



REGULAR SELECTIVE INFORMATION FLOW

for the attention of the National Human Rights Structures

Issue#119

[1 - 30 April 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.13)*

B. Decisions on admissibility (p.23)

C. Communicated cases (p.23)

§2 - European Committee of Social Rights (p.26)

A. Resolutions & Decisions (p.26)

B. Other information (p.26)

§3 - Recommendations & Resolutions (p.27)

A. Recommendations (p.27)

B. Resolutions (p.27)

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

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

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

C. Information from the Commissioner of Human Rights (p.30)

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

PART II - INFORMATION BY COUNTRY (p.32)

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

Introduction

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

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

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

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

Index by Country

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

ALBANIA, 13, 30
[ARMENIA](#), 13, 23, **32**
[AZERBAIJAN](#), 13, 24, **33**
[BELARUS](#), **34**
BELGIUM, 14
[BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA](#), **35**
[BULGARIA](#), 24, **36**
CROATIA, 14, 24
[CYPRUS](#), **37**
[CZECH REPUBLIC](#), 24, 30, **38**
[DENMARK](#), **39**
[FRANCE](#), 1, 2, 14, 24, 26, **40**
[GEORGIA](#), 7, 24, **41**
GERMANY, 9, 15, 24
[GREECE](#), 15, 16, 30, **42**
[HUNGARY](#), 10, 30, **43**
[ITALY](#), 6, 16, 24, **44**
LATVIA, 16
[LIECHTENSTEIN](#), **45**
[LITHUANIA](#), 30, **46**
[MOLDOVA](#), 6, 20, 30, **47**
[NETHERLANDS](#), 24-25, **48**
NORWAY, 25
[POLAND](#), 16, 25, **49**
PORTUGAL, 17
[ROMANIA](#), 11, 17, 18, 23, 30, **50**
[RUSSIA](#), 5, 7, 19, 20, 25, **51**
SERBIA, 25
[SLOVAKIA](#), **52**
SLOVENIA, 9
SPAIN, 11
SWEDEN, 20
SWITZERLAND, 20
["THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA"](#), 20, **53**
[TURKEY](#), 8, 9, 12, 20, 21, 23, **54**
[UKRAINE](#), 22, 24, 25, **55**
THE UNITED KINGDOM, 10, 23

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 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.

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.

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

[PEREVEDENTSEVY V. RUSSIA \(No. 39583/05\) - Importance 2 - 24 April 2014 - Violation of Article 2 - Domestic authorities’ failure to evaluate the seriousness of the risks for the life of the applicants’ son - Violation of Article 2 §1 - Domestic authorities’ failure to make an effective and sufficient investigation](#)

The case concerned the death of the applicants’ son during his military service. His parents, the applicants in the case, alleged that his death was due to the system called “dedovshchina” and not due to a suicide.

Violation of Article 2

Even if the Court noted that under domestic law the commander of a military unit bore personal responsibility for the functioning of the unit, it noted that domestic authorities had to have been aware of the psychological difficulties of the applicant’s son, namely due to two reports. Moreover, they should have been aware of the “dedovshchina” system, which was rife in Russian armed forces, and which brought gross abuse of human rights, including extortion, beatings, sleep deprivation and so on. Domestic authorities had therefore failed to evaluate the seriousness of the risks to the life on the applicants’ son; and could not prevent his death. Given this lack of protection, the Court concluded that

there had been a violation of Article 2.

Violation of Article 2 § 1

The Court was satisfied that the investigation had been independent and immediately opened after the incident. However, it observed that proceedings lasted more than six and a half years. Furthermore, several omissions in the investigation gave grounds for serious misgivings as to domestic authorities' good faith in establishing the truth. Indeed, they did not try to determine whether the son had been bullied or extorted; and did not verify how he spent the money he received from his parents; nor had they verified what had been said during his superior and parents' communication a few days before his death. So, the Court found that the investigation had been ineffective and insufficient, in violation of Article 2 §1.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The court held that domestic authorities had to pay the applicants EUR 40,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 6,380 for costs and expenses.

MARRO AND OTHERS V. ITALY (No. 29100/07) - Importance 3 - 30 April 2014 - No violation of Article 2 - Lack of domestic authorities' failure to protect the prisoner from taking drugs.

The case concerned the death of a prisoner from an overdose.

The Court reiterated that domestic authorities should ensure the health and well-being of prisoners. However, it is not convinced that the fact that a prisoner had been able to obtain drugs constituted a breach of that obligation. Moreover, the applicants could not allege that domestic authorities were aware of the fact that the situation of the concerned prisoner was more dangerous than the situation of the others, who also suffered from drug addiction. Besides, domestic authorities had made several inspections to take action against drug trafficking in prison, in order to protect the prisoners that were addicted to drugs. As they keep a margin of appreciation, they had not been required to take more efficient measures like using sniffer dogs or others. So, as the fact that the concerned prisoner was able to obtain drugs could not make domestic authorities liable for his death, there was no violation of Article 2; therefore, the Court rejected the application as manifestly ill-founded.

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

GAVRILIȚĂ V. THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 22741/06) - Importance unspecified - 22 April 2014 - Violation of Article 3 - Domestic authorities' failure to give reasonable compensation to the applicants - Violation of Article 5 §1 - Domestic authorities' failure to recognise a detention, leading to a total negation of the fundamental guarantees of the disposition.

The case concerned ill-treatment that both applicants claimed to have sustained and the unlawful detention claimed by one of the applicant.

Violation of Article 3

The parties had not disputed the findings about ill-treatment of the applicants. However, as domestic authorities had awarded each of the applicants EUR 900 for compensation, they considered that the applicants had lost their victim status. According to the Court, this amount was considerably lower than that awarded by the Court in similar cases against this state. So, it observed that the applicants had not lost their victim status within the meaning of the European Convention on Human Rights. Then, there had been a violation of Article 3 of the Convention in respect of the two applicants.

Violation of Article 5 §1

Concerning the situation of the applicant who alleged his detention to have been unlawful, domestic authorities did not recognised explicitly or in substance the breach of Article 5 §1. Nevertheless, they had taken the view that the applicant could have been arrested and detained several days before the official beginning of his police custody. However, the refusal to recognise a detention of an individual constituted a total negation of the fundamental guarantees of Article 5 and was, therefore, in breach of this disposition.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The Court held that domestic authorities had to pay EUR 9,000 to one of the applicant and EUR 10,000 to the other in respect of non-pecuniary damage, and EUR 140 to both applicants jointly in respect of costs and expenses.

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

LAGUTIN AND OTHERS V. RUSSIA (Nos. 6228/09, 19123/09, 19678/07, 52340/08 AND 7451/09) - Importance 2 - 24 April 2014 - Violation of Article 6 §1 - Domestic authorities' failure to verify allegations of entrapment

The case concerned the conviction of five people for drug dealing by the use of undercover agents, and their allegations having been victims of police entrapment.

The Court reiterated its case-law recognising the legitimacy of the use of undercover agents for serious crimes. However, domestic authorities should be able to demonstrate the reason of the initiation of the operation. The Court noted that they had referred to "operational information" according to which the applicants had previously been involved in drug dealing. Nevertheless, they had not provided any further details about it and had not tried to demonstrate this allegation. Therefore, the Court could not determine whether the authorities had had legitimate reasons for the use of undercover agents for these cases.

In respect of procedural guarantees, domestic authorities should have established in adversarial proceedings the reasons of the initiation of the operation, the extent of the police's involvement in the operation and the nature of any pressure under the applicants leading to drug dealing. Indeed, applicants' convictions were based entirely or predominantly on the evidence obtained in the police-controlled test purchase of drugs. Besides, in previous cases against Russia, the Court had already found a structural failure of domestic authorities' system as the test purchases fell entirely within the competence of the operational search bodies. So, again, the Court found that not checking the allegations had been at odds with the fundamental guarantees of a fair trial, in particular the principles of adversarial proceedings and the equality of arms between the prosecution and the defence, in breach of Article 6 as regards all five applicants.

Under Article 41 (Just satisfaction), the court held that domestic authorities had to pay the applicants EUR 3,000, each in respect of non-pecuniary damage.

