2016)81	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]

Croatia

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Omerovic (No. 2) (No. 22980/09)	14 April 2014	CM/ResDH(2016)57	Examination closed
Neda Tomic and Others (No. 5569/12)	23 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)58	Examination closed
Gordana Vucic and 2 Other applications (No. 34319/14)	19 May 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)58	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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Rummi (No. 63362/09)	15 April 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)59	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]

France

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Peduzzi (No. 23487/12)	21 May 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)60	Examination closed
Haddad (No. 10485/13)	21 May 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)60	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]

Georgia

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
The Georgian Labour Party (No. 9103/04)	8 October 2008	CM/ResDH(2016)42	Examination closed
Janiashvili (No. 35887/05)	27 February 2013	CM/ResDH(2016)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]

Greece

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Christos Alamaras and Others (No. 3384/12)	17 February 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)83	Examination closed
Athanasios Georgiou and others (No. 4330/12)	24 March 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)83	Examination closed
Athina Koutroumanou (No. 77966/11)	8 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)83	Examination closed
Ioanna Papadopoulou and 4 other applications (No. 45793/11)	23 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)83	Examination closed
Maria Papathanasiou-Bouboukioti (No. 46822/11)	17 February 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)83	Examination closed
Georgios Perontsis (No. 77390/14)	20 October 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)83	Examination closed
Panagiotis Psyrris and 10 Other Applications (No. 58668/10)	23 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)83	Examination closed
Despina Stiropoulou and Others (No. 77033/11)	21 April 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)83	Examination closed

Anna Tsakismenou and Others (No. 72692/11)	17 February 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)83	Examination closed
Vasilis Tsalkitzis and Christina Tsalkitzi (No. 31365/12)	23 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)83	Examination closed
Ionnis Vlassiadis and 5 Other applications (No. 29440/11)	8 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)83	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ CPT: The Committee visited “hotspots” in Greece (20.04.2016)

A delegation of the CPT carried out an ad hoc visit to Greece from 13 to 18 April 2016 ([Read more](#)).

Hungary

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Zoltan Németh (No. 29436/05)	14 September 2011	CM/ResDH(2016)61	Examination closed
Ivanné Adonyi (No. 74201/11)	20 October 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)62	Examination closed
Suleiman Al-Sairafi (No. 388/12)	8 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)62	Examination closed
Sandorné Ducs and others (No. 51004/13)	20 October 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)62	Examination closed
Geraldine Fehér (No. 20108/11)	8 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)62	Examination closed
Istvánné Horvath (No. 22286/11)	7 July 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)62	Examination closed
Laszlo Karoly (No. 4340/12)	8 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)62	Examination closed
Gyulané Kecskés and others (No. 45543/11)	7 July 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)62	Examination closed
Zoltan Sipöcz (No. 58893/13)	7 July 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)62	Examination closed
Bélané Takacs (No. 63676/11)	7 July 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)62	Examination closed
Laszlo Varga (No. 15815/12)	8 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)62	Examination closed
Stella Zuhatagi- Fésű (No. 65612/11)	20 October 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)62	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ PACE: Pedro Agramunt in Hungary urged European solidarity: ‘No country can solve the challenges we face alone’ (06.04.2016)

PACE President called for a comprehensive pan-European approach to meeting the challenges of the refugee crisis, and the threat of terrorism and radicalisation, as well as finding solutions to “frozen conflicts”. ([Read more - PACE President to visit Hungary](#))

Italy

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Panetta (No. 38624/07)	15 October 2014	CM/ResDH(2016)63	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ CPT: The Committee visited Italy (27.04.2016)

A delegation of the CPT carried out a visit to Italy from 8 to 21 April 2016. It was the Committee's sixth periodic visit to the country ([Read more](#)).

Kosovo*

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ GRETA: Publication of GRETA report on Kosovo (12.04.2016)

The Council of Europe's expert body on trafficking in human beings has published a report evaluating the anti-trafficking legislation, policy and practice of Kosovo ([Read more](#)).

