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**Human Rights Committee**

Follow-up progress report on individual communications

A. Introduction

1. At its thirty-ninth session, the Human Rights Committee established a procedure and designated a Special Rapporteur to monitor follow-up on its Views adopted under article 5 (4) of the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Special Rapporteur for follow-up on Views prepared the present report in accordance with rule 101, paragraph 3, of the Committee’s rules of procedure. The present report sets out all information provided by States parties and authors or their counsel/representative between March to December 2016.[[1]](#footnote-2)

2. To date, the Committee has concluded that there have been violations of the Covenant in 1029 of the 1221 Views it has adopted since 1979.

3. At its 109th session, the Committee decided to include in its reports on follow-up to Views an assessment of the replies received from and action taken by States parties. The assessment is based on the criteria applied by the Committee in the procedure for follow-up to its concluding observations.

4. At its 118th session, on 4 November 2016, the Committee decided to revise its assessment criteria.

**Assessment criteria (*as revised during the 118th session*)**

**Assessment of replies:**

**A** Response largely satisfactory

**B** Action taken, but additional information or measures required

**C** Response received but actions or information not relevant or do not implement the recommendation

**D** No follow-up report received after reminder(s)

**E** Information or measures taken are contrary to or reflect rejection of the Committee’s recommendations

*During the evaluation of the replies, the criteria are applied as follows*:

**[A] Reply/action satisfactory**: The State party has provided evidence of significant action taken towards the implementation of the recommendation made by the Committee: in this case, the Special Rapporteur for follow-up to concluding observations or views requests no additional information from the State party and the follow-up procedure on the particular issue is discontinued.

[**B] Reply/action partially satisfactory**: The State party took steps towards the implementation of the recommendation but additional information or action remains necessary. In this case, the Special Rapporteur for follow-up to concluding observations or views requests additional information, within a specific time frame or in the next periodic report, on specific points of the State party’s previous reply that require clarification, or on additional steps taken by the State party to implement the recommendation.

**[C] Reply/action not satisfactory**: The action taken or information provided by the State party does not address the situation under consideration. In the case of follow-up to concluding observations, information provided by the State party that reiterates information previously made available to the Committee prior to the concluding observations is considered not relevant for these purposes. The Special Rapporteur for follow-up renews the request for information on steps taken to implement the recommendation.

**[D] No cooperation with the Committee**: The State party has not provided a follow-up report after one reminder and a request for a meeting with the Special Rapporteur for follow-up to concluding observations or Views.

**[E] The measures taken are contrary to or reflect rejection of the recommendation**: The State party adopted measures that are contrary to or have results or consequences that are contrary to the recommendation of the Committee or reflect rejection of the recommendation.

B. Follow-up information received and processed between March and December 2016

1. Algeria

**Communication No. 1905/2009, *Ouaghlissi***

Views adopted on 26 March 2012

Violation Article 6, paragraph 1; article 7; article 9; article 10, paragraph 1; article 16; and article 2, paragraph 3, read in conjunction with article 6, paragraph 1; article 7; article 9; article 10, paragraph 1; and article 16 of the Covenant with regard to Maamar Ouaghlissi, and of article 7, read alone and in conjunction with article 2, paragraph 3, of the Covenant with regard to the author and her daughters.

Remedy: Effective remedy, including by (i) conducting a thorough and effective investigation into the disappearance of Maamar Ouaghlissi; (ii) providing the author with detailed information about the results of the investigation; (iii) freeing him immediately if he is still being detained incommunicado; (iv) if Maamar Ouaghlissi is dead, handing over his remains to his family; (v) prosecuting, trying and punishing those responsible for the violations committed; and (vi) providing adequate compensation for the author and herdaughters for the violations suffered and for Maamar Ouaghlissi if he is alive. Notwithstanding Ordinance No. 06-01, the State party should ensure that it does not impede enjoyment of the right to an effective remedy for the victims of crimes such as torture, extrajudicial killings and enforced disappearance.