NATSVLISHVILI AND TOGONIDZE V. GEORGIA (No. 9043/05) - Importance 3 - 29 April 2014 - No violation of Article 6 §1 - Lack of domestic authorities' failure to give minimum safeguards to prevent abuse in the plea bargaining arrangement - No violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 7 - Legitimate limitation of the right to appeal in case of a legal plea bargain - No violation of Article 6 §2 – Right to a fair trial not infringed by the filming of the applicant's arrest - No violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 – Justified forfeiture of the applicant's assets - No violation of Article 34 - Lack of domestic authorities' intention to make the applicants withdraw or modify their application.

The case concerned the acceptance by the applicant of a plea bargain in which he was to be convicted without an examination of the merits in exchange for a reduced sentence.

Article 6 §1

The Court observed that the possibility for an accused to obtain the reduction of charges or of sentence in exchange for a guilty plea or a plea of no contest was a common characteristic of European criminal justice systems. However, it underlined that the waiver had to be established in an unequivocal manner; accompanied by minimum safeguards to prevent abuse; and conform to public interest. The Court noted that the applicant himself had had the initiative for a plea-bargaining arrangement. And he had explicitly confirmed that he understood the content of the agreement and its legal consequences. Furthermore, the exact terms of the agreement had been set out for judicial review; it had been submitted to domestic authorities for consideration about its fairness; and they were not bound by this agreement. It concluded that there were sufficient safeguards against possible abuse of process that the decision did not run counter to public interest, so that there had been no violation of Article 6 § 1.

Article 2 of Protocol No. 7

The Court considered as normal the fact that the right to appeal was more limited while based on a plea bargain than on an ordinary criminal trial. Indeed, by accepting the plea bargain, the applicant had consciously waived his right to an ordinary appellate review, without any duress, nor false promises. So, Article 2 of Protocol No. 7 had not been breached.

Article 6 §2

The Court noted that domestic authorities had not specifically referred to the applicant while expressing their intention to fight corruption. It found that the filming of the applicant's arrest by private media did not constitute a media campaign against him, so that his right to a fair trial had not been undermined. Then, there had been no violation of Article 6 § 2.

Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

The Court observed that the lawfulness of the forfeiture of the applicants' assets and the other payments could not be dissociated from the question of plea bargain itself because these sanctions had been related to the determination of his criminal liability. Having regard to its findings under Article 6 § 1 and Article 2 of Protocol No. 7, the Court concluded that there had been no violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1.

Article 34

The Court noted that the e-mail exchange between the applicants' daughter and domestic authorities had constituted an informal communication, which was not appropriate to settle a case. However, this was not incompatible with their obligation under Article 34. Indeed, the reason was not to incite the applicants to withdraw or modify their application. So, as to the Court, there had been no violation of Article 34.

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

NURSET KAYA AND OTHERS V. TURKEY ([in French only](#)) (Nos. 43750/06 and 4 others) - Importance 2 - 22 April 2014 - Violation of Article 8 - Domestic authorities' unjustified refusal to restrict the language into which prisoners can communicate - No violation of Article 6 - Domestic authorities' justified decision not to held the proceedings in public

The case concerned domestic authorities' refusal to allow Turkish prisoners using Kurdish in their telephone conversations.

Article 8

The Court first noted that it was essential for the prison authorities to help inmates maintain contact with their close relatives, but that it was sometimes justified to limit those contacts where there was a pressing social need, and mainly for reasons of security.

However, the Court noted that the rules then in force were applied in a general and indiscriminate manner, not related to an individual assessment of the individual risks in each case. In addition, it emphasised that Kurdish was one of the languages commonly spoken in Turkey; moreover, the inmates' assertion that Kurdish was the language used in their family relations, and was the only language understood by their relatives, could not be called into question. In spite of that, and notwithstanding the need for the authorities to help inmates to maintain contact with their close relatives, they did not appear to have envisaged using a translation system. The Court thus held that there had been a violation of Article 8.

Article 6

The applicants complained about the proceedings not being held in public and the lack of reasoning of the courts' decisions. As to the first complaint, the Court took the view that the lack of complexity of the dispute, in which none of the facts were contested, meant that it could be examined and settled adequately on the basis of the parties' written pleadings. As to the second complaint, the Court pointed out that Article 6 did not require that the grounds given by a court should deal specifically with all the points that one of the parties might consider fundamental for their arguments. It moreover observed that, having regard to the case file, the domestic decisions at issue were duly reasoned and the complaint was thus ill-founded. The Court thus held that there had been no violation of Article 6 § 1

Article 41 (just satisfaction)

The Court held that Turkey was to pay EUR 300 in respect of non-pecuniary damage to each of the applicants and EUR 500 in respect of costs and expenses.

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

BROSA V. GERMANY (No. 5709/09) - Importance 2 - 17 April 2014 - Violation of Article 10 - Domestic authorities' failure to strike a fair balance between the personality rights of a candidate to an election and the applicant's right to freedom of expression.

The case concerned an injunction against the distribution of leaflets calling not to vote for a candidate for local elections who allegedly provided cover for a neo-Nazi organisation.

Violation of Article 10

The Court observed that the distribution of the leaflet was of a political nature and concerned a question of public interest. Moreover, as the candidate ran for the office of mayor, the Court reiterated its case-law saying that the limits of acceptable criticism were wider as regards a politician than as regards a private individual. And the Court observed that the applicant's statement had not exceeded these limits, given the context of the upcoming local elections. In addition, the Court noted that there was an on-going debate about the allegation that qualifies the association as a dangerous neo-Nazi organisation. In fact, domestic authorities had monitored the association; and even the candidate had written in response to the applicant's article, publicly, keeping the debate on-going. The Court also found that domestic authorities had required a disproportional high degree of factual proof while requiring "compelling proof" from the applicant, although this was not usual for someone who expresses opinion on a matter of public concern. So, it concluded that domestic authorities had failed to strike a fair balance between the relevant interests. It therefore noted that they did not establish the necessity to put the protection of the candidate's personality rights above the applicant's right to freedom of expression, in breach of Article 10.

Article 41 (Just satisfaction)

The court held that domestic authorities had to pay the applicant EUR 3,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 2,683.02 in respect of costs and expenses.

MLADINA D.D. LJUBLJANA V. SLOVENIA (No. 20981/10) - Importance 2 - 17 April 2014 - Violation of Article 10 - Domestic authorities' failure to strike a fair balance between the protection of a parliamentarian against defamatory remarks and a publisher's right to freedom of expression

The case concerned a decision by national courts condemning the applicant to pay damages to a parliamentarian as he had published an article concerning a parliamentary debate on the legal recognition of same-sex relationships.

The Court first reiterated that journalists should respect reputation and rights of others, but still have a duty to impart information and ideas on all matters of public interest. It reiterated that as regards a politician, the limits of acceptable criticism were wider, especially when he himself had made controversial public statements, than as regards a private individual. In fact, the parliamentarian had expressed the opinion that homosexuals were generally undesirable, whether as children, same-sex couples or parents. The Court was not convinced that the statement at issue was a gratuitous personal attack on the parliamentarian. It saw, however, that the statement was a response to the parliamentarian's own public remarks. It especially observed that the question was a matter of public interest. The applicant had simply described the parliamentarian's behaviour as that of "a cerebral bankrupt" who, in a country with less limited human resources, would not be able to find work even as a school janitor. Therefore, domestic authorities failed to strike a fair balance between the competing interests of protecting the parliamentarian from defamatory remarks and the publisher's right to freedom of expression. The interference in question had not therefore been "necessary in a democratic society", which is a violation of Article 10.

Under Article 41 (Just satisfaction), the Court held that domestic authorities were to pay the applicant EUR 2,921.05 in respect of pecuniary damage and EUR 5,850.29 in respect of costs and expenses.

- **Freedom of association (Article 11)**

R.M.T. V. THE UNITED KINGDOM (No. 31045/10) - Importance 1 - 8 April 2014 – No violation of Article 11 – Justified restrictions on the right to strike (ban on “secondary industrial action”)

The case concerned two complaints by a trade union about statutory restrictions on the right to strike and, in particular, the ban on secondary industrial action (strike action against a different employer aimed at exerting indirect pressure on the employer involved in the industrial dispute).