* All reference to Kosovo, whether to the territory, institutions or population, in this text shall be understood in full compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 (1999) and without prejudice to the status of Kosovo.

Latvia

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Olga Bacilova (No. 57486/09)	1 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)43	Examination closed
Jelena Frolova (No. 16409/13)	1 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)43	Examination closed
Shannon (No. 32214/03)	24 February 2010	CM/ResDH(2016)64	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ CPT: The Committee visited Latvia (26.04.2016)

A delegation of the CPT carried out a periodic visit to Latvia from 12 to 22 April 2016 ([Read more](#)).

Lithuania

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
JGK Statyba LTD and Guselnikovas (No. 3330/12)	27 April 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)65	Examination closed
Pyrantienė (No. 45092/07)	27 January 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)66	Examination closed
Albergas and Arlauskas (No. 17978/05)	27 August 2014	CM/ResDH(2016)66	Examination closed
Paplauskienė (No. 31102/06)	14 January 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)66	Examination closed
Digrytė Klibavicienė (No. 34911/06)	21 January 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)66	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

[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: The Committee published the response of the Luxembourg authorities on its 2015 visit report (28.04.2016)

The CPT published the response of the Government of Luxembourg to the report on the CPT's most recent visit to Luxembourg, from 28 January to 2 February 2015. The response is made public at the request of the Luxembourg authorities ([Read more](#)).

Republic of Moldova

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Ciubotaru (No. 27138/04)	27 July 2010	CM/ResDH(2016)84	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ PACE: Moldovan authorities must carry out credible reforms without delay (29.04.2016)

The co-rapporteurs called on the Moldovan authorities to rapidly adopt further measures to ensure the separation of powers, respect for the rule of law and the protection of fundamental human rights. The system as a whole, including political parties, should be reformed. The co-rapporteurs also urged all stakeholders to establish conditions conducive to free and fair elections, following the decision of the Constitutional Court reinstating the direct election of the President of the Republic. ([Read more - Information note](#))

Montenegro

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Sabanovic (No. 5995/06)	31 August 2011	CM/ResDH(2016)44	Examination closed
Koprivica (No. 41158/09)	23 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)45	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]

Netherlands

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Geisterfer (No. 15911/08)	9 March 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)67	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]

Norway

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Lindheim and others (No. 13221/08+)	22 October 2012	CM/ResDH(2016)46	Examination closed
Kaplan and Others (No. 32504/11)	24 October 2014	CM/ResDH(2016)68	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]

Poland

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Sierpinski (No. 38016/07)	27 July 2010	CM/ResDH(2016)47	Examination closed
Wloch No. 2 (No. 33475/08)	28 November 2011	CM/ResDH(2016)48	Examination closed
Mariusz Bogurski (No. 28653/13)	2 July 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Bartłomiej Bojar (No. 2173/13)	9 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Krzysztof Adam Cieslak (No. 62572/14)	9 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Sławomir Dąbrowski (No. 8286/13)	2 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Ryszard Data (No. 72690/12)	14 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Mirosław Dawidowski (No. 9937/13)	9 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Andrzej Dykban (No. 38211/13)	2 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Robert Dziurkowski (No. 25609/14)	23 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Kamil Gorecki (No. 30699/13)	2 July 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Robert Gronkiewicz (No. 72600/11)	2 July 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Marek Hamryszak (No. 16008/13)	9 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Marcin Jankowski (No. 73891/13)	30 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed

Dariusz Kaminski (No. 17460/13)	9 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Jacek Kazimierczuk (No. 63294/12)	16 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Robert Niezgoda (No. 42432/13)	23 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Krzysztof Nowak (No. 29522/13)	2 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Lukasz Pertkiewicz (No. 1259/13)	2 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Robert Cezary Przybylski (No. 8951/14)	2 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Dariusz Ratkowski (No. 33779/14)	23 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Dariusz Roguski (No. 68730/12)	9 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Robert Rudnik (No. 72872/12)	16 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Artur Sieranski (No. 21868/12)	16 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Piotr Stachowicz (No. 37560/13)	9 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Slawomir Franciszek Steinke (No. 63797/12)	2 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Tomasz Stozek (No. 49676/13)	2 July 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Robert Werner (No. 11378/12)	2 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Kazimierz Wolkowski and Krystian Jacyno (No. 2037/14)	14 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Michal Wozniak (No. 8988/13)	2 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed
Mariusz Zelek (No. 76137/13)	2 July 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)69	Examination closed

