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**Human Rights Committee**

 Follow-up progress report on individual Communications adopted by the Committee at its 116th session (7-31 March 2016)

 Progress report covering submissions processed between March 2015 and February 2016

 I. Introduction

1. In July 1990, the Committee established a procedure for the monitoring of follow-up to its Views under article 5, paragraph 4, of the Optional Protocol, and created the mandate of the Special Rapporteur for follow-up on Views to this effect. In accordance with Rule 101(3) of the Committee’s Rules of Procedure, the Special Rapporteur for follow-up on Views prepared the present report.

2. As of the 116th session, 975 of the 1156 Views adopted since 1979 concluded that there had been a violation of the Covenant.

3. At its 109th session, the Committee decided to include in its reports on follow-up to Views an assessment of the States parties' reply/action, based on the criteria of the follow-up procedure to the Concluding Observations, which are reproduced as Annexe I to the present report.

4. The present report sets out all information provided by States parties and authors or their counsel/representative between March 2015 and February 2016.

 II.

|  |
| --- |
| **Assessment criteria** |
| *Reply/action satisfactory* |
| **A** | Reply/action largely satisfactory |
| *Reply/action partially satisfactory* |
| **B1** | Substantive action taken, but additional information required |
| **B2** | Initial action taken, but additional information required |
| *Reply/action not satisfactory* |
| **C1** | Reply received, but actions taken do not implement the recommendation |
| **C2** | Reply received but not relevant to the recommendation |
| *No cooperation with the Committee* |
| **D1** | No reply received within the deadline, or no reply to any specific question in the report |
| **D2** | No reply received after reminder(s) |
| *The measures taken are contrary to the recommendations of the Committee* |
| **E** | The reply indicates that the measures taken go against the recommendations of the Committee |

 III. Follow-up information covering submissions received and processed between March 2015 and February 2016

**State party**Australia

**Case** ***M.G.C,* 1875/2009**

**Views adopted on** 26 March 2015

**Violation** Article 9

**Remedy** Effective and appropriate remedy, including compensation.

**No previous follow-up information.**

*Submission from:* State party

*Date of submission:* 2 October 2015 The State party does not share the Committee’s view that the detention of the author was arbitrary. It reiterates that it is entitled to take measures, including detention, to control the entry of non-citizens into its territory. Australian law provides for the detention of unlawful non-citizens at the end of a term of criminal custody, to ensure that a person who does not have a lawful basis to remain in Australia is available for removal. Australia considers that the author’s detention in this context is for a legitimate purpose. The length of his immigration detention is related to legal proceedings instituted by the author regarding the cancellation of his spouse visa and refusal of his Protection visa application. In respect of both visa claims, the author had access to the highest levels of review, including by way of applications to the High Court of Australia and for ministerial intervention. While litigation was ongoing, Australia did not proceed with the author’s removal and this had the effect of prolonging the period in which the author was detained.

The State party adds that the Committee reached its view on article 9(1) partially on the basis of its understanding that Australia did not make an individual assessment of the need to maintain the author in immigration detention. Australia claims that in fact, the author’s circumstances were considered for possible ministerial intervention under section 195A on three occasions and section 197AB of the Act on one occasion. Therefore, contrary to the view of the Committee, the author’s detention was reviewed on several occasions and in substantive terms. Consequently, his detention was in accordance with article 9(1) of the Covenant, and Australia does not accept the Committee’s views that it is obliged to provide the author with a remedy, nor conduct a review of its migration legislation.

 Committee’s assessment:

 (a) Effective remedy, including compensation: E

 (b) Publication of Views: No information

 (c) Non repetition: C2

 Committee’s decision: Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**State party**Australia

**Case** ***Leghaei,* 1937/2010**

**Views adopted on** 26 March 2015

**Violation** Article 17, read in conjunction with article 23, of the Covenant, with regard to the author and his family

**Remedy** Effective and appropriate remedy, including a meaningful opportunity to challenge the refusal to grant him a permanent visa; and compensation.

**No previous follow-up information.**

*Submission from:* State party

*Date of submission:* 26 October 2015

The State party disagrees with the Committee’s finding that the author’s rights under article 17, read in conjunction with article 23, were violated. Mr Leghaei was lawfully assessed as a direct risk to Australia’s national security. It is not clear why the Committee has not accepted this as a legitimate reason for any interference with the family. The risk assessment was carefully weighed against family interests and the best interest of the child by the Minister. Permanent visas were granted to the author’s wife and child, which supports the assertion that decisions were made with due consideration of the family’s circumstances,

Australia disagrees with the Committee’s finding that there was a lack of due process in the procedure leading to the author’s removal. Determining whether compelling reasons of national security arise is to be determined by the State, which is afforded a very wide discretion. The necessity of withholding the reasons for the adverse assessment against Dr Leghaei was reviewed by Australian courts, and the Federal Court determined that he was accorded procedural fairness to the extent that the interests of national security permitted, including by providing his counsel with access to evidence detailing the allegations against him.

As Australia does not agree with the Committee’s finding that a breach of the Covenant occurred, it does not consider it appropriate to implement the Committee’s recommendation.

 Committee’s assessment:

 (a) Effective remedy, including a meaningful opportunity to challenge the refusal to grant him a permanent visa, and compensation: E

 (b) Publication of Views: No information

 (c) Non repetition: C2

 Committee’s decision: Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**State party**Australia

**Case** ***Blessington and Elliot*, 1968/2010**

**Views adopted on** 22 October 2014

**Violation** Articles 7, 10, paragraph 3, and 24

**Remedy** Effective remedy, including compensation

**No previous follow-up information.**

*Submission from*: State party

*Date of submission*: 28 April 2015

The State party submits that the authors have at their disposal the following avenues for review of the detention of the authors and prospects of release: After serving at least 30 years of their sentences, they will be eligible to apply to the Supreme Court of New South Wales for the determination of a non-parole period of their sentences. If the Supreme Court declines to set a non-parole period, the authors may appeal to the Court of Criminal Appeal. Under s. 154A(3)(a) of the Crimes (Administration of sentences) Act 1999 (NSW), after considering an application, the State parole authority could only release the authors on parole if satisfied, on the basis of a report prepared by the Chief Executive Officer of Justice health, that the authors: are in imminent danger of dying, or are incapacitated to the extent that they no longer have the physical ability to do harm to any person; and they have demonstrated that they do not pose a risk to the community.

The State parole Authority must be satisfied that because of those circumstances, the making of such an order is justified. The Royal Prerogative of mercy remains an avenue for the authors to seek executive clemency.

 Committee’s assessment:

 (a) Effective remedy, including release under individually appropriate conditions for those authors still in detention, rehabilitation and appropriate compensation: C2

 (b) Publication of Views: No information

 (c) Non repetition: C2

 Committee’s decision: Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**State party**Australia

**Case** ***Griffiths,* 1973/2010**

**Views adopted on** 21 October 2014

**Violation** Articles 9(4)

**Remedy** Effective remedy, including adequate compensation, including compensation of the legal costs incurred by the author.

**No previous follow-up information**

*Submission from:* State party

*Date of submission:* 30 June 2015

Australia considers that the author’s detention under the *Extradition Act 1988* does not violate article 9(1) of the Covenant. His detention was reasonable and necessary in the circumstances, given the Minister’s obligation to provide procedural fairness to the author, and to seek the necessary information from overseas agencies to properly exercise his discretion under Australian law.

 (a) Effective remedy, including adequate compensation, including compensation of the legal costs incurred by the author: E

 (b) Publication of Views: No information

 (c) Non repetition: C2

**Committee’s decision:** follow-up dialogue ongoing

**State party**Bosnia and Herzegovina

**Case** ***Hamulic,* 2022/2011**

**Views adopted on** 30 March 2015

**Violation** Articles 6, 7 and 9, read in conjunction with article 2 (3), of the Covenant, with regard to Mr. Hamulić, and of article 7, read alone and in conjunction with article 2 (3), with regard to the authors

**Remedy:** Effective remedy, including (a) strengthening its investigations to establish the fate or whereabouts of Mr. Hamulić, as required by the Law on Missing Persons 2004, and having its investigators contact the authors as soon as possible to obtain information from them, so that they can contribute to the investigation; (b) strengthening its efforts to bring to justice those responsible for his disappearance, without unnecessary delay, as required by the national war crimes strategy; and (c) providing effective reparation to the authors, including adequate compensation and appropriate measures of satisfaction. The State party is also under an obligation to prevent similar violations in the future and must ensure, in particular, that investigations into allegations of enforced disappearance are accessible to the families of missing persons.

**No previous follow-up information.**

*Submission from*: State Party

*Date of submission*: 11 November 2015

There is currently no ongoing war crime investigations regarding Mr Hamulic’s matter and at present the State Party has no other information in their possession about prosecution of any individuals responsible for the enforced disappearance of Mr Hamulic. Further, the High Judicial and Prosecutorial Council of Bosnia and Herzegovina has no jurisdiction to exert influence on the implementation of the Views.

The Missing Persons Institute of BiH was not able to track Mr Hamulic, nor find his mortal remains. With regard to financial support for the family of Mr Hamulic, the Fund for Providing Assistance to Families of Missing Persons has not been established yet. However, despite no results being achieved, the views of the Committee are considered ‘highly important and binding.’

 Committee’s assessment:

(a) Strengthening its investigations: B2

 (b) Bring to justice those responsible: B2

 (c) Providing effective reparation: C1

 (d) Ensuring adequate compensation: C1

 (e) Publication of the Views: No information

 (f) Non repetition: No information

 Committee's decision: Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**State party**Cameroon

**Case** ***Engo,* 1397/2005**

**Views adopted on** 22 July 2009

**Violation** Article 9 (2) and (3), article 10 (1), and article 14, paragraphs (2) and (3) (a), (b), (c) and (d)

**Remedy:** An effective remedy leading to his immediate release and the provision of adequate ophthalmological treatment.

P**revious follow-up information: CCPR/C/112/3.**

*Submission from*: Author’s counsel.

*Date of submission*: 20 September 2015

The author’s Counsel submits that Cameroon failed to provide an effective remedy, or to release Mr. Engo from detention. The State party has not provided any reason for its contempt of the Committee’s Views. According to the author’s counsel, this requires appropriate financial compensation and orders bringing the state of impunity to an end.

 Committee’s decision: follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**State party**Canada

**Case** ***Hamida,* 1544/2007**

**Views adopted on** 18 March 2010

**Violation**  Articles 2 and 7

**Remedy** Effective remedy, including a full reconsideration of his expulsion order, taking into account the State party’s obligations under the Covenant.

**Previous follow-up information**: A/69/40 (110th session).[[1]](#footnote-2)

*Submission from*: author’s counsel

*Date of submission*: 30 October 2015

The author’s counsel submits that since the adoption of the Committee’s Views, Mr. Hamida’s rights to privacy and family life have not been respected. In June 2010, a Humanitarian and compassionate grounds application was filed, based on the author’s presence of his wife and children in Canada. A “pre-removal risk assessment” (PRRA) was also filed late 2010, which was rejected by the end of 2012, because of the alleged complicity of the author with the former Tunisian regime. On 18 October 2014, an appeal filed by the author against the PRRA decision was granted by the Federal Court, which ordered the case to be re-examined de novo by a PRRA agent. The decision remains pending. However, Mr Hamida was summoned by the Security and war crimes Unit of Canada’s Border Services Agency (CBSA), which informed him that he would be removed, regardless of his pending judicial review of the PRRA decision.

A stay of removal application was rejected on 21 October 2015. A further application was filed.

The author’s counsel stresses that Mr Hamida has been living in Canada for the past 16 years, where he works and has been married for 12 years; that he has not committed any crime, and that the decision to remove him is thus arbitrary and disproportionate.

*Submission from:* State party

*Date of submission:* 12 January 2016

The State party submits that the author’s removal would not contravene the Committee’s Views, adopted in 2010. Since then, the author had the opportunity to file several applications before administrative and judicial jurisdictions, which confirmed the legality of his deportation. In 2012, in the context of the author’s third PRRA application, it was determined that the latter did not face a risk of torture or persecution in Tunisia.

In 2012, in the context of his third « H&C » application, it was determined in a 17 page analysis, which took into account the author’s marriage to a Canadian citizen, as well as articles 17 and 23 of the ICCPR and the human rights situation in Tunisia, that the entry ban against Mr Hamida, on account of his complicity in crimes against humanity, outweighed humanitarian considerations.

In 2012, after leave to appeal was granted by the Federal Court, the author’s H&C application was returned for a new decision, based on a new Supreme Court jurisprudence, which modified the appraisal of complicity in the commission of crimes against humanity. The H&C decision remains pending.

Although he is in principle subject to immediate removal, the Canadian Border Services Agency (CBSA) has agreed to stay Mr Hamida’s removal until the H&C decision is adopted.

Since 2010, the author has presented numerous applications for stay of removal and judicial control of decisions. Accordingly, the State party contends that it has complied with the Committee’s request to proceed with a revision of the decision to expel him.

In addition, and notwithstanding the 2010 Views, the State party submits that since the “Jasmine revolution” and destitution of the Ben Ali government, the human rights situation has improved significantly, with the adoption of a new Constitution and a 2013 law contemplating the adoption of a national mechanism for the prevention of torture. More than ever therefore, the author’s allegation that he would face a risk of torture in Tunisia is not credible.

 Committee’s assessment:

 (a) Full reconsideration of his expulsion order: A

 (b) Publication of the Views: No information

 (c) Non-repetition: No information

 Committee’s decision: follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**State party** Colombia

**Case** ***Bonilla Lerma,* 1611/2007**

**Views adopted on** 26 July 2011

**Violation** Article 14 (1) of the Covenant

**Remedy** Effective remedy, including adequate compensation.

**Previous follow-up information:** CCPR/C/113/3.

*Submission from*: State party

*Date of submission*: 10 April 2015

The State submits that it is committed to implementing the Committee’s Views. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has received information from the Council of Ministers which is being analysed.