What was important for the Court in this case was that the ban affected only an accessory aspect of the freedom of association of trade unions as opposed to any core aspect of their rights under Article 11. The facts of the case showed that the applicant union had been able to act in defence of its members' interests through collective bargaining with the employer and then primary strike action, even if its members rejected the revised terms offered to them. The claim that the union would have prevailed in its demands had it had the possibility of leading a strike by its members in another bigger company was regarded by the Court as speculative. It decided that the United Kingdom's margin of appreciation to regulate trade union freedom should be wide, since a country's industrial relations policy formed part of its overall economic and social policy, and was of recognised sensitivity. The Court would therefore respect the legislature's choices unless these were manifestly without reasonable foundation. Parliament's reason for introducing the ban, informed by previous experience, was to guard against excessive disruption of the economy and to strike a better balance between unions, employers and the wider public. It was relevant that three different Governments had maintained the ban since its introduction over 20 years ago. The Court concluded that there was nothing in the facts raised by the applicant union to show that the general prohibition on secondary strikes had had a disproportionate effect on their rights under Article 11. The United Kingdom had therefore remained within its margin.

MAGYAR KERESZTÉNY MENNONITA EGYHÁZ AND OTHERS V. HUNGARY (Nos. 70945/11, 23611/12, 26998/12, 41150/12, 41155/12, 41463/12, 41553/12, 54977/12 AND 56581/12) - Importance 1 - 8 April 2014 - Violation of Article 11 in the light of Article 9 – Religious communities' loss of full church status following the entry into force of a new law

The case concerned the loss of the status as church of the applicant religious communities, after a domestic law entered in force.

The Court considered that the “deregistration” as churches of the applicants had constituted an interference with their rights under Articles 9 and 11. However, it had to examine whether this had been “necessary in a democratic society”. It considered that even if domestic authorities had to ensure the possibility of religious communities to obtain legal capacity as entities under civil law, there was no right for religious organisations to have a specific legal status. Furthermore, it noted that in many countries, the denomination as a church and the recognition by domestic authorities had an important social impact as to reveal suspicions of sect. The Court then found important the recognition as churches of the applicant communities. It also observed that domestic authorities had not demonstrated that the problem could not be tackled with less drastic solutions. Nor had they demonstrated why it was necessary to examine once again already active churches from the perspective of dangerousness for society, nor had they demonstrated any element of actual danger emanating from the applicant communities. Given those elements, the measure had not been “necessary in a democratic society”. There had accordingly been a violation of Article 11 read in the light of Article 9.

Under Article 41 (Just satisfaction), the Court held that the finding of a violation constituted sufficient just satisfaction in respect of the claims of non-pecuniary damage of five of the individual applicants.

- **Right to an effective remedy (Art. 13)**

A.C. AND OTHERS V. SPAIN ([IN FRENCH ONLY](#)) (No. 6528/11) - Importance 2 - 22 April 2014 - Violation of Article 13 taken together with Article 2 and Article 3 - Domestic authorities' failure to give the applicants the opportunity to justify the risks of torture they could face by returning to their country of origin – Application of Article 46 – Obligation made to the contracting state to ensure the remaining of the applicants on its territory

The case concerned applications lodged for international protections because of the risks of inhuman and degrading treatments.

The Court reiterated that the concept of an effective remedy included the opportunity to suspend a removal order as well as the person facing deportation could be exposed to a risk of ill-treatment, torture or a violation of his right to life.

It observed that the applicants had lodged applications for international protection, which had been rejected after being considered and reconsidered by domestic authorities. But these proceedings did not, in themselves, have suspensive effect, therefore the applicants had sought a stay of execution of the orders for their deportation. Nevertheless, the latter had been rejected by domestic authorities because no arguments could allow concluding about the existence of any special emergency that could justify the suspension of the measure. So, the application of Rule 39 of the Rules of Court had been the sole opportunity for applicants to suspend the procedure for their removal as proceedings before domestic authorities did not have such suspensive effects.

Moreover, as the proceedings had been accelerated, the applicants could not provide any further explanations on these points. Indeed, even if such applications need to be treated rapidly, the Court however considered that it should not lead to undermine the effectiveness of the procedural safeguards for protecting the applicants against arbitrary removal to their country of origin.

So, the Court found that there had been a violation of Article 13 in conjunction with Articles 2 and 3.

Article 46 (Binding force and execution of judgements)

Having regard to the particular circumstances of the case, the Court held that domestic authorities had to ensure the remaining of the applicants within its territory during the examination of their cases.

- **Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (Right to property)**

PREDĂ AND OTHERS V. ROMANIA ([in French only](#)) (Nos. 9584/02 and 7 others) - Importance 2 - 29 April 2014 - Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 - Domestic authorities' failure to afford redress in restitution proceedings in which multiple documents of title concern the same building

The case concerned proceedings for compensation or restitution in respect of property confiscated or nationalised by the communist regime, in accordance with laws passed by Romania after the fall of the regime in December 1989.

The Court concluded that, bearing in mind the margin of appreciation enjoyed by the Romanian state, the law enacted by the Romanian Parliament provided in principle an accessible and effective framework of redress for alleged violations of the right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions, and that it was up to the claimants concerned to make use of that framework. The Court however found that in situations where there were multiple documents of title for the same building, the Romanian Law did not contain any provisions capable of affording redress. It therefore found a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 in that respect.

Under Article 41 (just satisfaction), the Court held that Romania was to pay EUR 200,000 in respect of pecuniary damage, EUR 5,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 3,000 in respect of costs and expenses.

- **Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 (Right to free elections)**

ORAN V. TURKEY (in French only) (Nos. 28881/07 and 37920/07) - Importance 2 - 15 April 2014 - No violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1, taken alone or in conjunction with Article 14 - Justified restriction on the right to free elections - No violation of Article 13 - No guarantee under the Convention of a remedy allowing a Contracting state's law as such to be challenged before a national authority on the ground of being contrary to the Convention

The case concerned a complaint lodged by a university lecturer who had stood as an independent candidate without party affiliations in the parliamentary elections. He complained of the fact that Turkish citizens who had lived abroad for more than six months could only vote for the lists presented by the political parties, and not for independent candidates like himself, in the polling stations set up at customs posts. He further complained of the fact that independent candidates, unlike political parties, were barred by law from campaigning on radio and television.

Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 taken alone and in conjunction with Article 14

The Court reiterated that having to satisfy a residence or length-of-residence requirement in order to have or exercise the right to vote was not, in principle, an arbitrary restriction of that right and was therefore not incompatible with Article 3 of Protocol No. 1. The Court took the view that the restrictions imposed on citizens living abroad had been designed to ensure the political stability of the country and of the government that would be in charge following the elections. Taking into consideration the wide margin of appreciation left to the state, the Court considered that there had been no infringement of the very essence of the right to free expression of opinion of the people or of the applicant's right to stand for election, for the purposes of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 taken alone and in conjunction with Article 14.

Article 13

The Court observed that the applicant had complained of his inability to challenge the impugned provisions of the electoral legislation before the Constitutional Court or another domestic court. It noted the applicant's claims that the treatment of which he complained stemmed from the legislation in force and that the decision of the National Electoral Commission of 4 July 2007 was not subject to appeal before a second appellate court. The Court reiterated that Article 13 of the Convention did not go so far as to guarantee a remedy allowing a Contracting state's laws as such to be challenged before a national authority on the ground of being contrary to the Convention. There had therefore been no violation of Article 13 of the Convention.