Subject matter Enforced disappearance

Previous follow-up information CCPR/C/115/3 (no response received from State Party, due since 6 April 2015[[2]](#footnote-3) )

Author’s counsel 27 May 2016

Upon the request of the victim’s family, the author’s counsel seized several administrative and judicial authorities with a view to seeking implementation of the Committee’s Views, including the Minister of Justice and the *Procureur de la République*. According to the author’s counsel, the Committee’s Views were never published nor disseminated, and no measure was undertaken to give them effect.

The author’s counsel also recalls his submission of 26 March 2015, in which he had alerted the Committee about measures of reprisal undertaken by the Algerian authorities against family members, for having submitted their case to the Committee and sought the implementation of the Views.

Committee’s assessment:

(a) Effective remedy: D

(b) Publication of Views: D

(c) Non-repetition: D

Committee’s decision: Meet with Government representatives during the 120th session

Follow-up dialogue ongoing

**Communication No. 1924/2010, *Boudehane***

Views adopted on 24 July 2014

Violation Article 2 (para. 3), read in conjunction with articles 6 (para. 1), 7, 9, 10 (para. 1) and 16 with regard to Tahar and Bachir Bourefis, of article 2 (para. 3) read in conjunction with article 17 with regard to Tahar Bourefis, and of article 2 (para. 3) read in conjunction with articles 7 and 17 with regard to the author;

Subject-matter Enforced disappearance

Remedy: Effective remedy, including by: (a) conducting a thorough and effective investigation into the disappearance of Tahar and Bachir Bourefis; (b) providing the author and her family with detailed information about the results of its investigation; (c) releasing them immediately if they are still being detained incommunicado; (d) in the event that Tahar and Bachir Bourefis are deceased, handing over their remains to their family; (e) prosecuting, trying and punishing those responsible for the violations committed; and (f) providing adequate compensation to the author and her family for the violations suffered and to Tahar and Bachir Bourefis, if they are still alive. Notwithstanding the terms of Ordinance No. 06-01, the State party should ensure that it does not impede enjoyment of the right to an effective remedy for crimes such as torture, extrajudicial killings and enforced disappearances.

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

Submission from: Authors’ counsel.

Date of submission: 27 May 2016

In the absence of implementation measures from the State party, the author’s counsel filed an application with the *Procureur de la République de Taher*, as well as the *Procureur militaire de la République près le Tribunal militaire permanent de Constantine* on 21 and 27 April 2016, to urge them to contribute to the implementation of the Committee’s Views. Since then, the family also contacted the Ministry of Justice. However, no response was received.

Committee’s assessment:

(a) Effective remedy: D

(b) Publication of Views: D

(c) Non-repetition: D

Committee’s decision: Follow-up dialogue ongoing

**Communication No.1931/2010, *Bouzenia***

Views adopted on 23 July 2014

Violation Articles 6 (para. 1), 7, 9, 10 (para. 1) and 16 and article 2 (para. 3), read in conjunction with articles 6 (para. 1), 7, 9, 10 (para. 1) and 16, with regard to Lakhdar Bouzenia. Articles 7 and 2 (para. 3), read in conjunction with article 7, with regard to the author and her family.

Subject-matter Enforced disappearance

Remedy: Effective remedy, including by: (a) conducting a thorough and effective investigation into the disappearance of Lakhdar Bouzenia; (b) providing the author and her family with detailed information about the results of its investigation; (c) releasing him immediately if he is still being detained incommunicado; (d) in the event that Lakhdar Bouzenia is deceased, handing over his remains to his family; (e) prosecuting, trying and punishing those responsible for the violations committed; and (f) providing adequate compensation to the author for the violations suffered and to Lakhdar Bouzenia, if he is still alive. Notwithstanding the terms of Ordinance No. 06-01, the State party should ensure that it does not impede enjoyment of the right to an effective remedy for crimes such as torture, extrajudicial killings and enforced disappearances.