Jacek Banaszek (No. 26871/13)	14 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)85	Examination closed
Bartosz Biernaciak (No. 80170/12)	22 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)85	Examination closed
Jaime Eduardo Cardona Giraldo (No. 20731/14)	22 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)85	Examination closed
Damian Domanski (No. 40080/13)	14 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)85	Examination closed
Rafal Jaworski (No. 63932/13)	13 October 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)85	Examination closed
Adrian Kosakowicz (No. 73177/12)	22 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)85	Examination closed
Arkadiusz Kruczek (No. 61041/10)	6 October 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)85	Examination closed
Marcin Kucharski (No. 63418/14)	6 October 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)85	Examination closed
Pawel Luczynski (No. 65831/12)	14 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)85	Examination closed
Dariusz Okroj (No. 33505/13)	20 October 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)85	Examination closed
Jaroslaw Ozimkiewicz (No. 37708/14)	14 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)85	Examination closed
Mariusz Slabosz (No. 26802/13)	22 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)85	Examination closed
Artur Zbrzezny (No. 45163/14)	22 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)85	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]

Portugal

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Gramaxo Rozeira (No. 21976/09)	21 April 2014	CM/ResDH(2016)49	Examination closed
Jorge Nina Jorge and Others (No. 52662/99)	19 May 2004	CM/ResDH(2016)86	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ GRETA: Committee's second evaluation round visit to Portugal (13.04.2016)

A delegation of the GRETA carried out an evaluation visit to Portugal from 4 to 8 April 2016. The visit provided an opportunity to assess progress in the implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings since the first evaluation visit by GRETA in 2012 (GRETA report on Portugal) ([Read more](#)).

Romania

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Pop and Others (No. 31269/06)	24 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)50	Examination closed
Codarcea (No. 31675/04)	2 September 2009	CM/ResDH(2016)70	Examination closed
Csoma (No. 8759/05)	15 April 2013	CM/ResDH(2016)71	Examination closed
Petru Andrei (No. 16053/09)	7 July 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)87	Examination closed
Gheorghe Chisalau (No. 6369/14)	1 October 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)87	Examination closed
Stefan Adrian Litu and 2 Other applications (No. 47992/13+)	1 October 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)87	Examination closed
Bogdan Constantin Mantu (No. 10639/14)	29 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)87	Examination closed
Manuela-Coca Popa (No. 6834/14)	21 April 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)87	Examination closed
Eugen Mitican (No. 50803/10)	1 October 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)87	Examination closed
Mircea Nita (No. 7884/07)	17 February 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)87	Examination closed
Zaiet (No. 44958/05)	24 June 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)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]

Russian Federation

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Konovalova (No. 37873/04)	16 February 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)72	Examination closed
Tatyana Nikitichna Chernikova and 3 Other applications (No. 29921/07+)	1 July 2014	CM/ResDH(2016)89	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ PACE: Rapporteurs concerned by the suspension of the Crimean Tatar Mejlis (14.04.2016)

Two rapporteurs of the PACE have expressed concern at the suspension, by the Prosecutor installed in Crimea by the Russian Federation, of the Mejlis of the Crimean Tatars, the executive body of the Tatar people. ([Read more](#))

■ PACE: Call for sanctions against those involved in the detention and trial of Nadiya Savchenko in the Russian Federation (21.04.2016)

PACE called on member states to adopt sanctions, in particular travel bans and freezing of accounts, against individuals involved in the kidnapping, unlawful detention, unfair trial and conviction of Nadyia Savchenko, unless she is released without further delay. Furthermore, PACE urged the separatist groups controlling the occupied regions of Donetsk and Luhansk to release their prisoners and hostages and cease all violations of human rights. Finally, PACE stressed that it was essential that all parties to the conflict “implement, without further delay, the Minsk agreement, especially prioritising the paragraph on the release of all captured persons” and the exchange of prisoners, and comply with international humanitarian law and the provisions of the Geneva Convention on prisoners of war and the protection of civilians. ([Read more](#) - [Adopted Resolution](#))

San Marino

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: Publication of the 4th Advisory Committee Opinion (21.04.2016)

The Council of Europe Advisory Committee on the FCNM has published its Fourth Opinion on San Marino ([Read the Opinion](#)).