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
ALBANIA	1 April 2014	LULI AND OTHERS (Nos. 64480/09, 64482/09, 12874/10, 56935/10)	2	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Excessive length of proceedings
ARMENIA	8 April 2014	MINASYAN (No. 44837/08)	3	Violation of Art. 5 § 1	Unlawful detention of the applicant (his detention had not been based on a court decision)
				No violation of Art. 5 § 3	Justified continuation of applicant's detention given the complexity of the case and the volume of the evidence to be analysed while no lack of diligence attributable to the domestic authorities had been found in handling the case
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Domestic appeal court's denial to review the lawfulness of the applicant's detention on the ground that the criminal case could no longer be considered to be in its pre-trial stage had resulted to an unjustified restriction of the applicant's right under Art. 5 § 4
AZERBAIJAN	10 April 2014	LAYIJOV (No. 22062/07)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Ill-treatment of the applicant during his arrest and in police custody
				Violation of Art. 3 (procedural)	Ineffective investigation into the applicant's allegation of ill-treatment
				Violation of Art. 6	Unfairness of proceedings on account of domestic courts' failure to address the applicant's objections and justified arguments concerning the authenticity of the evidence on which his criminal conviction had been based

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

BELGIUM	17 April 2014	PAPOSHVILI (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 41738/10)	2	No violation of Art. 2 or Art. 3	No real risk of deterioration of applicant's health in case of expulsion to his country of origin given that he could have access to an adequate medical treatment and no real risk of ill-treatment as the applicant's country of origin, being a state party to the Convention, is committed to respect the rights guaranteed therein, in this case the prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment
				No violation of Art. 8	No failure of the domestic authorities to strike a fair balance between the public interest and the rights of the applicant given the gravity of the offenses he committed and the existing ties with his country of origin
CROATIA	24 April 2014	MARIJA BOZIC (No. 50636/09)	3	Violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1	Interference with the applicant's right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions on account of the non-payment of her pension for about 11 years
		UDOVICIC (No. 27310/09)	3	Violation of Art. 8	Domestic authorities' failure to handle the applicant's case with due diligence and to ensure her right to respect for her home and her private life (the impugned situation had persisted for more than 10 years without finally setting the issue before the competent domestic authorities)
	30 April 2014	SIMECKI (No. 15253/10)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Domestic authorities' failure to ensure the applicant's right to access to court as the domestic courts had erroneously dismissed, as lodged out of time, the applicant's appeal concerning the enforcement order that had not been carried out in accordance with the domestic law as it had become final without reaching her
FRANCE	17 April 2014	GUERDNER AND OTHERS (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 68780/10)	2	No violation of Art. 2 (substantive)	No deficiency of domestic legislative framework concerning the use of force when qualified as absolutely necessary, thus meeting the requirements of the Art. 2
				Violation of Art. 2 (substantive)	Excessive use of force against the applicants' relative which resulted in his death
				No violation of Art. 2 (procedural)	Independent and impartial investigation into the applicants' relative's death

GERMANY	17 April 2014	<u>SCHATSCHASCHWILI</u> (No. 9154/10)	2	No violation of Art. 6 § 1 in conjunction with Art. 6 § 3 (d)	Fairness of proceedings despite the impossibility of the applicant to question the key witnesses given the counterbalancing factors such as the evaluation of the witnesses' credibility by the domestic court and the presence of the domestic public prosecutor who had been able to question the witnesses during the pre-trial interview
	GREECE	3 April 2014	KONSTANTINIDIS (<u>IN FRENCH ONLY</u>) (No. 58809/09)	2	No violation of Art. 8
2				No violation of Art. 14 in conjunction with Art. 8	No discrimination concerning the different provisions under domestic legislation which allow children born out of wedlock, whose parents are married after their birth, to bring an action for recognition of paternity without being submitted to a time limitation period given that the applicant's situation could not be considered comparable
GREECE	17 April 2014	ADAMANTIDIS (<u>IN FRENCH ONLY</u>) (No. 10587/10)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Extended pre-trial detention of the applicant (4 months) in the premises of a police station which by their nature do not satisfy the needs of a prolonged detention
		KAVOURIS AND OTHERS (<u>IN FRENCH ONLY</u>) (No. 73237/12)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Extended pre-trial detention of the applicants (between 1 to 3 months) in the premises of a police station which by their nature do not satisfy the needs of a prolonged detention
				Violation of Art. 13	Lack of an effective remedy concerning the applicants' complaints under Art. 3
		LICI (<u>IN FRENCH ONLY</u>) (No. 69881/12)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Extended pre-trial detention of the applicant (6 months) in the premises of a police station which by their nature do not satisfy the needs of a prolonged detention
Violation of Art. 13	Lack of an effective remedy concerning the applicant's complaints under Art. 3				

GREECE (CONTINUED)	24 April 2014	HERMAN AND SERAZADISHVILI (IN FRENCH ONLY) Nos. 26418/11 AND 45884/11)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive) (concerning both applicants)	Poor conditions of detention in police premises (overcrowding, lack of personal space concerning the first applicant, overcrowding, lack of recreational activities, lack of meals concerning the second applicant)
				Violation of Art. 5 § 1 (concerning the first applicant)	Domestic authorities' failure to act with due diligence given that they did not contact the relevant authorities of the applicant's state in order to obtain the required travel documents and achieve the applicant's deportation (the applicant had been held in detention for 6 months)
				No violation of Art. 5 § 1 (concerning the second applicant)	No lack of diligence on account of the domestic authorities as the duration of the applicant's detention had been attributable to the relevant authorities of the applicant's state
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4 (concerning both applicants)	Lack of an effective judicial review concerning the lawfulness of the applicants' detention pending deportation
ITALY	15 April 2014	STEFANETTI AND OTHERS (Nos. 21838/10, 21849/10, 21852/10, 21822/10, 21860/10, 21863/10, 21869/10 AND 21870/10)	2	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Domestic authorities' legislative intervention in their favour while the applicants' proceedings had still been pending before the domestic courts had breached the applicants' right to a fair trial
				Violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1	Excessive burden on account of the applicants' loss of 67% of their pensions following the unforeseeable legislative intervention
	22 April 2014	G.C (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 73869/10)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Inadequate medical treatment of the applicant's pathology
				No violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Applicant's conditions of detention cannot be considered as contrary to the Art. 3
LATVIA	15 April 2014	DJUNDIKS (No. 14920/05)	2	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive and procedural)	Domestic authorities' failure to provide any explanation concerning the injuries the applicant had sustained while in detention and ineffective investigation in that respect
				Violation of Art. 5 § 1	Unlawful detention of the applicant (absence of legal grounds under domestic legislation)
POLAND	15 April 2014	KRASICKI (NO. 17254/11)	3	No violation of Art. 8	Domestic authorities' failure cannot be attributed to a lack of diligence on their behalf as they took all the necessary steps in order to enforce the applicant's right to contact his sons
		TOMASZEWSKY (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 8933/05)	2	Violation of Art. 5 § 1	Unlawful detention of the applicants (absence of legal basis under domestic law)
				Violation of Art. 5 § 5	Lack of a compensatory remedy concerning the violation of Art. 5 § 1

PORTUGAL	3 April 2014	AMORIM GIESTAS AND JESUS COSTA BORDALO (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 37840/10)	3	Violation of Art. 10	Disproportionate interference regarding the applicants' right to freedom of expression given the severity of the penalty imposed to them while the article had been based on evidence and had contributed to a debate of general interest
	10 April 2014	TEREBUS (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 5238/10)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Excessive length of proceedings on account of domestic authorities' failure to enforce the judgment in favour of the applicant
ROMANIA	1 April 2014	ENACHE (No. 10662/06) AUREL RADULESCU (No. 32800/12)	2	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive) (in both cases)	Poor conditions of detention (overcrowding, lack of hygiene concerning both cases, lack of hot and cold running water, poor quality of food, inadequate activities and out-of-cell time and systematic handcuffing concerning the first applicant)
			3	Violation of Art. 34 (concerning the first applicant)	Interference with the applicant's right of individual petition (the applicant had been forced by state agents to withdraw his complaint)