 Committee’s assessment:

 (a) Remedy: C1

 (b) Publication of the Views: No information

 (c) Non-repetition: C1

 Committee’s decision: follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**State party**Colombia

**Case** ***Guerra de la Espirella*, 1623/2007**

**Views adopted on** 18 March 2010

**Violation** Article 14

**Remedy:** Effective remedy, including appropriate compensation.

**No previous follow-up information**

*Submission from:* Author

*Date of submission:* 10 August 2015

The author submits that due to the state party refusal to provide him with an effective remedy and an appropriate compensation, and taking into account there was not any judicial mechanism available to implement the Committee’s Views, he lodged an action aiming at protecting his constitutional guarantees to due process, to effective judicial remedy, and to recognise the prevalence of international treaties. On 8 April 2011, the Jurisdictional Disciplinary Chamber of the Sectional Council of the Judiciary of Bogotá declared the action inadmissible. On second instance, on 22 June 2011, the Jurisdictional Disciplinary Chamber of the Superior Council of the Judiciary upheld the first decision. In 2014, the Constitutional Court confirmed the decision, stressing that such action was not the appropriate mechanism to implement international bodies’ decisions. The author concludes that Colombia has failed to meet its international obligations.

 Committee's decision: follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**State party**Denmark

**Case** ***Husseini****,* **2243/2013**

**Views adopted on** 24 October 2014

**Violation** Article 23, paragraph 1, read in conjunction with article 24

**Remedy:** Effective remedy by proceeding to a review of the decision to expel him with a permanent re-entry ban, taking into account the State party’s obligations under the Covenant.

 Previous follow-up information: CCPR/115/C/3.

*Submission from:* Author’s counsel

*Date of submission:* 5 August 2015

The author’s counsel recalls that the author was removed to Afghanistan on 14 June 2015, but that as the Afghan authorities refused to admit Mr Husseini, he was returned to Denmark on 15 June 2015.

The author was unsuccessful appealing the decision ordering his deportation and re-entry ban. His last attempt before the Immigration Board was rejected on 29 July 2015. Thus, he claims that he is denied State protection, and is the victim of a serious interference by Denmark of his and his children’s rights, in breach of articles 23(1) and 24. Although he is no longer detained, the author is unable to maintain a decent family life, being without permission to live in Denmark nor to work.

*Submission from*: State party

*Date of submission*: 12 January 2016

The State party considers that it has given full effect to the Committee’s Views by having brought the author’s case before Danish courts under s. 50 of the Aliens Act for the second time, thus providing him with an effective remedy by proceeding to a review of the decision to expel him with a permanent entry ban, which took into account the author’s new circumstances. The Committee’s Views were also taken into account in the orders adopted by the Copenhagen City Court and the High Court of Eastern Denmark, respectively adopted on 17 December 2014 and 3 February 2015. In this last decision, the High Court of Eastern Denmark determined that the author’s expulsion was not contrary to article 23(1), rea in conjunction with article 24 of the Covenant.

It follows from the decision adopted by the Refugee Appeals Board on 9 June 2015 that it is incumbent upon the author to leave Denmark, and that he may forcefully be returned to Afghanistan if he does not leave voluntarily. The fact that the Afghan authorities have not allowed him to enter Afghan territory does not change the fact that the author is legally compelled to leave Denmark.

On 7 February 2008, the Danish Immigration Service had determined that the author could reside in the Sandholm Reception Center. This decision still applies.

In its decision of 19 October 2015, the Ministry of Immigration, Integration and Housing ordered the author to report to the police every Tuesday and Thursday at 10 am. This measure was determined necessary and proportionate, to ensure the author’s presence until his actual deportation. In this decision, the Ministry took into account the fact that the author had stated to the police that he did not want to return voluntarily; and the fact that he had previously failed to observe residence and reporting requirements, and had gone in hiding. Except for the residence and reporting requirements, the author is free to spend his time freely. The author is staying in Denmark until he leaves Denmark voluntarily, or is forcibly removed.

Concerning the decision of the Danish Immigration Board of 29 July 2015 which rejected the author’s family reunification, the State party notes that the Committee’s decision is not concerned with such issue, bur is rather limited to the issue of whether the court’s decision to expel him as a consequence of the prison sentence imposed on him should be reviewed, considering his new family situation after the 2005 expulsion order.

The State party concludes that it has complied with the Committee’s decision.

 Committee’s assessment:[[2]](#footnote-3)

 (a) Effective remedy, including review of the decision to expel him with a permanent re-entry ban: A

 (b) Publication of Views: A

 (c) Non repetition: B1

 Committee’s decision: Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**State party**Kazakhstan

**Case** ***Toregozhina,*****2137/2012**

**Views adopted on** 17 March 2014

**Violation** Articles 9, 19 and 21

**Remedy** Effective remedy, including review of her conviction and to an adequate compensation, including reimbursement of the legal costs incurred.

**Previous follow-up information**: CCPR/C/115/3.

*Submission from*: Author

*Date of submission*: 16 November 2015

The author submits that the general prosecutor’s office is not taking any action on the author’s complaints, which she has filed seven times.

The police, with the support of the local government, continues to arrest and detain individuals participating in peaceful assemblies, while the town halls keep rejecting requests to hold meetings in public places.

The author also claims that there are no legal mechanisms to restore her rights. On 12 February 2015, the Special Inter-District Administrative Court rejected her complaint, on the ground that the new Code of Administrative Offences is only enforceable to cases under a procedural review initiated after 1 January 2015. The author further filed two complaints, on 20 January 2015 and 27 February 2015, to the District Court of Astana requesting the Ministry of Finance to compensate the administrative fines, legal costs and moral harm. Her complaints were rejected on the grounds that the Committee’s decisions and international covenants cannot be taken into consideration. Lastly, she filed a cassation appeal, which is pending.

**Committee´s decision**: Follow up dialogue ongoing.

**State party** Kyrgyzstan

**Case *Moidunov and Zhumabaeva,* 1756/2008**

**Views adopted on** 23 March 2011

**Violation** Articles 2(3), 6(1) and 7

**Remedy:** Effective remedy, which should include an impartial, effective and thorough, prosecution of those responsible and full reparation, including appropriate compensation.

**Previous follow-up information**: CCPR/C/112/C/3

*Note: While taking note with satisfaction of positive general measures aiming at preventing future violations,**the Committee decided at its 112th session to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of the Committee’s recommendation.*

*Submission from*: author’s counsel

*Date of submission*: 10 April 2015

The author’s counsel expresses concern over the Committee’s decision, during its 112th session, to suspend the dialogue in the case.

Following the Committee’s Views, a moral damage compensation claim was filed against the Government in March 2014. An initial district court decision rejected the claim; however, significantly, the Supreme Court overturned the decision in November 2014, on the basis that it violated material and procedural law. The claim is now back before the first instance court for further consideration on the merits. Given this decision, the author’s counsel is optimistic that compensation might be awarded in this case. Article 41(2) of the Kyrgyz Constitution expressly stipulates that the State must provide restoration and compensation for human rights violations. While this provision has never been tested in the past, it would set an important judicial precedent, and would also provide a number of additional advocacy opportunities. Support from the Committee through an active and ongoing follow-up process is therefore crucial, and suspending the dialogue at this stage removes an important form of oversight. The author’s counsel thus requests the Committee to resume active follow-up dialogue in the case.

**Committee’s decision:** Resume the follow-up dialogue in the case and inform both parties accordingly.

**State party**Kyrgyzstan

**Case** ***Krasnov,*****1402/2005**

**Views adopted on** 29 March 2011

**Violation** Articles 7; 9(2), and 14(1), and (3) (b) and (c)

**Remedy** Effective remedy, including a review of his conviction taking into account of the provisions of the Covenant, and appropriate compensation.

**Previous follow-up information**: A/66/40.

*Submission from*: Author

*Date of submission*: 29 March 2015

The author informs that her son has been granted asylum in the Russian Federation, and that she is trying to re-open the case with the support of the UN Human Rights Regional Office in Kyrgyzstan.

*Submission from*: State Party

*Date of submission*: 7 May 2015

The State Party recalls that Mr. Krasnov was sentenced to 10 years prison, a decision which was confirmed by the Supreme Court. As Supreme Court decisions are final and cannot be appealed.

On 18 September 2014 the author’s counsel filed an appeal under supervisory review to the Supreme Court on the grounds of the Committee’s decision of 29 March 2011. The State party notes that, based upon the Criminal Procedural Code, decisions of the Supreme Court can be re-adjudicated if the court violated rights and freedoms of the international covenants ratified by the State party. However, only the court has the right for the re-adjudication of the case under new circumstances.

On 20 August 2014 the Russian General Prosecutor’s Office informed the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Kyrgyzstan that Mr Krasnov was arrested on the Russian territory. On 12 September 2014, the Prosecutor’s office of Bishkek requested Mr Krasnov’s extradition. Meanwhile, the latter was freed and given temporary asylum for one year on 15 January 2015 by the Prosecutor’s office of Samara.

 Committee’s assessment:

 (a) Review of the author’s conviction, and compensation: C2

 (b) Publication of the Views: No information

 (c) Non-repetition: B1

*Submission from*: Author

*Date of submission*: 25 November 2015

The author informs the Committee that on 26 October 2015, the Supreme Court of Kyrgyzstan re-considered the author’s complaint, challenging the decision of the Supreme Court of Kyrgyzstan. The Court rejected the appeal, stating that the Committee’s views on violation of article 2 (3) of the Covenant by Kyrgyzstan are not sufficient grounds to reopen the criminal investigation of the case since the Committee did not identify the specific circumstances of the violation of Mr Krasnov’s rights and freedoms.

**Committee’s decision:** follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**State party**Lithuania

**Case** ***Paksas*, 2155/2012**

**Violation** Article 25 paragraphs (b) and (c).

**Remedy:** Effective remedy, including revision of the lifelong prohibition of the author’s right to be a candidate in presidential elections or to be a prime minister or minister. Additionally, the State party is under the obligation to take steps to avoid similar violations in the future.

**Previous follow-up information:** CCPR/C/113/2.[[3]](#footnote-4)

*Submission from*: Counsel

*Date of submission*: 15 November 2015

The author’s counsel informs the Committee that the State Party has taken no effective steps to implement the Committee’s Views, for lack of political will. This is because Mr. Paksas remains a political figure with a high support of the Lithuanian population, and that implementing the Views of the Committee would mean his return to the post of head of State. The author’s counsel suggests the suspension of Lithuania’s voting rights to elect Members of the Human Rights Committee.

**Committee’s decision:** follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**State party**Nepal

**Case** ***Basnet****,* **2051/2011**

**Views adopted on** 29 October 2014

**Violation:** Articles2(3); 7; 9 and 10

**Remedy:** Effective remedy, including by: (a) conducting a thorough and effective investigation into the facts and prosecuting, trying and punishing those responsible for the violations committed; (b) providing the authors with detailed information about the results of this investigation; (c) providing adequate compensation to the authors for the violations suffered; ensuring that the necessary and adequate psychological rehabilitation and medical treatment is provided to the authors; and (e) providing appropriate measures of satisfaction.

**No previous follow-up information**.

*Submission from*: State Party

*Date of submission*: 13 May 2015

The State Party informs the Committee that once a recommendation is received from the Commission constituted under the Act on Commission on Investigation of Disappeared Persons, Truth and Reconciliation 2014, the Government shall take legal action against those involved. Further, the State Party informs the Committee that Mr Basnet’s family will receive 100 000 Nepalese Rupees as interim relief and that they will ensure that the family is protected from acts of reprisals or intimidation. Finally, the State Party states that the views of the Committee will be translated into Nepalese and the views will be disseminated accordingly.

 Committee’s assessment

 (a) Thorough investigation: C1

 (b) Prosecution and punishment of those responsible: C1

 (c) Adequate compensation: C1

 (d) Appropriate measures of satisfaction: C1

 (e) Publication of the Views: B2

 (f) Non-repetition: C1

*Submission from*: Author’s counsel

*Date of submission*: 8 October 2015 The State Party has failed to implement the Committee’s views and despite repeated attempts and correspondence, the Views have still not been translated into Nepalese.

In relation to the investigation into the detention and torture of Mr Basnet, the authors have not been informed about the status of the investigations. In relation to efforts to prosecute those responsible, no steps have been taken. In relation to compensation, to date, none has been granted. Similarly, none of the authors have received adequate psychological rehabilitation and medical treatment.

In relation to the amendment of criminal domestic legislation on Enforced Disappearance and torture, this has not occurred.

**Committee’s decision:** follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**State party**Nepal

**Case** ***Katwal,* 2000/2010**

**Views adopted on** 1 April 2015

**Violation** Articles 2(3),6, 7, 9 and 16.

**Remedy** Effective remedy, including by: (a) conducting a thorough and effective investigation, with a view to locating the remains of Mr. Katwal and returning them to his family; (b) prosecuting, trying and punishing those responsible and making the results of such measures public; and (c) providing effective reparation, including adequate compensation and appropriate measures of satisfaction.

*Submission from*: State party

*Date of submission*: 04 August 2015

On 06 July 2015 the Government of Nepal decided to take legal action against those involved in the enforced disappearance and murder of Mr Chakra Katwal. Mr Katwal’s family have received three hundred thousand Nepalese Rupees as an interim relief. Due the Committee’s views concerning the insufficiency of the interim relief, the Government of Nepal is providing an additional one hundred thousand Nepalese Rupees to the family. The Government further indicates that the Katwal family is entitled to receive compensation, restitution, reparation and other benefits and that the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Ministry of Defence are working to establish a mechanism for the protection of Mr Katwal’s family from acts of reprisal and to control the recurrence of similar incidents in the future.