Serbia

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Henjel (No. 34619/08)	20 March 2012	CM/ResDH(2016)73	Examination closed
Dojcin Jorgic and 8 other applications (No. 45608/08+)	17 February 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)74	Examination closed
Dragana Micic and Dragomir Duric (No. 835/08+)	16 December 2014	CM/ResDH(2016)74	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

■ Recommendation on the application of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages by Serbia, 27 April 2016

CM recommended that the authorities of Serbia take account of all the observations and recommendations of the Committee of Experts and, as a matter of priority, to strengthen teacher training and provide adequate teaching materials for all regional or minority languages; to provide teaching of/in languages covered only by Part II of the Charter at all appropriate levels; to establish an adequate offer of Romani in education; to strengthen the use of all regional or minority languages in administration; and to continue to promote awareness and tolerance in Serbian society at large vis-à-vis the regional or minority languages and the cultures they represent. ([Recommendation \(2016\)3](#))

C. Other information

■ PACE: Early parliamentary elections in Serbia (25.04.2016)

International observers expressed that Serbia elections offered voters variety of choices and respected fundamental freedoms, but playing field was not level. ([Read more](#))

Slovak Republic

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Horvath (No. 5515/09)	27 February 2013	CM/ResDH(2016)75	Examination closed
Schvarc (No. 64528/09)	14 April 2014	CM/ResDH(2016)75	Examination closed
Akhadov (No. 43009/10)	28 April 2014	CM/ResDH(2016)75	Examination closed
Sablij (No. 78129/11)	28 July 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)75	Examination closed
Ladislav Durbak (No. 73497/12)	29 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)90	Examination closed
Dusan Durdovic (No. 71948/11)	29 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)90	Examination closed
Gabriel Focko and Others (No. 65989/11)	29 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)90	Examination closed
Incheba, Akciova Spolocnost (No. 70899/14)	29 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)90	Examination closed
Maria Kostrejova and Ladislav Demko (No. 44298/13)	29 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)90	Examination closed
Marian Kovacik (No. 64382/12)	29 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)90	Examination closed

Eva Kroslakova (No. 63865/14)	29 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)90	Examination closed
Stanislav Kudela (No. 34877/13)	29 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)90	Examination closed
Jolana Spodniakova (No. 7875/13)	29 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)90	Examination closed
Juraj Vyskoc (No. 23479/12)	29 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)90	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

■ CM: Resolution on the implementation of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities by the Slovak Republic, 15 April 2016

The authorities are invited to take measures to improve further the implementation of the Framework Convention, in particular, to increase attention to minority rights as an integral part of human rights in the government agenda and ensure effective inter-institutional co-ordination on all issues pertaining to human and minority rights protection, in close consultation with national minority and civil society representatives; to comprehensively address anti-Gypsyism in the education system and put in place the necessary measures to ensure that Roma children are systematically placed in integrated regular classes; to intensify efforts to effectively protect Roma from discrimination in all spheres of life by raising rights awareness and ensuring that law enforcement officers are adequately trained to properly investigate and follow-up all cases of racial discrimination. ([Resolution \(2016\)6](#))

■ CM: Recommendation on the the application of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages by the Slovak Republic, 27 April 2016