ROMANIA (CONTINUED)	8 April 2014	BLAJ (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 36259/04)	2	No violation of Art. 6 §§ 1 and 3 (c)	No failure of the domestic authorities to inform the applicant of the charges against him at the first interrogation while he had been represented by lawyers during all the stages of the procedure (the statements obtained following the flagrante delicto procedure, where the applicant did not have the right to be assisted by a lawyer as prescribed by the domestic law, had only served as evidence in order to establish the blazing offence and had not been considered as separate incriminating statements)
				No violation of Art. 6 § 1	Fairness of proceedings despite the applicant's allegations that he had been entrapped to commit the offence by the police agents given that, according to the documents and especially to the video recordings between the applicant and the co-accused, a prior agreement had existed between them
				No violation of Art. 8	Lawful interference with the applicant's right to respect to private and family life as the interception and the recording of the applicant's communications had been authorised while he had had the opportunity to listen to them and challenge their content and even seek their destruction according to the domestic legislation
				No violation of Art. 13 in conjunction with Art. 8	Domestic high court had examined the applicant's complaints regarding the legality of the recordings and had found them in compliance with the domestic law
				No violation of Art. 34	Applicant's lawyers had had access to all written documents in his case file including the transcripts of the recordings in order to efficiently prepare his defence
	15 April 2014	FLORIN ANDREI (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 33228/05)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention in a police station (overcrowding, poor sanitary conditions, lack of access to a toilet)
			3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (overcrowding, poor sanitary conditions)
	22 April 2014	AXINTE (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 24044/12)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (lack of personal space, lack of hygiene, defective ventilation system, poor lighting)

RUSSIA	3 April 2014	ARTEMOV (No. 14945/03)	3	Violation of Art. 5 § 3	Excessive length of applicant's pre-trial detention on insufficient grounds (2 years and 1 month)
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Domestic authorities' failure to notify the applicant and his lawyer of the appeal hearings
				Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Lack of a public hearing
		OSHLAKOV (No. 56662/09)	3	No violation of Art. 3	Absence of evidence suggesting that the applicant would face any real risk of ill-treatment in case of his extradition to the country of his origin
				Violation of Art. 5 § 1	Unlawful detention of the applicant (absence of factual or legal grounds)
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Lack of a judicial review of the lawfulness of the applicant's detention
			No violation of Art. 5 § 4	Availability of a judicial review of the lawfulness of the applicant's detention as he had the possibility, under domestic law, to appeal against the detention order to a higher domestic court while he had failed to demonstrate that any new relevant factors requiring the review of the lawfulness of his detention had arisen	
	17 April 2014	GAYRATBEK SALIYEV (No. 39093/13)	3	Violation of Art. 3	Real risk of ill-treatment in case of the applicant's extradition to his country of origin
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Excessive length of the applicant's appeal proceedings in respect of the detention orders
		ISMAILOV (No. 20110/13)	3	Violation of Art. 3	Real risk of ill-treatment in case of the applicant's removal to his country of origin
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Lack of a judicial review of the lawfulness of the applicant's detention pending administrative removal
				Violation of Art. 5 § 1 (f)	Unlawfulness of the applicant's detention pending administrative removal while no attempt had been made in order to find alternative solutions which would secure the enforcement of the expulsion order
		LYUBOV STETSENKO (No. 26216/07)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Excessive length of proceedings on account of domestic authorities' failure to enforce a final judicial decision in favour of the applicant (15 years and 5 months)
30 April 2014	TIKHONOVA (No. 13596/05)	3	No violation of Art. 2 (substantive)	Domestic authorities' impossibility to predict the death of the applicant's son	
			Violation of Art. 2 (procedural)	Ineffective investigation into the circumstances of the death of the applicant's son	

RUSSIA (CONTINUED)	30 April 2014	ZENKOV (No. 37858/08)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (overcrowding)
				Violation of Art. 5 § 1 (c)	Unlawful pre-trial detention of the applicant under domestic law (pre-trial detention had been authorised retroactively)
SWEDEN	3 April 2014	A.A.M (No. 68519/10)	3	No violation of Art. 3	No real risk suggesting that the applicant would be submitted to ill-treatment in case of his deportation to the country of his origin in a different region
SWITZERLAND	22 April 2014	R.E. (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 28334/08)	3	No violation of Art. 6 §§ 1 and 3 (b)	Absence of evidence suggesting that the domestic authorities had concealed elements that could have contributed to the applicant's defence
"THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA	24 April 2014	DUSKO IVANOVSKI (No. 10718/05)	2	Violation of Art. 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d)	Unfairness of proceedings on account of the domestic courts' refusal to hear the defence witnesses and admit alternative expert evidence
				Violation of Art. 5 § 3	Extension of the applicants' pre- trial detention on insufficient grounds
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Lack of an oral hearing in the review proceedings of the applicants' detention and inability to obtain a copy of the domestic prosecutor's observations which had infringed their right to adversarial proceedings
THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA	8 April 2014	KENZIE GLOBAL LIMITED LTD (No. 287/07)	3	Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Domestic supreme court's failure to summon the applicant company to the hearing had deprived it of the chance to present its case while the other parties were present at the proceedings and were given the opportunity to present their positions
	15 April 2014	RADU (No. 50073/07)	2	Violation of Art. 8	Unlawful interference under domestic law with the applicant's right to respect for private and family life (hospital's disclosure of applicant's medical information to her employer)
	22 April 2014	TRIPADUS (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 34382/07)	3	Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Domestic court's refusal to grant the applicant access to the evidence in the review procedure of the lawfulness of his pre-trial detention, thus depriving him of the opportunity to adequately challenge the findings against him
TURKEY	1 April 2014	MEHMET KOSE (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 10449/06)	3	Violation of Art. 2 (procedural)	Ineffective investigation into the death of the applicant's son

TURKEY (CONTINUED)	8 April 2014	ERGEZEN (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 73359/10)	2	Violation of Art. 5 § 3	Unjustified pre-trial detention of the applicants
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Absence of the applicant during the review proceedings of his pre-trial detention while his last appearance before a judge dated back more than 4 months
				Violation of Art. 5 § 5	Lack of a compensatory remedy concerning the violation of Art. 5 § 4
				Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Excessive length of proceedings (more than 5 years and 2 months for the first applicant and more than 7 years and 8 months for the second applicant)
	15 April 2014	ASALYA (No. 43875/09)	3	Violation of Art. 3 (substantive)	Poor conditions of detention (lack of beds, inadequate facilities for wheel-chair bound detainees)
				Violation of Art. 5 § 1	Unlawful detention of the applicant (absence of legal grounds as the deportation procedure had no longer been in progress)
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Lack of a prompt judicial review of the lawfulness of the applicant's detention
				Violation of Art. 5 § 5	Lack of a compensatory remedy concerning the violation of Art. 5 § 1
				Violation of Art. 13 in conjunction with the Art. 2, 3 and 8	Lack of an effective remedy regarding the applicant's threatened deportation while he had not been provided with sufficient safeguards against arbitrary conduct on the part of domestic authorities
		CULAZ AND OTHERS (IN FRENCH ONLY) (Nos. 7524/06 AND 39046/10)	3	Violation of Art. 2 (substantive)	Domestic authorities' failure to provide an explanation regarding the unacknowledged detention of the applicants' relatives which may be presumed dead
				Violation of Art. 2 (procedural)	Domestic authorities' failure to carry out an effective criminal investigation into the circumstances of the disappearance of the applicants' relatives
		HASAN YAZICI (No. 40877/07)	3	Violation of Art. 10	Disproportionate interference with the applicant's right to freedom of expression as it had not been based on sufficient reasons to show that the interference had been necessary in a democratic society in order to protect the reputation and the rights of others
				Violation of Art. 6 § 1	Excessive length of proceedings (6 years and 3 months)
		MURAT OZDEMIR (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 60225/11)	3	Violation of Art. 5 § 3	Excessive pre-trial detention (5 years)