 Committee’s assessment

 (a) Thorough investigation: C1

 (b) Prosecution and punishment of those responsible: C1

 (c) Adequate compensation: B2

 (d) Appropriate measures of satisfaction: C1

 (e) Publication of the Views: No information

 (f) Non-repetition: C1

*Submission from*: Counsel

*Date of submission*: 8 October 2015

The level of implementation of the Committee’s views ‘remains almost inexistent’. This is despite the author’s representatives and daughters trying to meet with relevant Ministers and exchanging correspondence. This demonstrates ‘a general unwillingness of the State Party to facilitate the implementation of the Views and to collaborate with the authors of the communication.’ In relation to the translation of the views of the Committee into Nepalese, this still has not occurred. In relation to an investigation into the arbitrary detention, torture and enforced disappearance of the author, the author’s counsel states that no measures have been taken. In relation to measures taken to locate, exhume and identify the remains of the author, no measures have been taken. In relation to measures to prosecute, try and sanction those responsible, no steps have been taken by the Attorney General in bringing the perpetrators of the crimes to justice. The author has not received any compensation for ‘serious material and moral harm suffered.’

No steps have been taken in relation to adequate measures of satisfaction in the form of a public ceremony where Nepalese authorities would recognise their international responsibility and issue apologies to the author. Furthermore, the author has not received any information about steps taken to criminalise enforced disappearance in Nepal.

**Committee’s decision**: follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**State party**Nepal

**Case** ***Chaulagain,* 2018/2010**

**Views adopted on** 28 October 2014

**Violations** Articles 2(3), 6, 7, 9 and 10

**Remedy** Effective remedy, which includes an effective and complete investigation of the facts, the prosecution and punishment of the perpetrators, full reparation and appropriate measures of satisfaction

**No previous follow-up information.**

*Submission from*: State Party

*Date of submission*: 5 June 2015

The State Party informs the Committee that they will take legal action against those persons involved in the offence. Further, the family of Mr Chaulagain has already received 300 000 Nepalese Rupees as an interim relief measure and the family is further entitled to receive compensation, restitution, reparation and other benefits on the recommendation of the Commission constituted under the Act on Commission on Investigation of Disappeared Persons, Truth and Reconciliation, 2014. Further, the State Party is working to establish a mechanism for the protection from acts of reprisals or intimidation to control the recurrence of similar incidents in the future.

 Committee’s assessment

 (a) Thorough investigation: C1

 (b) Prosecution and punishment of those responsible: C1

 (c) Adequate compensation: B2

 (d) Appropriate measures of satisfaction: C1

 (e) Publication of the Views: No information

 (f) Non-repetition: C1

*Submission from*: Counsel

*Date of submission*: 6 November 2015

Since the publication of the Views, the author has not received any correspondence or contact from the State Party in relation to the steps it plans to take. The investigation of this matter through the Truth and Reconciliation Commission is inadequate because they would be ‘unable to provide an adequate remedy in respect of the violations alleged’ and as such the State Party should create a specialised team of police investigators and prosecutors to complete a criminal investigation. The author’s family has not received adequate reparation. The family has been given NPR 300 000, which is not tantamount to the pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage suffered. The family has also not been offered a formal apology or offered other appropriate measures of satisfaction. The Government should contact the family of Mr Chaulagain and obtain an estimate from them regarding pecuniary damage and non-pecuniary damages incurred and to offer appropriate measures of satisfaction. Lastly, the State Party must take actions to avoid similar violations in the future, including amending the TRC Act and acceding to the Rome Statute.

**Committee’s decision:** follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**State party**Nepal

**Case** ***Kumar*, 2031/2011**

**Views adopted on** 29 October 2014

**Violation** Articles 2(3), 6, 7, 9 and 16

**Remedy** Effective remedy, including by: (a) conducting a thorough and effective investigation; (b) locating the remains of Mr. Bhandari and handing them over to his family; (c) prosecuting, trying and punishing those responsible; (d) providing adequate compensation to the author; and (e) ensuring the necessary and adequate psychological rehabilitation and medical treatment.

**No previous follow-up information**

*Submission from*: Author’s counsel

*Date of submission*: 9 November 2015

The State Party is yet to take any significant steps to implement the Committee’s Views. Despite countless efforts to engage in the implementation process, no concrete action has occurred.

The State Party continues to refer the matter to the Transitional Justice Mechanism, which is contrary to the views of the Human Rights Committee and appears to have a merely dilatory intent. The State Party’s ‘recurrent referral’ to this mechanism is an attempt to indefinitely postpone implementation. Further, according to Trial, the transitional justice mechanisms are not fully operational yet.

The State party has not translated the Views, despite the author’s attempts to contact both the Ministry of Law and Justice and the Ministry of Peace and Reconstruction. The State Party has also failed to criminalise enforced disappearance under Nepalese legislation and to provide psychological rehabilitation to the author.

**Committee’s decision:** follow-up dialogue ongoing. Send a reminder to the State party (observations overdue since 11 May 2015).

**State party**Nepal

**Case** ***Tripathi* *et al*., 2111/2011**

**Views adopted on** 29 October 2014

**Violation Articles** 2(3), 6, 7, 9 and 16

**Remedy** Effective remedy, including by: (a) conducting a thorough and effective investigation; (b) releasing him if still alive; (c) in the event that Mr Gyanendra Tripathi is deceased, handing over his remains to his family; (d) prosecuting, trying and punishing those responsible for the violations committed; (e) providing adequate compensation; (f) ensuring the necessary and adequate psychological rehabilitation and medical treatment; and (g) providing appropriate measures of satisfaction.

*Submission from*: State Party

*Date of submission*: 19 March 2015

The State Party informs the Committee that once facts, evidences and recommendations are received from the Commission constituted under the Act on Commission on Investigation of Disappeared Persons, Truth and Reconciliation, the perpetrators will be brought to justice. Further, the family of Mr Tripathi has received 300 000 Nepalese Rupees as interim relief and they will be entitled to receive compensation, reparation and rehabilitation as well as free health care for Mr Tripathi’s wife and daughter. The Ministry of Home Affairs and Ministry of Defence shall ensure that family members are protected from acts of reprisals. The Office of the Prime Minister and Council of Ministers is initiating steps to draft a law to criminalise the acts of the enforced disappearance. The Ministry of Peace and Reconstruction will translate into the views of the Committee into Nepalese.

 Committee’s assessment

 (a) Thorough investigation: C1

 (b) Prosecution and punishment of those responsible: C1

 (c) Adequate compensation: B2

 (d) Rehabilitation and medical treatment: No information

 (e) Appropriate measures of satisfaction: C1

 (f) Publication of the Views: No information

 (g) Non-repetition: C1

*Submission from*: Author’s counsel

*Date of submission*: 8 October 2015 The Views of the Committee have not been translated into the local language or disseminated.

In relation to an investigation into the arbitrary detention, torture and enforced disappearance of the author, and despite many letters being sent to various authorities, the authors have not received a reply and have not been informed about the status of the investigation. In relation to measures taken to locate, exhume and return Mr Tripathi’s remains, the State Party has not taken any meaningful steps to ensure Mr Tripathi’s whereabouts are established. In relation to efforts to prosecute those responsible, the Attorney General has demonstrated a lack of cooperation in bringing this to effect. No compensation has been granted. The State Party has equally failed to provide adequate psychological rehabilitation and medical treatment to the authors. In relation to adequate measures of satisfaction in the form of a public ceremony, this has not occurred. Finally, the author has not received any information about steps taken to criminalise enforced disappearance in Nepal.

**Committee’s decision:** follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**State party** The Netherlands

**Case *Timmer***, **2097/2011**

**Views adopted on** 17 March 2014

 24 July 2014

**Violation** Article 14, paragraph 5

**Remedy:** An effective remedy which will allow a review of the author’s conviction and sentence by a higher tribunal, or implementation of other appropriate measures capable of removing the adverse effects caused to the author, together with adequate compensation. The Committee also considers that the State party should bring the relevant legal framework into conformity with the requirements of article 14, paragraph 5, of the Covenant

**Previous follow-up information**: CCPR/C/115/3.

*Submission from*: author’s counsel

*Date of submission*: 13 March 2015

Despite information submitted by the State party, [[4]](#footnote-5) for the time being the system of leave to appeal remains. By February 2015, the parliamentary procedure had not started. Accordingly, the Views have yet to be implemented.

*Submission from*: State party

*Date of submission:* 2 April 2015

The State party submits that in addition to the general measures already detailed,the Government will ensure that: 1) the fine paid by the author is reimbursed to him; 2) legal cost and expenses related to the application and leave to appeal proceedings are also reimbursed; and 3) the offence which was the subject-matter of the communication is struck off his criminal record.

 Committee’s assessment:

1. Review of the author’s conviction and sentence by a higher tribunal or other measures: A
2. Compensation: B1

 (b) Bring the relevant legal framework into conformity with the requirements of article 14, paragraph 5: B1

 (c) Publication of the Views: No information

 (d) Non-repetition: B1

**Committee's decision:** Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**State party**Paraguay

**Case** ***Domínguez,* 1828/**2008

**Views adopted on** 22 March 2012

**Violation** Articles 2(3) and 6 (1)

**Remedy:** Effective remedy, which includes an effective and complete investigation of the facts, the prosecution and punishment of those guilty and full reparation, including appropriate compensation.

**Previous follow-up information**: A/69/40

*Submission from:* Authors’ counsel.

*Date of submission*: 7 August 2015

The author’s counsel submits that in June 2012 they initiated a dialogue with the State in order to get to an agreement on the appropriate remedies’ and its implementation. Although exchanges on different settlement drafts took place, communication with the State party has been sporadic and protracted. The main obstacles to a settlement are those in relation to the impunity remedies, as the State has hindered progress of administrative investigations in police and military headquarters and also refused to reopen penal investigations.

It is regrettable that more than three years after the adoption of the Committee’s Views, the parties have not managed to reach a settlement yet.

**Committee’s decision**: follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**State party**Paraguay

**Case *Benitez Gamarra,* 1829/2008**

**Views adopted on** 22 March 2012

**Violation** Articles 2(3) and 7

**Remedy:** Effective remedy which should, as an alternative to what has been undertaken so far, include an impartial, effective and thorough investigation of the facts, the prosecution and punishment of those responsible and full reparation, including appropriate compensation.

**Previous follow-up information**: A/69/40

*Submission from*: Author’s counsel

*Date of submission*: 2 September 2015

A dialogue was initiated with a view to reaching a settlement with the State party. The State party has hindered progress in administrative investigations within police and military headquarters and also refused to reopen penal investigations. Mr. Benítez Gamarra refuses to sign any settlement if the impunity remedies are not guaranteed.

**Committee’s decision:** follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**State party**Philippines

**Case *Wilson****,* **868/1999**

**Views adopted on** 30 October 2003

**Violation**  Articles 7, 9 and 10

**Remedy:** An effective remedy. In respect of the violations of article 9 the State party should compensate the author. Compensation due to the author should take due account both of the seriousness of the violations and the damage to the author caused. The State party must undertake a comprehensive and impartial investigation of the issues raised in the course of the author's detention, and to draw the appropriate penal and disciplinary consequences for the individuals found responsible. As to the imposition of immigration fees and visa exclusion, the State party should refund to the author the moneys claimed from him. All monetary compensation thus due to the author by the State party should be made available for payment to the author at the venue of his choice, be it within the State party's territory or abroad.

**Previous follow-up information**: A/61/40

*Submission from*: Author’s counsel

*Date of submission*: 9 October 2015

The author’s counsel recalls that the State party has failed to give effect to the Views, and that the Committee deemed the Philippines’ response to be unsatisfactory.[[5]](#footnote-6)

In 2009, the author’s counsel filed a petition in the Supreme Court, seeking a mandamus against the Government that it takes steps to pay and give reparation in an amount sufficient to compensate him for the torture and abuse suffered. The case has made no progress in the Supreme Court, despite an application in 2012 for it to be heard. The victim’s physical and mental health is being adversely affected and his suffering is exacerbated as a result of the non-implementation of any effective remedy.

The author’s counsel recently secured an updated medical legal report by an expert, which includes evidence on how the delay in achieving any tangible justice has negatively impacted on his well-being.

Although they recognize that it may be a rare or novel matter for the Committee to engage directly in domestic legal proceedings, the author’s counsel request the intervention of the Special Rapporteur on follow-up to Views, by means of an expert letter or report, urging the Supreme Court to set down the matter down for a hearing, and setting out the Committee’s position on the obligation to comply with Views, as articulated in General Comment No. 2.

Submission from: State party

Date of submission: 11 February 2016

The State party views the proposal of the author’s counsel to use the office of the Rapporteur for follow-up to Views in domestic judicial proceedings as an interference in the State’s internal affairs. The State party recalls that it has responded to the Views as early as May 2005, with a reply expressing a disinclination to accept the Committee’s findings of fact, particularly its assessment of evidence on the case of Mr. Wilson.

Compensation is available to the author or his counsel and is ready to be collected by the author or his representative in the Philippines. .

The State party requests the Rapporteur for follow-up to Views to inform the author that he may secure his compensation from the Philippines Department of Justice Claims Board personally, or through his authorized representative.

 Committee’s assessment:

1. Effective remedy, including compensation and a comprehensive and impartial investigation: B2
2. Publication of the Views: No information
3. Non-repetition: No information

**Committee’s decision**: During the 116th session, the Special Rapporteur for follow-up to Views has met the Permanent Mission of the Philippines to discuss progress in implementation of all outstanding cases against the Philippines, including *Wilson*.

**Committee’s decision:** follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**State party** Philippines

**Case** ***Rouse,* 1089/2002**

**Views adopted on** 25 July 2005

**Violation** Articles 14 (1) and (3) (c) and (e); 7; and 9(1)

**Remedy:** Effective remedy, including adequate compensation, inter alia, for the time of the author’s detention and imprisonment.

**Previous follow-up information**: A/69/40

*Submission from*: State party

*Date of submission*: 23 March 2015

The State party informs the Committee that on 23 January 2015, the Board of Pardons and Parole of the Department of Justice recommended to the President of the Philippines the grant of Absolute Pardon in favour of Leon Rouse, on the ground of the expiration of the maximum sentence imposed against him.