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

Submission from: Author’s counsel.

Date of submission: 27 May 2016

In the absence of implementation measures from the State party, the authors counsel filed an application with the *Procureur de la République de Taher* on 11 May 2016, to urge him to contribute to the implementation of the Committee’s Views. Since then, the family also contacted the Ministry of Justice. However, no response was received.

Committee’s assessment:

(a) Effective remedy: D

(b) Publication of Views: D

(c) Non-repetition: D

Committee’s decision: Follow-up dialogue ongoing

**Communication No. 1964/2010, *Fedsi***

Views adopted on 23 July 2014

Violation article 6 (para. 1) with regard to Nasreddine and Messaoud Fedsi, and of article 2 (para. 3) read in conjunction with article 6 (para. 1) with regard to the author.

Subject-matter Enforced disappearance

Remedy Effective remedy, including by: (a) conducting a thorough and effective investigation into the executions of Nasreddine and Messaoud Fedsi; (b) providing the author and his family with detailed information about the results of its investigation; (c) prosecuting, trying and punishing those responsible for the violations committed; and (d) providing adequate compensation to the author for the violations suffered. Notwithstanding the terms of Ordinance No. 06-01, the State party should ensure that it does not impede enjoyment of the right to an effective remedy for crimes such as torture, extrajudicial executions and enforced disappearances.

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

Submission from: Author’s counsel.

Date of submission: 27 May 2016

In the absence of implementation measures from the State party, the author’s counsel filed an application with the *Procureur de la République de Taher* on 24 May 2016, to urge him to contribute to the implementation of the Committee’s Views. Since then, the family also contacted the Ministry of Justice. However, no response was received.

Committee’s assessment:

(a) Effective remedy: D

(b) Publication of Views: D

(c) Non-repetition: D

Committee’s decision: Follow-up dialogue ongoing

2. Australia

**Communication No. 2005/2010, *Hicks v. Australia***

Views adopted: 26 March 2015

Violation:Article 9

Remedy:

The finding of a violation constitutes appropriate reparation in the form of satisfaction. The State party is under an obligation to take steps to prevent similar violations in the future.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subject matter: | Arbitrary detention in Australia further to a transfer deal agreed with the US authorities (after a conviction in the US) |
|  |  |

Previous follow-up information:None

Submission from State party: 8 August 2016

The State party submits that the Views will be published on the website of the Australian Attorney-General’s Department.

The State party disagrees with the Committee’s comment, in relation to the author’s time in the custody of the United States, that Australia was in a position to take positive measures to ensure that the author was treated in a manner consonant with the USA’s obligations under the Covenant, as the author was not subject to Australia’s jurisdiction during that time.

Regarding the enforcement of the author’s sentence under the transfer arrangement, and referring to the Committee’s decision that the fact that the United States had not ratified the Optional Protocol was not an obstacle, admissibility-wise, for the Committee to examine the author’s claims under article 9 of the Covenant with respect to Australia, the State party deems this analysis to be inconsistent with article 1 of the Protocol, and to the Committee’s own decisions. The State party recalls that the author’s imprisonment in Australia was based on the imposition by the US of a retroactive offence upon him, and flowed directly from his alleged unfair and unlawful trial before a US military commission. It was thus not possible for the Committee to determine the lawfulness under article 9(1) of the Covenant of Australia’s detention of the author without first reaching the view that the United States breached the Covenant; Consequently the State party remains strongly of the view that the Committee should not have found the author’s claims under article 9 of the Covenant to be admissible.