UKRAINE	3 April 2014	DZHULAY (No. 24439/06)	2	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, largely due to the lack of an effective investigation by domestic authorities
				No violation of Art. 6 § 1 taken together with Art. 6 § 3 (c)	Fairness of criminal proceedings despite the identification parade held in the absence of the applicant's lawyer given that, during the court hearing, the defence had the opportunity to ask the victims questions regarding the identification of the applicant while the applicant's identification was neither the sole nor the decisive evidence on which he had been convicted
	17 April 2014	ANATOLIY RUDENKO (No. 50264/08)	2	Violation of Art. 5 § 1 (c)	Unlawful detention of the applicant (his detention had not been based on any judicial decision)
				Violation of Art. 5 § 1 (e)	Domestic authorities failure to establish with the necessary procedural safeguards against arbitrariness the existence and persistence of a genuine mental disorder which would justify the applicant's admission and detention in a psychiatric hospital
				Violation of Art. 5 § 3	Excessive and unjustified pre-trial detention of the applicant (3 years and 3 and a half months)
				Violation of Art. 5 § 4	Lack of a prompt judicial review concerning the lawfulness of the applicant's detention
	24 April 2014	BUDCHENKO (No. 38677/06)	3	Violation of Art. 1 of Prot. No. 1	Domestic authorities' failure to exempt the applicant from payment to which he had been entitled by law

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 March 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
ROMANIA	6 March 2014	MIHAELA MIHAI NEAGU (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 66345/09)	Art. 3 of Protocol No. 1 (rejection of the applicant's candidature for the elections of Members of the European Parliament)	Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded
	6 March 2014	SINDICATUL PRO ASISTENTA SOCIALA (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 24456/13)	Mainly Art. 6 § 1 (domestic authorities refusal to request a preliminary ruling from the Court of Justice of the European Union)	Inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded
THE UNITED KINGDOM	11 March 2014	A.S. (No. 22189/10)	Art. 8 (retention on police files of information about the charges brought against the applicant)	Inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies
TURKEY	11 March 2014	AKDENIZ (IN FRENCH ONLY) (No. 20877/10)	Mainly Art. 10 (blocking of websites visited by the applicant)	Incompatible <i>ratione materiae</i> with the provisions of the Convention

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. Those decisions are published with a delay on the Court's website. Therefore the decisions listed below cover only the period from 16 November to 10 December 2013.

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
ARMENIA	20 November 2013	MIKAYELYAN (No. 1879/10)	Prosecution and conviction of the applicant by the domestic authorities for his opposition activism and participation in opposition rallies.

AZERBAIJAN	18 November and 9 December 2013	GAHRAMANLI AND OTHERS (No. 36503/11 AND 5 OTHER APPLICATIONS) MANSUROV (No. 35834/11)	Alleged discrimination of the applicants to stand as candidates in free elections because of biased and dependent electoral commissions and approval of the election results while their appeals challenging them are still pending before the Supreme Court.
BULGARIA	3 December 2013	KARAAHMED (No. 30587/13)	Verbal aggression, coupled with physical violence against members of the group of Islamic worshippers to which the applicant belonged, and threat of physical violence against him personally. Lack of efficiency and impartiality by the authorities in the investigation.
CROATIA	18 November 2013	B.V. AND OTHERS (No. 38435/13)	Domestic authorities' alleged failure to protect efficiently the applicants from the constant harassment by their neighbours.
CZECH REPUBLIC	6 December 2013	SABADOSH IN FRENCH ONLY (No. 76192/13)	If deported to Ukraine, the applicant fears to be exposed to bad conditions of detention and he would be separated from his family.
FRANCE	21 November 2013	M.B. IN FRENCH ONLY (No. 72095/13)	If sent back to Lebanon, the applicant fears to be exposed to inhuman treatments by the Hezbollah.
GEORGIA	3 December 2013	AGHDGOMELASHVILI AND JAPARIDZE (No. 7224/11)	The applicants were victim of ill-treatment, interference with their private lives as well as an absence of an effective investigation into the police abuse, allegedly because of the actual or perceived sexual orientation and/or the LGBT-related activities of the applicants.
GERMANY	25 November 2013	KHAN (No.38030/12)	Allegedly disproportionate deportation order to Pakistan given the applicant's regular situation. This deportation would separate her from her son, endanger her health by the lack of effective access to medical facilities and treatment and she would also be particularly vulnerable with a low social status as a divorced female convert.
ITALY	3 December 2013	OLIARI AND OTHERS (No. 18766/11) ORLANDI AND OTHERS (No. 26431/12)	The applicants consider that they are being discriminated against as a result of their sexual orientation since the Italian legislation did not allow marriage between persons of the same sex, nor did it provide any other type of union, which could give them legal recognition. The domestic authorities also refused to register same sex marriage contracted abroad.
THE NETHERLANDS	20 November 2013	S.B. (No. 63999/13)	If expelled to Iran, the applicant fears inhuman treatments because of his conversion to Christianity.

THE NETHERLANDS	25 November 2013	A.K. AND B.N. (No. 72606/13)	Removal from the Netherlands while the applicants' minor daughter is still missing.
	10 December 2013	Y.M. (No. 71247/13)	If expelled to Somalia, the applicant fears inhuman treatments and even murder by al-Shabaab.
NORWAY	27 November 2013	S.A.K. (No. 61156/13)	If deported to Ethiopia, the applicant fears to face inhuman treatments.
POLAND	25 November 2013	KOŚCIELAK (No. 60373/11)	The applicant was not allowed to attend his father's funeral without the prison officers' escort, which constituted disproportionately severe and humiliating safety measures.
RUSSIA	19 November 2013	BOLSHAKOV (No. 54328/08)	Seizure and destruction of the applicant's belongings bearing symbols of his political affiliations because the domestic authorities assimilated them with Nazi propaganda whereas, according to the applicant, the swastika is an ancient symbol used extensively throughout the history.
	27 November 2013	YEDINOE DUKHOVNOYE UPRAVLENIYE MUSULMAN KRASNOYARSKOGO KRAYA (No. 28621/11)	Domestic authorities' decision to classify as "extremist" a translation in Russian of a Muslim book.
	2 December 2013	ALEKHINA AND OTHERS (No. 38004/12)	Allegedly unjustifiable and disproportionate conviction and detention of the applicants, members of the Pussy Riot feminist punk band, for their performance in a cathedral. Their conditions of detention and transportation during the hearing period were inhuman and degrading and the domestic authorities declared extremist the video recordings of the Pussy Riot band's performances.
SERBIA	18 November 2013	STOJANOVIĆ (No. 28181/11)	Failure of the domestic authorities to enforce the judicial decisions in a reasonable time, which resulted in the inability for the applicant to exercise her parental rights and see her child.
UKRAINE	4 December 2013	I.N. (No. 28472/08)	Unlawful placement of the applicant in a mental hospital without a court decision.

PartOne

§2 - EUROPEAN COMMITTEE OF SOCIAL RIGHTS

A. Reclamations and Decisions

1. Reclamations

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

2. Decisions

STATE	COMPLAINANT	RECLAMATION NUMBER	SUBJECT MATTER	DECISION
FRANCE	Union syndicale des magistrats administratifs (USMA)	84/2012	Violation of Article 4§2 of the Charter on the right to an increased rate of remuneration for overtime work	Complaint admissible but no violation of Article 4§2 of the Charter (Resolution CM Res ChS (2014) 5)

B. Other information

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

PartOne

§3 - RECOMMENDATIONS & RESOLUTIONS

A. Recommendations

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

B. Resolutions

AUTHOR	DATE	TEXT NUMBER	SUBJECT MATTER	DECISION
PACE	8 April 2014	1983	Prostitution, trafficking and modern slavery in Europe	The PACE called on the states notably to consider criminalising the purchase of sexual services, and if they have legalised prostitution, ensure laws and regulations are properly implemented. It also called on states to combat human trafficking by signing the CoE's Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings, and raise awareness on this serious human rights violation through the medias and education (Read more - Voting results)
PACE	8 April 2014	1984	Request for Partner for Democracy status with the PACE submitted by the Kyrgyz Republic	The PACE welcomed the commitment of the Kyrgyz Republic to continue work towards compliance with the basic values and principles of the CoE and engaged itself to help Kyrgyzstan reach this goal. The PACE notably called on the state to ensure full respect of human rights, and fight discrimination. It granted the state the status of partner for democracy (Read more - Voting results)
PACE	08.04.2014	1985	The situation and rights of national minorities in Europe	The PACE assessed that territorial self-government arrangements can contribute to effectively protecting minority rights, and reasserted the right to a common identity. It invited the media to provide services in minority languages and the states to follow closely the issue of national minorities (Read more - Voting results - Recommendation 2040)
PACE	09.04.2014	1986	Improving user protection and security in cyberspace	The PACE called on states to launch, in cooperation with the internet and online industry, a global initiative for improving user protection and security in cyberspace, with a view to protecting international human rights (Recommendation 2041)