CM recommended that the authorities of the Slovak Republic take account of all the observations and recommendations of the Committee of Experts. CM recommended, as a matter of priority: to review the requirements related to thresholds in order to make the undertakings in the field of administration operational; to strengthen efforts to provide teaching in or of all regional or minority languages at all appropriate levels; to take measures to improve teacher-training for regional or minority language education; to strengthen the support to television, radio and newspapers in all regional or minority languages; to continue measures to abolish unjustified enrolments of Roma children in special schools or classes and start to introduce Romani-language education for Roma children on a large scale; to raise awareness and promote tolerance in the Slovak society at large vis-à-vis regional or minority languages and the cultures they represent. ([Recommendation \(2016\)2](#))

C. Other information

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

Switzerland

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Haldimann and others (No. 21830/09)	24 May 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)76	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
Spasovski (No. 45150/05)	10 June 2010	CM/ResDH(2016)77	Examination closed
Petar Ilik (No. 67481/14)	6 October 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)78	Examination closed
Milco Josimovski and others (No. 2375/14)	6 October 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)78	Examination closed
Kosta Markovski (No. 25300/11)	22 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)78	Examination closed
Vesna Mitevska and Lazarinka Ristova (No. 6526/14)	6 October 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)78	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].

Turkey

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
Veysi Aktas (No. 45059/10)	13 October 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Bayram Ali Ayan (No. 6226/12)	13 October 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Ergin Aydemir (No. 58240/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Selim Aydin (No. 69265/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Ilker Aygören (No. 55970/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Ismail Biçen (No. 31917/12)	13 October 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Mehmet Ali Bülbul (No. 49103/12)	29 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Yusuf Çağlar (No. 8164/13)	19 May 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Erhan Ceylan (No. 58038/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Ziya Çiçekçi and Others (No. 13743/14)	20 October 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Mahir Demir (No. 58204/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Turan Denizli (No. 58978/12)	19 May 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Haci Yusuf Doğan (No. 76898/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Kenan Doğruel (No. 62231/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Murat Duran (No. 58191/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
İsa Elçi (No. 48971/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Ismail Güldür (No. 58232/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed

Aydin Gündüz (No. 53889/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Mehmet Güney (No. 3167/13)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Zafer Hantik (No. 57294/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Cemil İcel (No. 62672/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Mustafa Kaya (No. 77611/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Rifat Kiliç (No. 29740/08)	13 October 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Cenk Kodaman (No. 55656/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Hüseyin Masirci (No. 69473/12)	19 May 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Dinçer Öktem (No. 55000/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Kubilay Örnek (No. 77462/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Aydin Özdağ (No. 62078/12)	19 May 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Mehmet Öztürk (No. 69523/12)	19 May 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Muhittin Pirinççioğlu (No. 50542/12)	13 October 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Erkut Sahin (No. 69351/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Emre Salman (No. 55646/12)	19 May 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Rahmi Seven (No. 58215/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Serkan Seyrek (No. 49228/11)	13 October 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Tekin Tas (No. 58244/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Nihat Türker (No. 69257/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Yıldırım Uzuncaköşe (No. 65723/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed

Mustafa Varol (No. 58189/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Yildirim (No. 21519/06)	28 September 2010	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Serdal Yildiz (No. 5964/13)	19 May 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Muzaffer Yildiz (No. 77452/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Ugur Yilmaz (No. 58250/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Halil Yilmaz (No. 66856/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Ercan Yolal (No. 65332/12)	19 May 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	Examination closed
Ali Yolcu (No. 81769/12)	15 September 2015	CM/ResDH(2016)51	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
Chorniy (No. 35227/06)	16 August 2013	CM/ResDH(2016)79	Examination closed
Shapovalov (No. 45835/05)	31 October 2012	CM/ResDH(2016)91	Examination closed
Zagorodniy (No. 27004/06)	24 February 2012	CM/ResDH(2016)92	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ PACE: Rapporteurs in eastern Ukraine worried about worsening security situation (08.04.2016)

PACE rapporteurs have expressed their concern at the renewed deterioration of the security situation along the contact line. ([Read more](#) - [Visit announcement](#))

United Kingdom

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: The Committee visited the United Kingdom (15.04.2016)

A delegation of the CPT carried out a two-week visit to the United Kingdom. The visit which began on 30 March 2016 was the Committee's eighth periodic visit to the country ([Read more](#)).