 Committee’s assessment:

 (a) Effective remedy, including adequate compensation: C1

 (b) Publication of Views: No information

 (c) Non repetition: No information

**Committee’s decision**: Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**State party**Republic of Korea

**Case** ***Jong-nam Kim et al****.,* **1786/2008**

**Views adopted on** 25 October 2012

**Violation** Article 18, paragraph 1.

**Remedy:** Effective remedy, including expunging their criminal records and providing them with adequate compensation. The State party is under an obligation to avoid similar violations of the Covenant in the future, which includes the adoption of legislative measures guaranteeing the right to conscientious objection.

**Previous follow-up information:** A/69/40

*Submission* *from*: Authors’ counsel

*Date of submission*: 5 October 2015

The authors’ counsel submits that the State party has refused to implement the Committee’s Views, and that conscientious objectors continue to be punished by prison sentences of one year and six months.

**Committee’s decision:** follow-up ongoing

**State party**Republic of Korea

**Case** ***X.*, 1908/2009**

**Views adopted on** 25 March 2014

**Violation:** Articles 6(1) and 7

**Remedy:** Effective remedy, including a full reconsideration of the author’s claim. The State party should not deport the author to any third country likely to deport him to Iran.

**Previous follow-up information:** CCPR/C/113/2[[6]](#footnote-7)

*Submission from*: author’s counsel

*Date of submission*: 14 November 2015

The author’s counsel notes that even though the Committee’s Views were published, the State party has yet to inform law enforcement officials, in particular immigration authorities, of the Views.

While the author was recognized as a refugee, which makes it possible for him to stay in Korea, he has not been provided compensation for his prolonged arbitrary detention, although the author’s counsel recognises the fact that the Committee did not address the merits of this part of the claim (for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies on this count). The author wishes to receive apologies for his prolonged detention, which resulted in mental illness and suffering.

The authors counsel also seeks general measures, including a time limit for immigration detention, as well as judicial review.

**Committee’s decision:** Close the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of satisfactory implementation of the Committee’s decision.

**State party****Republic of Korea**

**Case** ***Young-kwan Kim et al*., 2179/2012**

**Views adopted on** 15 October 2014

**Violation** Articles 9 (1) and 18 (1).

**Remedy:** Effective remedy, including expunging their criminal records and providing them with adequate compensation. The State party is under an obligation to avoid similar violations of the Covenant in the future, which includes the adoption of legislative measures guaranteeing the right to conscientious objection.

**No previous follow-up information**

*Submission* *from*: State party.

*Date of submission*: 18 August 2015

The State party submits that the Government published the Committee’s Views in its Official Gazette on 30 July 2015. Regarding the requirement to expunge the authors’ criminal records, the State party notes that although the relevant column on the convict list shall be deleted and the convict plate shall be discarded, criminal records materials are, however, kept and managed in accordance with the *Act on the Lapse of Criminal Sentences*. As to compensation, the State party points out that under the existing legal system, it is not conceivable to recognize the legal grounds for providing compensation or reparation to those who are found guilty by the courts. The State party submits that the government maintain its discreet stance over introducing alternative services for conscientious objectors that will have substantial impact on the military manpower resources, considering the state of national security. Nevertheless, the consideration of introduction of possible alternative services is included in the Second National Action Plan for Human Rights 2012-2016.

 Committee’s assessment:

 (a) Expunging the authors’ criminal records and adequate compensation: C1

 (b) Publication of the Committee’s Views: A

 (c) Legislative measures (non-repetition): B2

**State party** Russian Federation

**Case *Dorofeev,* 2041/2011**

**Views adopted on** 11 July 2014

**Violation** Articles 2(3), 14 (3) (d)

**Remedy** Effective remedy, including adequate compensation.

**No previous follow-up information.**

*Submission from*: Author

*Date of submission*: 11 May 2015

The author complains that he has not received any compensation. On 31 March 2015, he filed a claim before the General Prosecutor’s Office, with a request to institute new cassation proceedings with respect to the violation of his right under article 14 (3) (d) determined by the Committee. On 13 April 2015 the General Prosecutor’s office rejected his claim, on the grounds that the Committee did not explicitly suggest re-instituting the cassation proceedings. Therefore, the author asks the Committee to impress upon the State party to allow new cassation proceedings.

**Committee’s decision**: follow-up dialogue ongoing. A reminder was sent to the State party for its observations on 15 December 2015.

**State party**Spain

**Case** ***Aarrass*, 2008/2010**

**Views adopted on** 21 July 2014

**Violation** Article 7

**Remedy:** Effective remedy, including by (i) providing adequate compensation; and (ii) taking all possible steps to cooperate with the Moroccan authorities in order to ensure effective oversight of the author’s treatment in Morocco.

**Previous follow-up information**: CCPR/C/115/R3

*Submission from*: Author’s counsel

*Date* *of* *submission*: 30 March and 11 October 2015

Since the author’s extradition to Morocco, his counsels have repeatedly informed and alerted the Moroccan authorities about the treatment inflicted to the victim, the lack of due process in the criminal procedure against him, the lack of investigation about his torture allegations, bad conditions of detention, health problems, and threats and pressure he experienced during his detention.

Raising these elements were aimed at establishing the illegality of Mr Aarrass’ conviction. Yet no appropriate measure ensued, and the victim was convicted to 12 years imprisonment. Although he filed cassation proceedings within the statutory deadline, his appeal has not been heard two years after it was filed. As a consequence, the victim is unable to request his transfer to Belgium, as the Moroccan conviction is not definitive yet.

To protest against the ill-treatment and intimidation suffered, Mr. Aarrass started a hunger strike on 10 July 2013. On 26 July 2013, he was no longer able to walk, and his counsels requested the assistance of the Belgian Minister of foreign affairs. Amnesty International issued an urgent appeal in the victim’s favour on 29 July 2013.

On 19 May 2014, the Committee against torture adopted a decision finding a violation of several provisions of the Convention against torture vis a vis the victim. The Moroccan authorities then opened an investigation into the treatment suffered by Mr Aarrass in detention.

On 9 September 2014, the Court of Appeal of Brussels, seized in urgent procedure (“référé urgence”), ordered the Belgian authorities to request Morocco to allow the Belgian consular authorities to visit Mr Aarrass on a weekly basis in prison.

On 22 September 2014, the Belgian authorities formally transmitted such request. No reply was received despite several reminders.

Mr Aarrass was medically examined on 6 November 2014 after a medical expertise was ordered by the Moroccan authorities. He had lost 6 kg.

The author’s counsel commends the publication of the Views by the Spanish authorities; it recalls, however, that the victim’s extradition could, and should have been refused, in light of the serious risk of torture alleged.

The author’s counsel is dismayed with the assertion by Spain that the Committee’s Views cannot be directly implemented, and that it is incumbent upon the victim to file an application to obtain compensation. The victim is physically weak and vulnerable from the fact of his detention; financially speaking, he also cannot afford to engage in judicial procedures. According to the author’s counsel, Spain’s position represents an unreasonable and disproportionate obstacle to the victim’s compensation, and is incompatible with its obligation to execute in good faith its international obligations stemming from the Committee’s Views.

The meetings described by Spain, which it held with the Moroccan authorities, do not qualify as effective follow-up by Spain. The State party only relied on a statement from Morocco on the supposed good health condition of the victim. It should have met with the victim, or at least his counsels to obtain first hand, objective information on his condition. Spain has merely relied on the information provided by Morocco, and this cannot be qualified as effective follow-up and implementation.

In addition, although the Spanish Government had informed the author’s counsel that it was thinking of the best way to implement the Views, it had never informed them (like it did with the Committee), of the procedure which had to be followed to obtain compensation, resulting in undue delays.

Mr Aarrass continues to complaint from harassment, reprisals and various forms of intimidation in jail. He recently stressed that the sustained visits from the Spanish consular authorities are of vital importance to prevent further abuse. The author’s counsel requests the Committee to impress upon the Spanish authorities to: visit the victim regularly to ensure his well-being and decent conditions of detention until his release; request the support of the Moroccan authorities to ensure the victim’s mental and physical health; seek all medical data from the Moroccan detention authorities to remain informed of his condition; visit the victim with a Spanish doctor with experience in forensic examination of torture victims, and to report to the State party and the victim; to seek information on the progress in the cassation proceedings filed in Morocco in 2012 against his conviction and imprisonment, and concerning the investigation for torture allegations.

By the end of September 2015, despite his weak health condition, the victim was searched violently in his cell, for which he filed a formal complaint on 5 October 2015, which remained unanswered. His cassation application also remains pending.

After 72 days, the author stopped his hunger strike. He is in critical health condition.

The request from Belgium to visit him has not been answered. As for the investigation into his torture allegation, the author’s counsel learnt that it had been filed, but could not obtain de decision.

**Committee's decision:** Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**State party** Ukraine

**Case**: ***Pustovoit,* 1405/2005**

**Views adopted on** 20 March 2014

**Violation**  Articles 7 and 14 (3) (b),

**Remedy** Effective remedy, including compensation, and to introduce the necessary modifications to its laws and practice

No previous follow-up information.

*Submission from*: the Author

*Date of submission*: 25 August 2015

The author submits that the State failed to provide the author with an effective remedy and pay compensation. His requests for legal aid were also ignored. The author has filed complaints on state’s inaction to several judicial instances: On 16 December 2014 with the Supreme Court, which rejected his application on formalistic grounds; and in March 2015 before the Court of Appeal of Khmelnitsk, with no more success. The author further filed a cassation appeal before the high specialized court, which also rejected his claim without consideration; On 14 July 2015, he filed again a further complaint to the Supreme Court, which has not given his judgment yet.

The author further submits that documents establishing hat he was tortured and kept in a solitary confinement in the Khmelnitsk detention facility were never given to him, despite his request from prosecutor’s office. The author seeks the Committee’s assistance to obtain compensation. He also informs that he has sought material assistance from the United Nations Fund on Victims of Torture, in order to buy stationery and file complaints.

**Committee’s decision:** follow-up dialogue ongoing. On 15 December 2015, a reminder was sent to the State party for its follow-up observations.

**State party** Uruguay

**Case** ***Torres Rodriguez,* 1765/2008**

**Views adopted on** 24 October 2011

**Violation** Articles 2 and 26 of the Covenant

**Remedy:** State party must recognize that reparation is due to the authors, including appropriate compensation for the losses suffered.

**Previous follow-up information**: A/69/40

*Submission from*: Author.

*Date of submission*: 30 March 2015

The author submits that, more than three years after the adoption of the Committee’s Views, the State party has not adopted any measure to repair the damage caused by the implementation of the contested Law.

**Committee's decision:** follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**State party**Uzbekistan

**Case** ***Musaev,* 1914-1915-1916/2009**

**Views adopted on** 21 March 2012

**Violation** Articles 7; 9 and 14(3) (b), (g) and (5)

**Remedy:** Effective remedy, including impartial, effective and thorough investigation and initiating criminal proceedings against those responsible; his retrial in conformity with all guarantees enshrined in the Covenant or his release; provide the victim with full reparation, including appropriate compensation.

**Previous follow-up information**: CCPR/C/115/3.

*Submission from*: State party

*Date of submission*: 15 May 2015

The State party informs that contrary to the author’s unverified assertions, the measures applied against her son are within the scope of permissible punishment regulations. Mr Musaev did not abide by all the prison rules and regulations, and a total of 16 disciplinary sanctions were adopted against him.

*Submission from*: Author

*Date of submission*: 3 October 2015

The author submits that her son is kept under strong psychological pressure by the police officers. The mailing correspondence was also stopped for the past three months and, as a consequence, she is without information on his current condition, and fears he might get killed by order of the State party. The author requests assistance in speeding up the case as her son has gone through torture, and been imprisoned for 10 years.

**Committee’s assessment (from 113th session):**

1. Investigation: C1
2. Retrial or release; and full reparation: C2
3. Publication of the Views: No information

Non-repetition: C1

**Committee's decision:** Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

2. **Meetings on follow-up on Views with States parties’ representatives**

During the 116th session, the Special Rapporteur for follow-up to Views has met with representatives of Libya, the Philippines, and Sri Lanka to discuss implementation of the Committee’s Views.

 Annex

*[English only]*

1. The table below displays a complete picture of follow-up replies from States parties received up to the 116th session (7-31 March 2016), in relation to Views where the Committee concluded to a violation of the Covenant. It indicates whether follow-up replies are or have been considered as satisfactory or unsatisfactory, in terms of their compliance with the Committee’s Views, or whether the dialogue between the State party and the Special Rapporteur for follow-up on Views continues.

2. As of its 109th session, the Committee, in an effort to have its assessment on follow-up to Views issues disclosed in a more comprehensive, structured and transparent manner, decided to include an indication of its current assessment of the follow-up status in cases where submissions were received from the parties during the reporting period (. Decisions to have the follow-up dialogue closed or suspended are also indicated in the table below.