PACE	09.04.20 14	1987	The right to internet access	The PACE recalled the importance of access to the internet in relation with the freedom of expression, regardless of age or income. It invited to a cooperation between commercial stakeholders of the internet and states (Read more - Voting results - Video of the debate)
PACE	09.04.20 14	1989	Access to nationality and the effective implementation of the European Convention on Nationality	The PACE emphasized the right to nationality, as the “right to have rights”, and called on states to facilitate the access to nationality, without discrimination and without falling into “passportisation” (Read more - Voting results - Recommendation 2042)
PACE	10.04.20 14	1991	Urgent need to deal with new failures to cooperate with the ECHR	The PACE called on states to respect interim measures indicated by the ECHR, and condemned instances of outright violations by several states. The PACE welcomed the use by the ECHR of factual presumptions and of the reversal of the burden of proof in dealing with refusals of states to cooperate (Read more - Voting results - Recommendation 2043)
PACE	10.04.20 14	1992	The protection of minors against excesses of sects	The PACE called on states to ensure no discrimination is allowed on the basis of which a movement is considered as a sect or not, and ensure measures taken towards non-traditional religious movements, new religious movements or “sects” are aligned with human rights standards (Read more - Voting results)
PACE	10.04.20 14	1993	Decent work for all	The PACE recalled the obligations for states to protect the right to work, and the rights at work. It notably called on states to adhere to the ECSR’s collective complaints procedure and to provide “more and better jobs” (Read more - Voting results)
PACE	11.04.20 14	1994	Refugees and the right to work	The PACE underlined the importance of the right to work for refugees and asylum seekers, and considered that states should do more to ensure these people are better integrated into the labour market (Read more - Video of the debate)
PACE	11.04.20 14	1995	Ending child poverty in Europe	The PACE urged member states to promote children’s rights to participate in recreation, sport and cultural activities as well as in decision-making that affects their lives (Read more - Recommendation 2044)

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

■ Adequate access to healthcare for migrants, asylum seekers and refugees (04.04.2014)

On the occasion of World Health Day, the Chairperson of the PACE Sub-Committee on Public Health and the Chairperson of the PACE Committee on Migration, Refugees and Displaced Persons called for adequate access to healthcare for all migrants in Europe ([Read more](#)).

■ Edward Snowden: “Mass surveillance is ineffective at preventing terrorism” (08.04.2014)

Edward Snowden, testifying on mass surveillance, stated that it results in “less safe” societies, and that mass surveillance is highly problematic for human rights as any government can justify any violation of private life on that basis ([Read more](#) - [Hearing's video](#) - [Announcement](#) - [Interview by Pieter Omtzigt](#)).

■ Anne Brasseur: breaking the vicious circle affecting many Roma (08.04.2014)

Marking International Roma Day, Anne Brasseur called on states to take practical measures to combat discrimination against Roma, and underlined the importance of Roma's access to education. The Commissioner for Human Rights has relayed the same idea in a statement before the PACE ([Read more](#) - [Video of Ms Brasseur's and Nils Muiznieks' statement](#)).

■ Statement on the situation of Iranian refugees in Camp Liberty (10.04.2014)

The Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy encouraged member states to consider favourably the resettlement demands of Liberty residents, particularly as the UNHCR has called on all countries to redouble their efforts to find humanitarian solutions for this population outside Iraq ([Read more](#)).

■ The Istanbul Convention will enter into force on 1 August 2014 (24.04.2014)

The General Rapporteur on violence against women welcomed the ratification of the Istanbul Convention, which will now enter into force, by Andorra and Denmark ([Read more](#) - [Istanbul Convention](#)).

C. Information for the Commissioner for Human Rights

■ 2013 annual activity report (08.04.2014)

The Commissioner presented his 2013 annual activity report before the PACE ([Read the report](#)).

■ Stateless but not rightless: improving the protection of stateless persons in Europe (08.04.2014)

The Commissioner expressed his concern about the major human rights issue of statelessness in a keynote speech, at the Conference organised by UNHCR and the European Network on statelessness, and notably underlined its impact on state as it prevents participation in socioeconomic, but also in public affairs, and it results in the alienation of entire groups from society ([Read the speech](#) - [Hearing on the need to eradicate statelessness](#)).

■ Protecting children's rights in the digital world: an ever-growing challenge (29.04.2014)

The Commissioner warned against the risks for children's rights violations through the growing access to Internet, even though it also brought about possibilities for children to exercise their rights, including the right to receive and impart information. Indeed, there is, among others, danger of private life violations, identity theft, etc. In this respect, the Commissioner has promoted measures in order to empower children with tools to protect themselves, to educate them and to create a safe environment for children on the Internet ([Read more](#) - [Read in Russian](#)).

D. Information from the monitoring mechanisms

■ GRECO: Conference on "Strengthening the capacity of parliamentarians, judges and prosecutors to prevent corruption in their own ranks: emerging trends from two years of GRECO Round IV evaluations" (from 10.04.2014 to 11.04.2014)

[Read the programme](#)

■ MONEYVAL: Outcome of MONEYVAL's 44th Plenary Meeting (11.04.2014)

MONEYVAL held its 44th plenary meeting in Strasbourg from 31 March to 4 April 2014. At this meeting, the Plenary, *inter alia*:

- adopted the evaluation reports on the 4th assessment visits to Liechtenstein, Romania and "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia";
- heard the report on the high-level mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina;
- examined the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina under step (iv) of the Compliance Enhancing Procedures and related peer pressure measures;
- discussed and adopted the interim report by Cyprus on action taken in response to the MONEYVAL Special Assessment on the Effectiveness of Customer Due Diligence Measures in the Banking Sector;
- heard and adopted the report on Lithuania under step (ii) of the Compliance Enhancing Procedures;
- took note of the expedited follow-up report of the Czech Republic, the regular follow-up report on Andorra and the interim follow-up reports on Malta, Slovakia and Albania;
- discussed various aspects involving Voluntary Tax Compliance Schemes in Albania, Hungary and Malta;
- discussed the templates for the questionnaires to be used for the commencement of its 5th round of evaluations;
- examined measures taken by the Republic of Moldova on identified important deficiencies as a result of the process regarding the state of compliance on all NC and PC ratings in the third round and decided to terminate the NC/PC process given the legislative progress achieved by the Republic of Moldova.

The reports which are public in accordance with MONEYVAL's publication policy will be made available under each jurisdiction' profile.

■ GRETA: The Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings has been ratified by Greece (11.04.2014)

PartTwo

INFORMATION BY COUNTRY

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

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

Armenia

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
MELIKYAN (No. 9737/06)	19 May 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)44	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

■ Commissioner for Human Rights: Freedom of expression, assembly and association deteriorating in Azerbaijan (23.04.2014)

The Commissioner recalled the state its need to comply with its human rights obligations and commitments. He notably denounced unjustified and selective criminal prosecution of people expressing dissenting views, restrictions to the activities of NGO, and the use of excessive force by the police in order to disperse peaceful protests ([Read more - Commissioner's observations on Azerbaijan - Comments of the state](#)).

Belarus

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: PACE President reacted to recent execution in Belarus: “No state has a right to kill” (23.04.2014)

In reaction to an execution carried out in Belarus, the PACE President highlighted the abolition of death penalty as one of the highest priorities for the PACE in its dealing with this state, and regretted that little progress has been made on the issue ([Read more](#)).

Bosnia and Herzegovina

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 3rd ACFC Opinion (07.04.2014)

The Council of Europe Advisory Committee on the FCNM has published its Third Opinion on Bosnia and Herzegovina together with the government comments. Both these documents are also available in the Bosnian language ([Read more](#)).

■ GRETA: Round-table to support the anti-trafficking efforts in Bosnia and Herzegovina

A round-table meeting on the follow-up given to GRETA's first report and the Committee of the Parties' recommendation on the implementation of the Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings by Bosnia and Herzegovina took place in Sarajevo on 10 April 2014 ([Read more](#)).

Bulgaria

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
GOSPODINOV AND DIMITROV AND OTHERS (No. 30392/09)	10 September 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)45	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ CPT: Visit to Bulgaria (04.04.2014)

A delegation of the CPT carried out a visit to Bulgaria from 24 March to 3 April 2014. The visit formed part of the CPT's programme of periodic visits for 2014.

The visit provided an opportunity to assess the extent to which the recommendations made after previous CPT visits have been implemented. Particular attention was paid to the treatment of persons in police custody, prison conditions, prison healthcare, and the treatment of juveniles in penitentiary establishments ([Read more](#)).

Cyprus

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: Receipt of the 4th cycle state Report (29.04.2014)

Cyprus has submitted its fourth state Report in English pursuant to Article 25, paragraph 2, of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. It is now up to the Advisory Committee to consider it and adopt an opinion intended for the Committee of Ministers ([Read the state Report](#)).

Czech Republic

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
FORMINSTER ENTREPRISES LIMITED (No. 38238/04)	15 September 2011	CM/ResDH(2014)38	Examination closed
OTAVA (No. 36561/05)	10 November 2011	CM/ResDH(2014)46	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ CPT: Visit to the Czech Republic (15.04.2014)

A delegation of the CPT carried out a periodic visit to the Czech Republic from 1 to 10 April 2014. During the visit, the CPT's delegation reviewed the situation of persons deprived of their liberty by the police and in prisons. In this connection, particular attention was paid to the measures taken by the Czech authorities in response to the previous Committee's recommendations concerning the situation of juveniles, high-security and life-sentenced prisoners. For the first time in the Czech Republic, the delegation examined the treatment of and legal safeguards offered to persons under the measure of "security detention" held at Brno Prison. The delegation also visited a psychiatric hospital where it examined the situation of involuntary patients, as well as the implementation of the new legislation concerning these patients ([Read more](#)).

■ GRECO: Publication of a compliance report (04.04.2014)

[Read more.](#)

Denmark

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ GRECO: Publication of an evaluation report (16.04.2014)

[Read the evaluation report.](#)

France

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
C.N. AND V. (No.67724/09)	11 January 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)39	Examination closed
ALBOREO (No. 5101/08)	20 January 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)47	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
TCHITCHINADZE (No. 18156/05)	29 May 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)48	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: Greece has become the 42nd party to the Convention (11.04.2014)

On 11 April 2014 Greece ratified the Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings. The Convention will enter into force as regards Greece on 1 August 2014.

Hungary

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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ CPT: Publication of a report on Hungary (30.04.2014)

The CPT has published the report on its periodic visit to Hungary in April 2013, together with the response of the Hungarian authorities ([Read the report](#)).

Italy

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
SNEERSONE AND KAMPANELLA (No. 14737/09)	12 October 2011	CM/ResDH(2014)40	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]

Liechtenstein

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: Receipt of the 4th cycle state Report (07.04.2014)

Liechtenstein submitted today its fourth state Report in English pursuant to Article 25, paragraph 2, of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. The report is also available in German. It is now up to the Advisory Committee to consider it and adopt an opinion intended for the Committee of Ministers ([Read the state Report](#)).

Lithuania

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
ESERTAS (No. 50208/06)	31 August 2011	CM/ResDH(2014)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]

Moldova

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
ASITO (No. 40663/98)	24 April 2007	CM/ResDH(2014)49	Examination closed
BIGEA (No. 21867/09)	24 January 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)50	Examination closed
BIRCA (No. 37262/07)	19 June 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)50	Examination closed
BOGDAN AND CIORAP (No. 44417/05+)	14 May 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)50	Examination closed
CICALA (No. 45778/05)	27 March 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)50	Examination closed
PLATE (No. 56608/08)	13 March 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)50	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
EMIN (No. 28260/07)	29 August 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)42	Examination closed
ADAMS (No. 21723/08)	12 November 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)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]

Poland

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 Poland (15.04.2014)

On 15 April 2014 the Anti-Trafficking Division of the Council of Europe, in co-operation with the Unit against Trafficking in Human Beings of the Ministry of the Interior of Poland, organised a round-table meeting in Warsaw for some 30 representatives of relevant ministries and public agencies, non-governmental organisations, trade unions and research centres ([Read more](#)).

Romania

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
VLACIS AND 16 OTHER APPLICATIONS (No. 31135/05)	29 May 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)52	Examination closed

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ Commissioner for Human Rights: Romania has to ensure a better protection to persons with disabilities, children and Roma (04.04.2014)

The Commissioner welcomed measures taken by the state, but expressed his concern about reported cases of inhuman and degrading treatment of persons with disabilities living in closed institutions. He asserted that the isolation of children with disabilities would only lead to the deterioration of their health and to their social exclusion. Thus he pointed out the need of a strong commitment to de-institutionalisation and to promoting the autonomy of persons with disabilities ([Read more](#)).

■ MONEYVAL: Evaluation report, Follow up round (04.04.2014)

[Read the summary](#).

Russia

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

NATURE	DATE	TITLE
Resolution 1990	10.04.2014	Reconsideration on substantive grounds of the previously ratified credentials of the Russian delegation

C. Other information

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

Slovakia

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

CASE	DATE	RESOLUTION	CONCLUSION
V.C. (No. 18968/07)	8 February 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)43	Examination closed
N.B. (No. 29518/10)	12 September 2012	CM/ResDH(2014)43	Examination closed
J.G. AND OTHERS (No. 15966/04)	29 April 2013	CM/ResDH(2014)43	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

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

B. Resolutions, signatures and ratifications

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

C. Other information

■ MONEYVAL: Evaluation report, follow-up round (03.04.2014)

[Read the summary.](#)

■ PACE: Monitoring Committee made public an information note (17.04.2014)

PACE's Monitoring Committee has made public an information note by the rapporteur on the post-monitoring dialogue with “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”. The note focuses notably on the promotion of human rights, including the ombudsman institution and the situation of Roma ([Read more - Committee's information note](#)).

■ PACE: Shortcomings during campaign overshadowed well-run election day (28.04.2014)

Though fundamental freedoms were respected, and candidates were able to campaign without obstruction in the 27 April elections, the observers noted that there continued to be credible allegations of voter intimidation, including pressure by one party on ethnic Albanian voters to boycott the presidential ballot ([Read more - Skopje: fundamental freedoms respected, but campaign playing field not level](#)).

Turkey

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: PACE committee worried over recent developments in Turkey (10.04.2014)

The Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights expressed its worries about recent restrictions of access to internet services during election time by the state, prosecution of peaceful opponents under anti-terrorism legislation, restrictive measures impeding peaceful protests and instances of substantial pressure on judges ([Read more](#)).

■ PACE: Turkey is one of the countries with the highest number of non-executed ECHR judgments, rapporteur said (28.04.2014)

The PACE rapporteur on the implementation of judgments of the ECHR stated that Turkey is one of the countries with the highest number of non-executed judgments, and noted outstanding human rights issues which need further improvement. He called for the establishment of a parliamentary structure to supervise implementation of ECHR's judgments and was given assurances that this idea would soon be pursued ([Read more](#)).

Ukraine

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

NATURE	DATE	TITLE
Resolution 1988	09.04.2014	Recent developments in Ukraine: threats to the functioning of democratic institutions (Read more)

C. Other information

■ PACE: statement of the pre-electoral delegation (30.04.2014)

The PACE pre-electoral delegation considered that the lack of independence and the lack of transparency of media ownership are matters of serious concern, in the context of the Ukrainian election campaign. It was also informed of cases of harassment and restrictions on the freedom of journalists and firmly condemned any attempt to undermine media freedom ([Read more](#)).

■ CPT: Publication of a report on Ukraine (29.04.2014)

The CPT has published the [report](#) on its most recent periodic visit to Ukraine in October 2013. This document has been made public at the request of the Ukrainian authorities ([Read the report](#)).

■ FNCM: *ad hoc* procedure (11.04.2014)

[Read more](#).