3. Follow-up information provided by States parties and by petitioners or their representatives subsequent to the previous interim report on follow-up to Views (CCPR/C/115/3) is published in the present report. Reports on follow-up to Views are no longer part of the Committee’s Annual reports, but will be periodically prepared by the Rapporteur for follow-up on Views, adopted by the Committee during its October and March sessions, and published on OHCHR website.

| *State party and number of cases with violation* | *Communication number, author and relevant Committee report* | *Follow-up response received from State party* |  |  | *No response* | *Follow-up dialogue ongoing* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Algeria (39) | 992/2001, *Bousroual*A/61/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1085/2002, *Taright*A/61/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1172/2003, *Madani*A/62/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1173/2003, *Benhadj*A/62/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1196/2003, *Boucherf*A/61/40 |  |  |  | XA/64/40 | X |
|  | 1297/2004, *Medjnoune* A/61/40 |  |  |  | XA/67/40 | X |
|  | 1327/2004, *Grioua*A/62/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1328/2004, *Kimouche*A/62/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
| 1439/2005, *Aber*A/62/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1495/2006, *Madoui*A/64/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1588/2007, *Benaziza*A/65/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1753/2008, *Rakik*A/68/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1779/2008, *Mezine*A/68/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1780/2008, *Aouabdia et al.*A/66/40 | XA/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1781/2008, *Berzig*A/67/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1791/2008, *Sahbi*A/68/401796/2008, *Zerrougui*  A/69/401798/2008, *Azouz* A/69/40  |  |  |  | Not due yetNot due yet | XXX |
|  | 1806/2008, *Saadoun*A/68/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1807/2008, *Mechani*A/68/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1811/2008, *Djebbar and Chihoub*A/67/401831/2008, *Larbi* A/69/401874/2009, *Mihoubi*  A/69/401884/2009, *Faraoun* A/69/401889/2009, *Marouf*A/69/401899/2009, *Lakhdar-Chaouch*A/69/401900/2009, *Mehalli*A/69/40 |  |  |  | Not due yetNot due yet | XXXXXXX  |
|  | 1905/2009, *Ouaghlissi*A/67/40CCPR/C/111/D/1924/2010, *Boudehane*CCPR/C/111/D/1931/2010, *Bouzenia*CCPR/C/111/D/1964/2010, *Fedsi*CCPR/C/111/D/1974/2010, *Bouzaout*CCPR/C/112/D/2026/2011, *Sassene*CCPR/C/112/D/2083/2011, *Kroumi*CCPR/C/112/D/2086/2011, *Ayache*CCPR/C/112/D/2098/2011, *Ammari*CCPR/C/112/D/2117/2011, *Louddi*CCPR/C/112/D/2132/2012, *Kerouane*CCPR/C/116/2297/2013,*Chani* |  |  |  | Not due yet | XX |
| Angola (2) | 711/1996, *Dias* A/55/40 | XA/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1128/2002, *Marques*A/60/40 | XA/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Argentina (4) | 400/1990, *Mónaco de Gallichio*A/50/40 | XA/51/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1458/2006, *González et al*.A/66/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1608/2007, *L.M.R.*A/66/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1610/2007, *L.N.P.*A/66/40Follow-up dialogue closed, with a note of a satisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/69/40) | XA/68/40 |  |  |  |  |
| Australia (33)  | 560/1993, *A.* A/52/40 | XA/53/40, A/55/40, A/56/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 900/1999, *C*.A/58/40 | XA/58/40, CCPR/C/80/FU/1, A/60/40, A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 930/2000, *Winata et al.*A/56/40 | XCCPR/C/80/FU/1, A/57/40, A/60/40 A/62/40 and A/63/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 941/2000, *Young*A/58/40 | XA/58/40, A/60/40, A/62/40 and A/63/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1014/2001, *Baban et al*.A/58/40 | XA/60/40, A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1020/2001, *Cabal and Pasini*A/58/40 | XA/58/40, CCPR/C/80/FU/1 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |
|  | 1036/2001, *Faure* A/61/40 | XA/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1050/2002, *Rafie and Safdel*A/61/40 | XA/62/40 and A/63/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1069/2002, *Bakhitiyari*A/59/40 | XA/60/40, A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Australia (*cont’d*) | 1157/2003, *Coleman*A/61/40 | XA/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1184/2003, *Brough*A/61/40 | XA/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1255, 1256, 1259, 1260, 1266,1268, 1270 and 1288/2004,*Shams*, *Atvan*, *Shahrooei*,*Saadat*, *Ramezani*, *Boostani*,*Behrooz* and *Sefed*A/62/40 | XA/63/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1324/2004, *Shafiq*A/62/40 | XA/62/40 and A/63/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1347/2005, *Dudko*A/62/40 | XA/63/40, A/64/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1442/2005, *Kwok*A/65/40 Follow-up dialogue closed, with a note of a satisfactory implementation of the recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI). | X A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1629/2007, *Fardon*A/65/40Follow-up dialogue closed, with a note of unsatisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/69/40)  | XA/66/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  | A/68/40 |
|  | 1557/2007, *Nystrom et al.*A/66/40Follow-up dialogue closed, with a note of unsatisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/68/40) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1635/2007, *Tillman*A/65/40Follow-up dialogue closed, with a note of unsatisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/69/40)1885/2009, *Horvath*A/69/40 CCPR/C/112/D/1968/2010, *Blessington and Elliot*CCPR/C/112/D/1973/2010, *Griffiths*2094/2011, *Abdul Gafoor, Faleel Khan et al.* A/69/40CCPR/C/115/2005/2010, *Hicks*2136/2012, *Mofis, Mohammad Mufis et al.* A/69/40 | XA/66/40, A/67/40 |  |  | Not due yet | A/68/40XXX  X |
|  | CCPR/C/116/2229/2013, *Nasir* |  |  |  | Not due yet | X |
|  | CCPR/C/116/2233/2013, *Javadi*CCPR/C/115/2279/2013, *Zoltowski et al.* |  |  |  | Not due yetNot due yet X  | X |
| Austria (5) | 415/1990, *Pauger*A/57/40 | XA/47/40, A/52/40, A/66/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 716/1996, *Pauger*A/54/40 | XA/54/40, A/55/40, A/57/40, A/66/40, CCPR/C/80/FU/1 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1952 |
|  | 965/2001, *Karakurt*A/57/40 | XA/58/40, CCPR/C/80/FU/1, A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1454/2006, *Lederbauer*A/62/40 | XA/63/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Azerbaijan (2) | 1633/2007, *Avadanov*A/66/40CCPR/C/112/D/1972/2010, *Quliyev* |  |  |  | X | XA/68/40 |
| Belarus (85) | 780/1997, *Laptsevich*A/55/40 |  |  |  | XA/56/40, A/57/40 | X |
|  | 814/1998, *Pastukhov*A/58/40 |  |  |  | XA/59/40 | X |
|  | 886/1999, *Bondarenko*A/58/40Case closed (92nd session) | XA/59/40, A/62/40 and A/63/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 887/1999, *Lyashkevich*A/58/40Case closed (92nd session) | XA/59/40, A/62/40 and A/63/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 921/2000, *Dergachev*A/57/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 927/2000, *Svetik*A/59/40 | XA/60/40, A/61/40 and A/62/40 |  |  | X | XA/62/40 |
|  | 1009/2001, *Shchetko*A/61/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1022/2001, *Velichkin*A/61/40 |  |  |  | XA/61/40 | X |
| Belarus (*cont’d*) | 1039/2001, *Boris et al*.A/62/40 | XA/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1047/2002, *Sinitsin*, *Leonid*A/62/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1100/2002, *Bandazhewsky*A/61/40 | XA/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1178/2003, *Smantser*A/64/40 | XA/65/40 |  |  |   | X |
|  | 1207/2003, *Malakhovsky*A/60/401226/2003, *Korneenko*A/68/40 | XA/61/40 |  |  | X | XXA/68/40 |
|  | 1274/2004, *Korneenko*A/62/40 | XA/62/40 |  |  |  | XA/62/40 |
|  | 1296/2004, *Belyatsky*A/62/40 | XA/63/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1311/2004, *Osiyuk*A/64/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1316/2004, *Gryb*A/67/40 |  |  |  | X | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1354/2005, *Sudalenko*A/66/40 | X |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1377/2005, *Katsora*A/65/40 | X |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1383/2005, *Katsora et al*.A/66/40 | X |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1390/2005, *Koreba*A/66/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1392/2005, *Lukyanchik* A/65/40 | XA/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1502/2006, *Marinich*A/65/40 | XA/66/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1553/2007, *Korneenko* *and Milinkevich* A/64/401592/2007, *Pichugina*A/69/40  | X A/65/40 |  |  |  X | XX |
| Belarus (*cont’d*) | 1604/2007, *Zalesskaya*A/66/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1750/2008, *Sudalenko*A/67/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1772/2008, *Belyazeka*A/67/40CCPR/C/112/D/1773/2008, *Kozulina*1784/2008, *Schumilin*A/68/40 |  |  |  | XXX | XXA/68/40 |
|  | 1785/2008, *Oleshkevish*A/68/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1787/2008, *Kovsh (Abramova)*A/68/401790/2008, *Govsha et al.*A/68/40 |  |  |  | XX | XXA/68/40 |
|  | 1820/2008, *Krassovskaya*A/67/401808/2008, *Kovalenko*A/69/401830/2008, *Pivonos*A/68/40 | X |  |  | XX | * X

A/68/40XXA/68/40 |
|  | 1835-1837/2008, *Yasinovich*A/68/401836/2008, *Katsora*A/68/40 |  |  |  | XX | XXA/68/40 |
|  | 1838/2008, *Tulzhenkova*A/67/401839/2008, *Komarovsky*A/69/401851/2008, *Sekerko* A/69/401864/2009, *Kirsanov* A/69/401867/2009, 1936, 1975, 1977-1891/2010**,** 2010/2010, *Levinov*A/68/40CCPR/C/114/D/1902/2009, *Bakur*1903/2009, *Youbko*A/69/40CCPR/C/112/D/1906/2009, *Yuzepchuk* 1910/2009, *Zhuk* A/69/401919-1920/2009, *Protsko & Tolchin* A/69/40 CCPR/C/112/D/1929/2010, *Lozenko*CCPR/C/112/D/1933/2010,*Aleksandrov*CCPR/C/111/D/1934/2010, *Bazarov*1948/2010, *Turchenyak* A/69/40 CCPR/C/114/1950/2010, *Timoshenko*CCPR/C/112/D/1952/2010, *Symonik*CCPR/C/114/1969/2010, *Surgan*CCPR/C/111/D/1976/2010, *Kuznetsov et al.*CCPR/C/114/1982/2010, *Mikhalchenko*CCPR/C/114/1984/2010, *Pugach*CCPR/C/111/D/1985/2010, *Koktish*CCPR/C/111/D/1986/2010, *Kozlov*CCPR/C/112/D/1987/2010, *Stambrovsky*CCPR/C/114/1988/2010, *Evrezov* CCPR/C/111/D/1991/2010, *Volchek*CCPR/C/111/D/1993/2010, *Mikhailovskaya and Volchek*CCPR/C/115/1996/2010, *Kruk*CCPR/C/112/D/1999/2010, *Evrezov, Nepomnyaschikh, Polyakov, and Rybchenko*CCPR/C/115/2011/2010, *Romanovsky*CCPR/C/115/2016//2010,*Sudalenko*CCPR/C/114/2017/2010, *Burdyko*CCPR/C/115/2019//2010,*Poplavny*CCPR/C/112/D/2029/2011, *Praded*CCPR/C/111/D/2030/2010, *Poliakov*CCPR/C/114/2036/2011, *Yusupova*2065/2011, *Kvasha*A/68/40CCPR/C/115/2076/2011, *Derzhavtsev* CCPR/C/116/2092/2011, *Androsenko*CCPR/C/111/D/2103/2010, *Poliakyov*CCPR/C/112/D/2114/2011, *Sudalenko*2120/2011, *Kovalev*A/68/40 CCPR/C/115/2133/2012, *Statkevich and Matskevich*CCPR/C/115/2141/2012, *Kostenko*CCPR/C/112/D/2153/2012, *Kalyakin*CCPR/C/112/D/2156/2012, *Nepomnyaschikh*CCPR/C/112/D/2165/2012, *Pinchuk*CCPR/C/115/2289/2013, *Selyun* |  |  |  | XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXNot due yetXXNot due yetNot due yet Not due yetNot due yetNot due yetNot due yetNot due yet Not due yetNot due yetNot due yet | XXXXX* A/6840

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX |
| Belgium (1)Benin (1) | 1472/2006, *Sayadi*A/64/40CCPR/C/111/D/2055/2011,*Zinsou* |  |  |  | X | X |
| Bolivia (PlurinationalState of) (1) | 176/1984, *Peñarrieta*A/43/40 | XA/52/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina (10)Bulgaria (1) | 1917-1918-1925/2008, *Prutina et al.*A/68/401955/2010, *Al-Gertani* A/69/40CCPR/C/111/D/1956/2010, *Duric*CCPR/C/112/D/1966/2010, *Hero*CCPR/C/112/D/1970/2010, *Kožljak*1997/2010, *Rizvanović et al* A/69/40CCPR/C/111/D/2003/2010, *Selimovic* 2048/2011, *Kadiric et al.*CCPR/C/115/2064//2011, *Mandic et al.* CCPR/C/114/2143/2012, *Dovadzija et al,*2073/2011, *Naidenova et al.* | X CCPR/C/118/3 |  |  | XXX | XXXXXXXX |
| Burkina Faso (1) | 1159/2003, *Sankara et al.*A/61/40Follow-up dialogue closed with a note of satisfactory implementation of the Committee’s recommendation (A/63/40) | XA/63/40 |  |  |  |  |
| Cameroon (8)  | 458/1991, *Mukong*A/49/40 |  |  |  | XA/52/40 | X |
|  | 630/1995, *Mazou*The State party reported that it had reinstated the author to the judiciary, and that it had offered him compensation, which he refused to accept because he considered it to be inadequate. The follow-up dialogue in the case was closed as the Committee deemed that the State party complied with the Views (A/59/40). | XA/57/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1134/2002, *Gorji-Dinka*A/60/40 | X A/65/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1186/2003, *Titiahongo*A/63/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1353/2005, *Afuson*A/62/40 | XA/65/40 |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1397/2005, *Engo*A/64/40 | XA/67/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1813/2008, *Akwanga*A/66/40CCPR/C/112/D/1965/2010, *Monika* |  |  |  | X | XA/68/40 |
| Canada (14) | 27/1978, *Pinkney*Fourteenth sessionSelected Decisions, vol. 1 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 167/1984, *Ominayak et al*.A/45/50 | XA/59/40, A/61/40, A/62/40 |  |  |  | XA/62/40 |
|  |  |
| Canada (*cont’d*) | 694/1996, *Waldman*A/55/40 | XA/55/40, A/56/40, A/57/40, A/59/40, A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 829/1998, *Judge*A/58/40 | XA/59/40, A/60/40 |  |  |  | XA/60/40 |
|  |  |
|  | 1051/2002, *Ahani*A/59/40 | XA/60/40, A/61/40 |  |  |  | X\*A/60/40 |
|  | \**Note*: The State party went some way to implementing the Views: the Committee has not specifically said implementation is satisfactory. |
|  | 1465/2006, *Kaba*A/65/40 | XA/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1467/2006, *Dumont*A/65/40Follow-up dialogue closed, with a note of a satisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/69/40) | XA/66/40, A/67/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1544/2007, *Hamida*A/65/40 | XA/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1763/2008, *Pillai et al*.Follow-up dialogue closed, with a note of a satisfactory implementation of the recommendation (see A/68/40)  | XA/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1792/2008 *Dauphin*A/64/401881/2009, *Masih* A/69/401898/2009, *Choudhary* A/69/40 1912/2009, *Thuraisamy* A/68/40 | XA/65/40Not dueNot due |  |  |  | XXXX |
|  | 1959/2010, *Warsame*A/66/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
| Central African Republic (1)  | 1587/2007 *Mamour*A/64/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
| Colombia (17)  | 45/1979, *Suárez de Guerrero*Fifteenth sessionSelected Decisions, vol. 1 | XA/52/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  |  |
| Colombia (*cont’d*) | 46/1979, *Fals Borda* Sixteenth sessionSelected Decisions, vol. 1 | XA/52/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  |  |
|  | 64/1979, *Salgar de Montejo*Fifteenth sessionSelected Decisions, vol. 1 | XA/52/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | X(A/68/40) |
|  |  |
|  | 161/1983, *Herrera Rubio* Thirty-first sessionSelected Decisions, vol. 2 | XA/52/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  |  |
|  | 181/1984, *Sanjuán Arévalo* *brothers*A/45/40 | X, A/52/40, A/64/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  |  |
|  | 195/1985, *Delgado Páez*A/45/40 | XA/52/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  |  |
|  | 514/1992, *Fei*A/50/40 | XA/51/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  |  |
|  | 612/1995, *Arhuacos*A/52/40 | XA/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 687/1996, *Rojas García*A/56/40 | XA/58/40, A/59/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 778/1997, *Coronel et al*.A/58/40 | XA/59/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 848/1999, *Rodríguez Orejuela*,A/57/40 | XA/58/40, A/59/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 859/1999, *Jiménez Vaca*A/57/40 | XA/58/40, A/59/40, A/61/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1298/2004, *Becerra*A/61/40 | XA/62/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1361/2005, *Casadiego*A/62/40 | XA/63/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1611/2007, *Bonilla Lerma*A/66/40 | X |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1641/2007, *Calderón Bruges*A/67/40CCPR/C/114/2134/2012, *Molina et al*. | XA/68/40 |  |  | X | XA/68/40X |
| Côte d’Ivoire (1) | 1759/2008, *Traoré*A/67/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
| Croatia (2) | 727/1996, *Paraga*A/56/40 | XA/56/40, A/58/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1510/2006, *Vojnović*, A/64/40 | XA/65/40, A/66/40  |  |  |  |  |
| Czech Republic (27)\* | \**Note*: For all of these property cases, see also follow-up to concluding observations for the State party’s reply in A/59/40. |
| 516/1992, *Simunek et al.*A/50/40 | XA/51/40, A/57/40, A/58/40, A/61/40, A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  |
|  | 586/1994, *Adam*A/51/40 | XA/51/40, A/53/40, A/54/40, A/57/40, A/61/40, A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Czech Republic (*cont’d*) | 747/1997, *Des Fours Walderode*A/57/40 | XA/57/40, A/58/40, A/61/40, A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 757/1997, *Pezoldova*A/58/40 | XA/60/40, A/61/40 andA/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 765/1997, *Fábryová*A/57/40 | XA/57/40, A/58/40, A/61/40, A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 823/1998, *Czernin*A/60/40 | XA/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 857/1999, *Blazek et al*.A/56/40 | XA/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 945/2000, *Marik*A/60/40 | XA/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 946/2000, *Patera*A/57/40 | XA/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1054/2002, *Kriz*A/61/40 | XA/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1445/2006, *Polacek*A/62/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1448/2006, *Kohoutek*A/63/40 | XA/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1463/2006, *Gratzinger*A/63/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1479/2006, *Persan*A/64/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1484/2006, *Lnenicka*A/63/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1485/2006, *Vlcek*A/63/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1488/2006, *Süsser*A/63/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
| Czech Republic (*cont’d*) | 1491/2006, *Fürst Blücher von Wahlstatt*A/65/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1497/2006, *Preiss*A/63/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1508/2006, *Amundson*A/64/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1586/2007, *Lange*A/66/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1533/2006, *Ondracka*A/63/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1563/2007, *Jünglingová*A/67/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1581/2007, *Drda*A/66/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1615/2007, *Zavrel*A/65/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1742/2007, *Gschwind*A/65/40  |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1847/2008, *Klain and Klain* A/67/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo (16)\* | \**Note*: See A/59/40 for details of follow-up consultations. |
| 16/1977, *Mbenge*Eighteenth sessionSelected Decisions, vol. 2 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 90/1981, *Luyeye*Nineteenth sessionSelected Decisions, vol. 2 |  |  |  | XA/61/40 | X |
|  | 124/1982, *Muteba*Twenty-second sessionSelected Decisions, vol. 2 |  |  |  | XA/61/40 | X |
|  | 138/1983, *Mpandanjila et al.*Twenty-seventh sessionSelected Decisions, vol. 2 |  |  |  | XA/61/40 | X |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo (*cont’d*) | 157/1983, *Mpaka Nsusu*Twenty-seventh sessionSelected Decisions, vol. 2 |  |  |  | XA/61/40 | X |
|  | 194/1985, *Miango*Thirty-first sessionSelected Decisions, vol. 2 |  |  |  | XA/61/40 | X |
|  | 241/1987, *Birindwa*A/45/40 |  |  |  | XA/61/40 | X |
|  | 242/1987, *Tshisekedi*A/45/40 |  |  |  | XA/61/40 | X |
|  | 366/1989, *Kanana*A/49/40 |  |  |  | XA/61/40 | X |
|  | 542/1993, *Tshishimbi*A/51/40 |  |  |  | XA/61/40 | X |
|  | 641/1995, *Gedumbe*A/57/40 |  |  |  | XA/61/40 | XA/68/40 |
|  | 933/2000, *Mundyo Busyo et* *al.*(68 judges)A/58/40 |  |  |  | XA/61/40 | X |
|  | 962/2001, *Mulezi*A/59/40 |  |  |  | XA/61/40 | X |
|  | 1177/2003, *Wenga and Shandwe*A/61/401890/2009, *Kitenge*A/69/40 |  |  |  | X | XX |
|  | CCPR/C/115/2214/2012, *Lumbala* |  |  |  | X | X |
| Denmark (11) | 1554/2007, *El-Hichou*A/65/40CCPR/C/113/D/2001/2010, *Qader*2007/2010, *J.J.M.*A/69/40Follow-up dialogue closed at the 115th session, with a note of satisfactory implementation of the Committee’s recommendationCCPR/C/112/D/2243/2013*Husseini*CCPR/C/115/2258/2013, *Rasappu et al.*CCPR/C/114/2288/2013,*Omo-Amenaghawon et al.*CCPR/C/114/2343/2014, *H.E.A.K.*,CCPR/C/114/2360/2014, *Jasin*CCPR/C/114/2370/2014,*A.H.*CCPR/C/114/2389/2014,*X.* | XA/66/40XXXXX |  |  | XX | XXXXXXX |
|  | CCPR/C/116/2409/2014, *Ali et al.* |  |  |  | Not due yet | X |
| Dominican Republic (2) | 193/1985, *Giry*A/45/40 | XA/52/40, A/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 449/1991, *Mojica*A/49/40 | XA/52/40, A/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Ecuador (3) | 277/1988, *Terán Jijón*A/47/40 | XA/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  |  |
| Ecuador (*cont’d*) | 319/1988, *Cañón García*A/47/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | CCPR/C/116/2244/2013, *Dassum* |  |  |  | Not due yet | X |
| Estonia (1) | CCPR/C/115/2040/2011, *Zeynalov* |  |  |  | X | X |
| Equatorial Guinea (3) | 414/1990, *Primo Essono*A/49/40 | A/62/40\* |  |  | X | X |
|  | 468/1991, *Oló Bahamonde*A/49/40 | A/62/40\* |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1152 and 1190/2003, *Ndong et al*. and *Mic Abogo*A/61/40 | A/62/40\* |  |  | X | X |
|  | \* The State party has not replied in writing, but it has met several times with the Special Rapporteur. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finland (1) | 779/1997, *Äärelä et al*.A/57/40 | XA/57/40, A/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
| France (6) | 1620/2007, *J.O.*A/66/40 | XA/67/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1760/2008, *Cochet*A/66/401852/2008, *Singh*A/68/40 |  |  |  | X | XA/68/40X |
|  | 1876/2009, *Singh*A/66/401928/2010, *Singh* A/69/401960/2010, *Ory*A/69/40 | XA/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40XX |
| Georgia (3) | 626/1995, *Gelbekhiani*A/53/40 | X A/54/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 627/1995, *Dokvadze*A/53/40 | XA/54/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 975/2001, *Ratiani*A/60/40 | XA/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Germany (1)Ghana (1)  | 1482/2006, *Gerlach*A/63/40 2177/2012*, Johnson*A/69/40 | XA/64/40 |  |  |  | XX |
| Greece (4)  | 1070/2002, *Kouldis*A/61/40 | XA/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1486/2006, *Kalamiotis*A/63/401558/2007, *Katsaris*A/68/40 | X A/64/40XA/68/40 |  |  |  | XX |
| Greece (*cont’d*) | 1799/2008, *Georgopoulos et al.*A/65/40 | XA/66/40, A/67/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
| Guyana (9) | 676/1996, *Yasseen and Thomas*A/53/40 | A/60/40\*A/62/40 |  |  | XA/60/40 | X |
|  | 728/1996, *Sahadeo*A/57/40 | A/60/40\*A/62/40 |  |  | XA/60/40 | X |
|  | 811/1998, *Mulai*, A/59/40 | A/60/40\*A/62/40 |  |  | XA/60/40 | X |
|  | 812/1998, *Persaud*A/61/40 | A/60/40\*A/62/40 |  |  | X | X |
|  | 862/1999, *Hussain and Hussain*A/61/40 | A/60/40\*A/62/40 |  |  | X | X |
|  | 838/1998, *Hendriks*A/58/40 | A/60/40\*A/62/40 |  |  | XA/60/40 | X |
|  | 867/1999, *Smartt*A/59/40 | A/60/40\*A/62/40 |  |  | XA/60/40 | X |
|  | 912/2000, *Ganga*A/60/40 | A/60/40\*A/62/40 |  |  | XA/60/40 | X |
|  | 913/2000, *Chan*A/61/40 | A/60/40\*A/62/40 |  |  | X | X |
|  | \* The State party has not replied in writing, but it has met several times with the Special Rapporteur. |
| Hungary (3) | 410/1990, *Párkányi*A/47/40 | X |  |  |  | X |
|  |  |
|  | 521/1992, *Kulomin*A/51/40 | XA/52/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 852/1999, *Borisenko*A/58/40 | XA/58/40, A/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Iceland (1)  | 1306/2004, *Haraldsson and Sveinsson*, A/62/40Follow-up dialogue closed, with a partly satisfactory implementation of the recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI). | XA/63/40, A/64/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
| Ireland (1) | CCPR/C/116/2324/2013, *Mellet* |  |  |  | Not due yet | X |
| Italy (1)  | 699/1996, *Maleki*A/54/40 | XA/55/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Jamaica (98)  | 92 cases\* |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | \**Note*: See A/59/40. Twenty-five detailed replies were received, of which 19 indicated that the State party would not implement the Committee’s recommendations; in 2, it promises to investigate; in 1, it announces the author’s release (592/1994—Clive Johnson—see A/54/40). There were 36 general replies indicating that death sentences have been commuted. No follow-up replies in 31 cases. |
|  | 695/1996, *Simpson*A/57/40 | XA/57/40, A/58/40, A/59/40, A/63/40, A/64/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 792/1998, *Higginson*A/57/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 793/1998, *Pryce*A/59/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 796/1998, *Reece*A/58/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 797/1998, *Lobban*A/59/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 798/1998, *Howell*A/59/40 | XA/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Kazakhstan (7)  | CCPR/C/111/D/2009/2010*Ilyasov*2024/2011, *Israil*A/67/402104/2011, *Valetov*A/69/40CCPR/C/116/2129/2012, *Esergepov*CCPR/C/112/D/2131/2012,*Leven*CCPR/C/112/D/2137/2012,*Toregozhina*CCPR/C/115/2304/2013, *Dzhakishev* |  |  |  | XNot due yetNot due yet | XXXX |
| Kyrgyzstan (16) | 1275/2004, *Umetaliev and Tashtanbekova*A/64/40 | XA/65/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1312/2004, *Latifulin*A/65/40 | XA/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1338/2005, *Kaldarov*A/65/40 | XA/66/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1369/2005, *Kulov*A/65/40 | XA/66/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1402/2005, *Krasnov* A/66/40 | XA/66/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Kyrgyzstan (*cont’d*) | 1461, 1462, 1476 and 1477/2006, *Maksudov*, *Rakhimov*, *Tashbaev*,*Pirmatov*A/63/40 | XA/65/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1470/2006, *Toktakunov*A/66/40Follow-up dialogue closed with a satisfactory implementation of the recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI). | XA/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1503/2006, *Akhadov*A/66/40 | XA/67/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1545/2007, *Gunan*A/66/40 | XA/67/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1547/2007, *Torobekov*A/67/40 | X |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1756/2008, *Moidunov and Zhumbaeva*A/66/40CCPR/C/115/2052/2011, *Akmatov*CCPR/C/116/2231/2012, *Askarov* | XA/67/40, A/68/40 |  |  | Not due yetNot due yet | XA/68/40XX |
| Latvia (2) | 884/1999, *Ignatane*A/56/40  | XA/57/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1621/2007, *Raihman*A/66/40 |  |  |  | X | XA/68/40 |
| Libya (20) | 440/1990, *El-Megreisi*A/49/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1107/2002, *El Ghar*A/60/40 | XA/61/40, A/62/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1143/2002, *Dernawi*A/62/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  |  |  |  |  | X | X |
|  |  |  |  |  | X | X |
|  |   |  |  |  | X | X |
| Libya (*cont’d*) | 1295/2004, *El Awani*A/62/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1422/2005, *El Hassy*A/63/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1640/2007, *El Abani*A/65/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1751/2008, *Aboussedra* *et al.*A/66/401755/2008, *El Hagog Jumaa*A/67/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1776/2008, *Ali Bashasha and Hussein Bashasha*1782/2008, *Aboufaied*A/67/40A/66/401804/2008, *Il Khwildy*A/68/401805/2008, *Benali*A/68/401832/2008, *Al Khazmi* A/69/40CCPR/C/111/D/1860/2009,*Al Rabassi*1880/2009, *Nenova et al.*A/67/40CCPR/C/111/D/1882/2009,*Al Daquel* |  |  |  | X | XXXX |
| Lithuania (1) | 1913/2009, *Abushala*A/68/40CCPR/C/111/D/1958/2010,*El Hojouj et al.*CCPR/C/112/D/2046/2011,*Hmeed*2006/2010, *Almegaryaf and Matar* A/69/402155/2012, *Paksas* A/69/40 |  |  |  |  | XXX |
| Madagascar (4)  | 49/1979, *Marais*Eighteenth sessionSelected Decisions, vol. 2 |  |  |  | X\* | X |
|  | \**Note*: According to the annual report (A/52/40), the author indicated that he had been released. No further information provided. |
|  | 115/1982, *Wight*Twenty-fourth sessionSelected Decisions, vol. 2 |  |  |  | X\* | X |
|  | \**Note*: According to the annual report (A/52/40), the author indicated that he had been released. No further information provided. |
|  | 132/1982, *Jaona*Twenty-fourth sessionSelected Decisions, vol. 2 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 155/1983, *Hammel*A/42/40 Selected Decisions, vol. 2 |  |  |  | X | X |
| Mauritius (1) | 1744/2007, *Narrain et al.*A/68/40 | XA/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
| Nepal (11) | 1469/2006, *Sharma*A/64/40 | XA/64/40, A/66/40, A/67/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1761/2008, *Giri et al.*A/66/401863/2009, *Maharjan*A/68/401865/2009, *Sedhai* A/69/40 | XA/67/40 |  |  |  | XXX |
|  | 1870/2009, *Sobhraj* A/65/40CCPR/C/112/D/2018/2010*Chaulagain*CCPR/C/112/D/2031/2011*Bhandari*CCPR/C/114/2038/2011, *Tharu et al.*CCPR/C/112/D/2051/2011*Basnet*CCPR/C/115/2077/2011, *A.S.*CCPR/C/112/D/2111/2011*Tripathi et al.* | XA/66/40, A/67/40, A/68/40XX |  |  |  | XA/68/40XX |
| Netherlands (6) | 786/1997, *Vos*A/54/40 | XA/55/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 976/2001, *Derksen*A/59/40 | XA/60/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1238/2003, *Jongenburger Veerman*A/61/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1564/2007, *X.H.L.*A/66/40 | XA/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1797/2008, *Mennen*A/65/40CCPR/C/111/D/2097/2011 *Timmer* | X |  |  | X | XX |
| New Zealand (2) | 1368/2005, *Britton*A/62/40 | XA/63/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1512/2006, *Dean*A/64/40 | XA/65/40 |  |  | X | X |
| Nicaragua (1)  | 328/1988, *Zelaya Blanco*A/49/40 | X A/56/40, A/57/40, A/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Norway (2) | 1155/2003, *Leirvag*A/60/40 | XA/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | \**Note*: Additional follow-up information expected. |
|  | 1542/2007, *Aboushanif*A/63/40Follow-up dialogue closed, with a note of a satisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/69/40)  | XA/65/40 |  |  |  |  |
| Panama (2) | 289/1988, *Wolf*A/47/40 | XA/53/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 473/1991, *Barroso*A/50/40 | XA/53/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Paraguay (3)  | 1407/2005, *Asensi* A/64/40 | XA/65/40, A/66/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1828/2008, *Domínguez*A/67/40 | XA/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1829/2008, *Benítez Gamarra*A/67/40 | XA/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
| Peru (15)  | 202/1986, *Ato del Avellanal*A/44/40 | XA/52/40, A/59/40, A/62/40 and A/63/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
| Peru (*cont’d*) | 203/1986, *Muñoz Hermosa*A/44/40Follow-up dialogue closed, with a note of unsatisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/69/40) | XA/52/40, A/59/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | A/68/40 |
|  | 263/1987, *González del Río*A/48/40 | XA/52/40, A/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 309/1988, *Orihuela Valenzuela*A/48/40 | XA/52/40, A/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 540/1993, *Celis Laureano*A/51/40 | XA/59/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 577/1994, *Polay Campos*A/53/40 | XA/53/40, A/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 678/1996, *Gutiérrez Vivanco*A/57/40 | XA/58/40, A/59/40, A/64/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 688/1996, *Arredondo*A/68/40 | XA/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 906/1999, *Vargas-Machuca*A/57/40 |  |  |  | XA/58/40, A/59/40 | X |
|  | 981/2001, *Gómez Casafranca*A/58/40 | XA/59/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1058/2002, *Vargas*A/61/40 | XA/61/40 and A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1125/2002, *Quispe*A/61/40 | XA/61/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1126/2002, *Carranza*A/61/40 | XA/61/40, A/62/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1153/2003, *K.N.L.H.*A/61/40 | XA/61/40, A/62/40 and A/63/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1457/2006, *Poma* *Poma*A/64/40 | XA/65/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
| Philippines (11)  | 788/1997, *Cagas*A/57/40 | XA/59/40, A/60/40, A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 868/1999, *Wilson*A/59/40 | XA/60/40, A/61/40, A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 869/1999, *Piandiong et al*.A/56/40 | XN/A |  |  |  | X |
| Philippines (*cont’d*) | 1089/2002, *Rouse*A/60/40 |  |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1320/2004, *Pimentel et al*.A/62/40The Committee decided to suspend the follow up dialogue, with a finding of a non-satisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI). | XA/63/40, A/64/40, A/66/40, A/67/40 |  |  |   |  |
|  | 1421/2005, *Larrañaga*A/61/40 | X |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1466/2006, *Lumanog and Santos*A/63/40 | XA/65/40, A/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1559/2007, *Hernandez*A/65/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1560/2007, *Marcellana and Gumanoy*, A/64/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1619/2007, *Pestaño* A/65/40 | XA/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1815/2008, *Adonis*A/67/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
| Portugal (1) | 1123/2002, *Correia de Matos*A/61/40 | XA/62/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
| Republic of Korea (12) | 518/1992, *Sohn*A/50/40 | XA/60/40, A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 574/1994, *Kim*A/54/40 | XA/60/40, A/62/40, A/64/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 628/1995, *Park*A/54/40 | XA/54/40, A/64/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 878/1999, *Kang*A/58/40 | XA/59/40, A/64/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 926/2000, *Shin*A/59/40 | XA/60/40, A/62/40, A/64/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1119/2002, *Lee*A/60/40 | XA/61/40, A/64/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Republic of Korea (*cont’d*) | 1321 and 1322/2004, *Yoon*,*Yeo-Bzum and* *Choi*,*Myung-Jin*A/62/40 | XA/62/40 and A/63/40A/64/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1593 to 1603/2007, *Jung et al*.A/65/40 | XA/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1642-1741/2007, *Jeong et al*.A/66/401786/2008, *Kim et al.*A/68/401908/2009, *Ostavari* A/69/40 Case closed at the 116th sessionwith a finding of satisfactory implementation of the Committee’s recommendationCCPR/C/112/D/2179/2012,*Young-kwan Kim et al*. | XA/67/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40X |
| Romania (1) | 1158/2003, *Blaga*A/60/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
| Russian Federation (29) | 712/1996, *Smirnova*A/59/40 | XA/60/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 763/1997, *Lantsov*A/57/40 | A/58/40, A/60/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 770/1997, *Gridin*A/55/40 | A/57/40, A/60/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 888/1999, *Telitsin*A/59/40 | XA/60/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 815/1997, *Dugin*A/59/40 | XA/60/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 889/1999, *Zheikov*A/61/40 | XA/62/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1218/2003, *Platanov*A/61/40 | XA/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1232/2003, *Pustovalov*A/65/40 | XA/66/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1278/2004, *Reshnetnikov*A/64/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1304/2004, *Khoroshenko*A/66/40 |  |  |  | X | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1310/2004, *Babkin*A/63/40 | X A/64/40, A/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Russian Federation (*cont’d*) | 1410/2005, *Yevdokimov and Rezanov*A/66/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1447/2006, *Amirov* A/64/401548/2007, *Kholodov*A/68/40 | XA/65/40, A/66/40 |  |  |  | XX |
|  | 1577/2007, *Usaev*A/65/40 | XA/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1605/2007, *Zyuskin*A/66/401628/2007, *Pavlyuchenkov*A/68/401795/2008, *Zhirnov*A/69/40 1856/2008, *Sevostyanov* A/69/40  |  |  |  | XX (24/02)X (24/02) | XA/68/40XXX |
|  | 1866/2009, *Chebotareva*A/67/401873/2009, *Alekseev* A/69/401932/2010, *Fedotova*A/68/40CCPR/C/116/1941/2010,*Neporozhnev*CCPR/C/114/2036/2011, *Yusupova*2041/2011, *Dorofeev*CCPR/C/116/2059/2011,*Mamonov*CCPR/C/116/2099/2011*Polskikh*2126/2011, *Kesmatulla*CCPR/C/115/2141/2012,*Kostenko* |  |  |  | XX (24/02) XNot due yetXXNot due yet | XXXXXXXX |
| Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (1) | 806/1998, *Thompson*A/56/40 |  |  |  | XA/61/40 | X |
| Serbia (1) | 1556/2007, *Novaković*A/66/40 | XA/66/40, A/67/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
| Sierra Leone (3) | 839/1998, *Mansaraj et al*.A/56/40 | XA/57/40, A/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 840/1998, *Gborie et al*.A/56/40 | XA/57/40, A/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 841/1998, *Sesay et al*.A/56/40 | XA/57/40, A/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
| South Africa (1) | 1818/2008, *McCallum*A/66/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
| Spain (22)  | 493/1992, *Griffin*A/50/40 | XA/59/40, A/58/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  |
|  | 526/1993, *Hill*A/52/40 | XA/53/40, A/56/40, A/58/40, A/59/40, A/60/40, A/61/40, A/64/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 701/1996, *Gómez Vásquez*A/55/40 | XA/56/40, A/57/40, A/58/40, A/60/40, A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Spain (*cont’d*) | 864/1999, *Ruiz Agudo*A/58/40 |  |  |  | XA/61/40 | X |
|  | 986/2001, *Semey*A/58/40 | XA/59/40, A/60/40, A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1006/2001, *Muñoz*A/59/40 |  |  |  | XA/61/40 | X |
|  | 1007/2001, *Sineiro Fernando*A/58/40 | XA/59/40, A/60/40, A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1073/2002, *Terón Jesús*A/60/40 |  |  |  | XA/61/40 | X |
|  | 1095/2002, *Gomariz*A/60/40 |  |  |  | XA/61/40 | X |
|  | 1101/2002, *Alba Cabriada*A/60/40 |  |  |  | XA/61/40 | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1104/2002, *Martínez Fernández*A/60/40 |  |  |  | XA/61/40 | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1122/2002, *Lagunas Castedo* A/64/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1211/2003, *Oliveró*A/61/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1325/2004, *Conde* A/62/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1332/2004, *Garcia et al.*A/62/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1351 and 1352/2005, *Hens and* *Corujo*A/63/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1363/2005, *Gayoso Martínez*A/65/40 | XA/66/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1364/2005, *Carpintero*A/64/40 | XA/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1381/2005, *Hachuel*A/62/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1473/2006, *Morales Tornel*,A/64/40Follow-up dialogue closed, with a note of unsatisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/69/40) | XA/66/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | A/68/40 |
| Spain (*cont’d*) | 1493/2006, *Williams Lecraft*A/64/40Case closed during the 99th session, in light of the measures undertaken by the State party (A/66/40) | XA/65/40, A/66/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1945/2010, *Achabal*A/68/40CCPR/C/111/D/2008/2010*Aarrass* | XX |  |  |  | X |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sri Lanka (16) | 909/2000, *Kankanamge*A/59/40 | XA/60/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 916/2000, *Jayawardena* | X |  |  |  | X |
|  | 950/2000, *Sarma*A/58/40 | XA/59/40, A/60/40, A/63/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1033/2001, *Nallaratnam*A/59/40 | XA/60/40, A/64/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1189/2003, *Fernando*A/60/40 | XA/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1249/2004, *Immaculate Joseph et al.*A/61/40 | XA/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1250/2004, *Rajapakse*A/61/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1373/2005, *Dissanakye*A/63/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1376/2005, *Bandaranayake*A/63/40 |  |  |  | X | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1406/2005, *Weerawanza*,A/64/40 |  |  |  | X | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1426/2005, *Dingiri Banda*A/63/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1432/2005, *Gunaratna*A/64/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
| Sri Lanka (*cont’d*) | 1436/2005, *Sathasivam*A/63/40 |  |  |  | XA/65/40 | X |
|  | 1523/2006, *Tiyagarajah* |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1862/2009, *Pathmini Peiris et al.*A/67/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 2087/2011, *Guneththige* |  |  |  | X | X |
| Suriname (8) | 146/1983, *Baboeram*Twenty-fourth sessionSelected Decisions, vol. 2 | XA/51/40, A/52/40,A/53/40, A/55/40, A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 148 to 154/1983, *Kamperveen*,*Riedewald*, *Leckie*, *Demrawsingh*, *Sohansingh*, *Rahman*, *Hoost*Twenty-fourth sessionSelected Decisions, vol. 2 | XA/51/40, A/52/40,A/53/40, A/55/40, A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Sweden (3) | 1416/2005, *Alzery*A/62/40 | XA/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1833/2008, *X.* A/67/40Follow-up dialogue closed, with a note of a satisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/69/40) 2149/2012, *Islam*A/69/40 | XA/68/40 |  |  |  | A/68/40X |
| Tajikistan (22)  | 964/2001, *Saidov*A/59/40The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of a non-satisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI). | XA/60/40, A/62/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 973/2001, *Khalilova*A/60/40The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of a non-satisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI). | XA/60/40, A/62/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 985/2001, *Aliboev*A/61/40 The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of a non-satisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI). | A/62/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
| Tajikistan (*cont’d*) | 1042/2002, *Boimurudov*A/61/40The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of a non-satisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI). | XA/62/40, A/63/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1044/2002, *Nazriev*A/61/40 | XA/62/40, A/63/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1096/2002, *Kurbonov*A/59/40 The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of a non-satisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI). | A/59/40, A/60/40, A/62/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |
|  | 1108 and 1121/2002, *Karimov, Askarov* and *Davlatov*A/62/40The Committee decided to close the follow-up dialogue concerning the case of Mr. A. Davlatov, and to suspend the dialogue, with a finding of a non-satisfactory implementation of its recommendation, concerning Mr. Karimov, Mr. Askarov, and Mr. N. Davlatov (see A/67/40, chap. VI).  | XA/63/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1117/2002, *Khomidova*A/59/40The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of a non-satisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI). | XA/60/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1195/2003, *Dunaev* A/64/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
| Tajikistan (*cont’d*) | 1200/2003, *Sattorova*A/64/40The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of a non-satisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI). | XA/65/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1208/2003, *B.* *Kurbanov*A/61/40The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of a non-satisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI). | XA/62/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1209/2003, 1231/2003 and 1241/2004, *Rakhmatov, Safarov and Salimov*, and *Mukhammadiev*A/63/40The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of a non-satisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI). | X A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1263/2004 and 1264/2004, *Khuseynov* and *Butaev*A/64/40The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of a non-satisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI). | XA/65/40, A/67/40 |  |  |   |  |
|  | 1276/2004, *Idiev*A/64/40The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of a non-satisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI). | XA/65/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1348/2005, *Ashurov*A/62/40The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of a non-satisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI). | XA/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
| Tajikistan (*cont’d*) | 1401/2005, *Kirpo*A/65/40The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of a non-satisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI). | XA/66/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1499/2006, *Iskandarov*A/66/40 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1519/2006, *Khostikoev*A/65/40The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of a non-satisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI). | XA/66/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
| Togo (4)  | 422 to 424/1990, *Aduayom et al*.A/51/40 | XA/56/40, A/57/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 505/1992, *Ackla*A/51/40 | XA/56/40, A/57/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Trinidad and Tobago (23) | 232/1987, *Pinto*A/45/40and 512/1992, *Pinto*A/51/40 | XA/51/40, A/52/40, A/53/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 362/1989, *Soogrim*A/48/40 | XA/51/40, A/52/40A/53/40, A/58/40  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 434/1990, *Seerattan*A/51/40 | XA/51/40, A/52/40, A/53/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 523/1992, *Neptune*A/51/40 | XA/51/40, A/52/40A/53/40, A/58/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 533/1993, *Elahie*A/52/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 554/1993, *La Vende*A/53/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
| Trinidad and Tobago (*cont’d*) | 555/1993, *Bickaroo*A/53/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 569/1996, *Mathews*A/43/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 580/1994, *Ashby*A/57/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 594/1992, *Phillip*A/54/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 672/1995, *Smart*A/53/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 677/1996, *Teesdale*A/57/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 683/1996, *Wanza*A/57/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 684/1996, *Sahadath*A/57/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 721/1996, *Boodoo*A/57/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 752/1997, *Henry*A/54/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 818/1998, *Sextus*A/56/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 845/1998, *Kennedy*A/57/40 |  |  |  | XA/58/40  | X |
|  | 899/1999, *Francis et al*.A/57/40 |  |  |  | XA/58/40 | X |
|  | 908/2000, *Evans*A/58/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 928/2000, *Sooklal*A/57/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 938/2000, *Siewpersaud et al*.A/59/40 |  |  |  | XA/51/40,A/53/40 | X |
| Turkey (2) | 1853/2008 and 1854/2008, *Atasoy* and *Sarkut* A/67/40 | XA/68/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
| Turkmenistan (8) | 1450/2006, *Komarovsky*A/63/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1460/2006, *Yklymova*A/64/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1530/2006, *Bozbey*A/66/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1883/2009, *Orazova*A/67/40CCPR/C/112/D/2069/2011*Shikhmuradov*CCPR/C/115/2221/2012, *M. Hudaybergenov*CCPR/C/115/2222/2012,*A.Hudaybergenov*CCPR/C/115/2223/2012, *Japparow* |  |  |  | Not due yetNot due yetNot due yet | XXXX |
| Ukraine (5) | 781/1997, *Aliev*A/58/401405/2005, *Pustovoit*A/69/40 | XA/60/40 |  |  |  | XX |
|  | 1412/2005, *Butovenko*A/66/40 |  |  |  | X | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1535/2006, *Shchetka*A/66/401803/2008, *Bulgakov*A/68/40 |  |  |  | X | XX |
| Uruguay (39) Uruguay (*cont’d*) | **A.** [5/1977, *Massera*Seventh session43/1979, *Caldas*Nineteenth session63/1979, *Antonaccio*Fourteenth session73/1980, *Izquierdo*Fifteenth session80/1980, *Vasiliskis*Eighteenth session83/1981, *Machado*Twentieth session84/1981, *Dermit Barbato*Seventeenth session85/1981, *Romero*Twenty-first session88/1981, *Bequio*Eighteenth session92/1981, *Nieto*Nineteenth session103/1981, *Scarone*Twentieth session105/1981, *Cabreira*Nineteenth session109/1981, *Voituret*Twenty-first session123/1982, *Lluberas*Twenty-first session] | X43 follow-up repliesreceived A/59/40\* |  |  |  | X |
|  | **B.** [103/1981, *Scarone*73/1980, *Izquierdo*92/1981, *Nieto*85/1981, *Romero*] |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **C.** [63/1979, *Antonaccio*80/1980, *Vasiliskis*123/1982, *Lluberas*] |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uruguay (*cont’d*) | **D.** [4/1977, *Ramirez*Fourth session6/1977, *Sequeiro*Sixth session25/1978, *Massiotti*Sixteenth session28/1978, *Weisz* Eleventh session32/1978, *Touron*Twelfth session 33/1978, *Carballal*Twelfth session37/1978, *De Boston*Twelfth session44/1979, *Pietraroia* Twelfth session52/1979, *Lopez Burgos*Thirteenth session56/1979, *Celiberti*Thirteenth session66/1980, *Schweizer*Seventeenth session70/1980, *Simones*Fifteenth session74/1980, *Estrella*Eighteenth session110/1981, *Viana*Twenty-first session139/1983, *Conteris*Twenty-fifth session147/1983, *Gilboa*Twenty-sixth session162/1983, *Acosta*Thirty-fourth session] |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **E.** [30/1978, *Bleier*Fifteenth session84/1981, *Dermit Barbato*Seventeenth session107/1981, *Quinteros*Nineteenth session] |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \**Note*: Follow-up information was provided on 17 October 1991 (unpublished). The list of cases under **A**: the State party submitted that on 1 March 1985, the competence of the civil courts was re-established. The amnesty law of 8 March 1985 benefited all the individuals who had been involved as authors, accomplices or accessory participants in political crimes or crimes committed for political purposes, from 1 January 1962 to 1 March 1985. The law allowed those individuals held responsible for intentional murder to have either their conviction reviewed or their sentence reduced. Pursuant to article 10 of the Act on National Pacification all the individuals imprisoned under “measures of security” were released. In cases subjected to review, appellate courts either acquitted or condemned the individuals. By virtue of Act 15.783 of 20 November all the individuals who had previously held a public office were entitled to return to their jobs. On cases under **B**: the State party indicates that these individuals were pardoned by virtue of Act 15.737 and released on 10 March 1985. On cases under **C**: these individuals were released on 14 March 1985; their cases were included under Act 15.737. On cases under **D**: from 1 March 1985, the possibility to file an action for damages was open to all of the victims of human rights violations which occurred during the de facto government. Since 1985, 36 suits for damages have been filed, 22 of them for arbitrary detention and 12 for the return of property. The Government settled Mr. Lopez’s case on 21 November 1990, by paying him US$ 200,000. The suit filed by Ms. Lilian Celiberti is still pending. Besides the aforementioned cases, no other victim has filed a lawsuit against the State claiming compensation. On cases under **E**: on 22 December 1986, the Congress passed Act 15.848, known as “termination of public prosecutions”. Under the Act, the State can no longer prosecute crimes committed before 1 March 1985 by the military or the police for political ends or on orders received from their superiors. All pending proceedings were discontinued. On 16 April 1989, the Act was confirmed by referendum. The Act required investigating judges to send reports submitted to the judiciary about victims of disappearances to the Government, for the latter to initiate inquiries. |
|  |
|  | 159/1983, *Cariboni*A/43/40Selected Decisions, vol. 2 |  |  |  | X | X |
| Uruguay (*cont’d*) | 322/1988, *Rodríguez*A/51/40, A/49/40 |  |  |  | XA/51/40 | X |
|  | 1887/2009, *Peirano Basso*A/66/40 |  |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 1637/2007, 1757/2008, and 1765/2008, *Canessa Albareda et al.*A/67/40 |  |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
| Uzbekistan (34)  | 907/2000, *Siragev*A/61/40 | XA/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 911/2000, *Nazarov*A/59/40 | XA/60/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 915/2000, *Ruzmetov*A/61/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 917/2000, *Arutyunyan*A/59/40 | XA/60/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 931/2000, *Hudoyberganova*A/60/40 | XA/60/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 959/2000, *Bazarov*A/61/40 | XA/62/40 |  |  |  | XA/62/40 |
|  | 971/2001, *Arutyuniantz*A/60/40 | XA/60/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1017/2001, *Strakhov* and 1066/2002, *Fayzulaev*A/62/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1041/2002, *Tulayganov* A/62/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1043/2002, *Chikiunov*A/62/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1057/2002, *Korvetov*A/62/40 | XA/62/40 |  |  |  | XA/62/40 |
|  | 1071/2002, *Agabekov*A/62/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
| Uzbekistan (*cont’d*) | 1140/2002, *Khudayberganov*A/62/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1150/2002, *Uteev*A/63/40 | XA/64/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1163/2003, *Isaev and Karimov*A/64/40 | XA/65/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1225/2003, *Eshonov*A/65/40 | XA/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1280/2004, *Tolipkhudzhaev*A/64/40 | XA/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1284/2004, *Kodirov*A/65/40 | XA/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1334/2004, *Mavlonov and Sa’di*A/64/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1378/2005, *Kasimov*A/64/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1382/2005, *Salikh* A/64/40 | XA/65/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1418/2005, *Iskiyaev*A/64/40 | XA/65/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1449/2006, *Umarov*A/66/40 | XA/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1478/2006, *Kungurov*A/66/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1552/2007, *Lyashkevich*A/65/40 | XA/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1585/2007, *Batyrov*A/64/40 | XA/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1589/2007, *Gapirjanov*A/65/40 | XA/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1769/2008, *Ismailov*A/66/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
| Uzbekistan (*cont’d*) | 1914-1915-1916/2009, *Musaev*A/67/40CCPR/C/116/2044/2011,*T.V. and A.G.*CCPR/C/114/2234/2013, *M.T.* | XA/68/40 |  |  | Not due yetNot due yet | XA/68/40XX |
| Venezuela (BolivarianRepublic of) (3) | 156/1983, *Solórzano*A/41/40Selected Decisions, vol. 2  | XA/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
| 1940/2010, *Eligio Cedeño*  XA/68/40CCPR/C/112/D/2085/2011*García Bolívar* |
| Zambia (6) | 390/1990, *Lubuto*A/51/40 | XA/62/40 |  |  | X | X |
|  | 821/1998, *Chongwe*A/56/40 | XA/56/40, A/57/40, A/59/40, A/61/40, A/64/40, A/66/40 |  |  |  | XA/68/40 |
|  | 856/1999, *Chambala*A/58/40 | XA/62/40 |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1132/2002, *Chisanga*A/61/401303/2004, *Chiti*A/68/40 | XA/61/40, A/63/40, A/64/40, A/65/40 |  |  | X | XX |
|  | 1859/2009, *Kamoyo*A/67/40 |  |  |  | X | X |

1. [The State party had then informed the Committee that following the adoption of the Committee’s Views, consideration of the author’s second PRRA request had resumed.] [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. [Maintaining assessment from 115th session] [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. [The assessment of the State’s response was as follows :

 (a) Revision of the lifelong prohibition of the author’s right to be a candidate in presidential elections or to be a prime minister or Minister: B2

 (b) Publication of Views: A

 (c) Non-repetition: B2] [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. CCPR/C/115: The State party had then reported that it was in the process of modernising its Code of Criminal Procedure, including on the proposal to abolish the system of leave to appeal [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. A/61/40 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. The State party had then informed the Committee that it had granted the author a residence permit, and the Committee’s assessment was as follows:

 (a) Effective remedy, including a full reconsideration of the author’s claim: A

 (b) Publication of the Views: A

 (c) Non-repetition: No information [↑](#footnote-ref-7)