The State party further disagrees with the Committee’s view that it violated the author’s rights under article 9(1) by agreeing to give effect to the remainder of the author’s sentence, and detaining the author in Australia for seven months. The Committee’s reasoning to reach such conclusion fails to articulate the basis of the alleged violation. It is unclear whether the Committee considers a receiving State in comparable circumstances must ensure, outright, that a transfer arrangement does not apply to prisoners who may not have received a fair trial under article 14 of the Covenant in the sending State, or must take such steps towards that outcome as are within the receiving State’s power. Moreover, whatever the alleged threshold is, the Committee has not identified what, in fact, Australia could have done to meet it.

The Committee’s reasoning is also circular. In particular, by reasoning that Australia violated the Covenant because it either did not ensure or did not do everything possible to ensure the transfer arrangement ‘did not cause it to violate the Covenant’, the Committee has presupposed the existence of an obligation in order to create a duty which it then asserts Australia failed to fulfil, leaving it in violation of its asserted obligation under the Covenant.

The State party reiterates that the transfer was lawful under the International Transfer of Prisoners Act 1997 (the Act) and that this legal framework did not involve an evaluation or endorsement of, or make Australia responsible for, the author’s trial and conviction in the United States. Nor did it give Australia full responsibility for enforcing the author’s sentence. Contrary to the Committee’s view, consent of the prisoner to the transfer was critical in this case.

For these reasons, the State party considers it has fulfilled its legal obligations in relation to the author’s transfer to, and detention in Australia. It did not have the obligation or obligations in relation to article 9(1) of the Covenant that the Committee has asserted.

The State party also disagrees with the implicit assumption, in the Committee’s views, that a State party’s legal obligations under the Covenant should be interpreted as incompatible with, and prevail over, its legal obligations under schemes for the international transfer of prisoners. The two bodies of legal obligations are compatible; and in this case, Australia was required to satisfy, and was capable of satisfying both bodies of obligations at once; and that it did so. The interpretation of the Covenant that the Committee has adopted may have a significant, negative human consequences, and undermine schemes for the international transfer of prisoners, to the detriment, primarily, of the prisoners themselves. In this instance, the alternative to the author’s transfer to and detention in Australia was for the author to remain in Guantanamo Bay.

As Australia does not agree with the Committee’s view that a violation of article 9(1) of the Covenant has occurred, it does not accept the Committee’s view that Australia is obliged to take steps to prevent similar violations in the future.

Committee’s assessment:

(a) Publication of Views: A

(b) Non-repetition: E

Committee’s decision: Meet with Government representatives during the 120th session

Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Communications No. 2094/2011, *F.K.A.G. et al.* ; and No. 2136/2012, *M.M.M. et al. v. Australia*** | | |
| Views adopted: | | 26 July 2013 and 25 July 2013, respectively |
| Violation: | | Articles 7 and 9 (1) and (4) |
| Remedy: | | Effective remedy, including release under individually appropriate conditions for those authors still in detention, rehabilitation and appropriate compensation. |
| Subject matter: | | Indefinite detention of refugees with adverse security assessments |
| Previous follow-up information: | | CCPR/C/118/3[[3]](#footnote-4) |
| Submission from State party:  Submission from author’s counsel | | 10 May 2016  Authors 1 and 7 were released from detention on 28 April 2016 and 24 February 2016 respectively. Each author was released following a decision of the Minister for Immigration and Border Protection to grant a visa, taking into consideration the issuance by the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation (ASIO) of a qualified security assessment.  Author 27 remains in immigration detention and the appropriateness of his detention continues to be reviewed. That author’s initial adverse security assessment was previously affirmed by the Independent reviewer. Subsequently, ASIO issued a new assessment.  Author 30 remains in immigration detention, and the appropriateness of his detention continues to be reviewed. The author’s security assessment has previously been affirmed by the Independent reviewer, as part of a periodic process.  The State party reiterates that it is entitled to take measures, including detention, to uphold Australia’s national security. Consistent with its international obligations, the State party has policies and processes in place to ensure that any such detention is non arbitrary and continues only for so long as there are grounds to justify it.  1 April and 15 August 2016  According to the author’s counsel, progress on the release of the authors is encouraging. However, the State party continues to be in breach of the Covenant as it failed to provide remedies for the violations identified by the Committee. Some authors remain arbitrarily detained without effective judicial review, in conditions that are cruel, inhumane or degrading.  The author’s counsel also stresses that while most of the authors have now been released, the State party has not acknowledged that their detention was contrary to the Covenant, or that they were released to fulfil Australia’s CCPR obligations. Rather, the State party maintains that their release resulted from a change in their security assessment under domestic law. The Australian laws which led to arbitrary detention and lack of judicial protection remain intact and unreviewed, and are likely to provide similar violations in the future.  Those authors who were released maintain their unfulfilled rights to compensation and rehabilitation. |
| Committee’s assessment: | | (a) Effective remedy, including release under individually appropriate conditions for those authors still in detention; rehabilitation; and appropriate compensation: B  (b) Publication of Views: No information  (c) Non-repetition: E |
| Committee’s decision: | | Follow-up dialogue ongoing. |
| **Communication No. 2233/2013, *F.J.et al. v. Australia*** | |
| Views adopted: | | 22 March 2016 |
| Violation: | | Articles 7 and 9 (1) and (4) |
| Remedy: | | Appropriate remedy, including rehabilitation and adequate compensation |
| Subject matter: | | Indefinite detention of persons in migration facilities |
|  | | No previous follow-up information |
| Submission from the State party: | | 10 October 2016  The State party reiterates that it is entitled to take measures, including detention, to uphold its national security. It is Australia’s policy that unlawful non‑citizens who are the subject of adverse security assessments from ASIO will remain in held immigration detention, pending the resolution of their cases. The State party submits that in forming its Views on article 9, the Committee failed to give adequate weight to various processes and policy developments. The authors’ adverse security assessments were reviewed regularly since the time they were issued, including through internal review processes by ASIO and, since 2012, additional review by the Independent Reviewer of Adverse Security Assessments. An Independent Reviewer of Adverse Security Assessments was first appointed on 3 December 2012. The Reviewer provides an independent review process for those individuals who remain in immigration detention, having been found to be owed international protection obligations, but not granted a permanent visa as a result of an adverse security assessment.  Also, all of the authors have been released from immigration detention. In each case, the decision to release an author from immigration detention was made by the Department of Immigration and Border Protection after ASIO issued either a qualified or a non‑prejudicial security assessment following its receipt of significant new information.  Australia disagrees with the Committee’s interpretation of article 9(4) of the Covenant. The obligation on States Parties is, in accordance with the terms of that article, to provide for review of the lawfulness of detention. There can be no doubt that the term ‘lawfulness’ refers to lawfulness according to the Australian domestic legal system.  The State party submits that it is mindful of the impact of continuing detention on individuals with adverse security assessments, while noting that it does not consider that detention *per se* causes harm to individuals.  The State party considers that the Committee should not have reached the conclusion that the authors were suffering from psychological harm in the absence of substantial and specific evidence of such harm causally connected with their detention. The authors’ submissions did not contain such evidence. The treatment of the authors does not meet the threshold to satisfy a violation of article 7, as steps were taken to meet the psychological health needs of the authors through medical and other health services. All individuals in immigration detention have a mental health assessment upon entry to detention and are offered regular mental health screening throughout their time in detention, conducted by mental health clinicians. All people in immigration detention facilities are supported under the Government’s Psychological Support Programme (PSP) Policy. The immigration detention facilities in which the authors reside have on-site primary health care services (including counselling and psychological). The authors received specific treatment and support in relation to their physical and mental health issues, and the State party reiterates that their treatment is not such that it has reached the threshold necessary to satisfy a finding of a violation of article 7. |

Committee’s assessment:

(a) Appropriate remedy, including rehabilitation and adequate compensation: E

(b) Publication of Views: No information

(c) Non-repetition: E Committee’s decision: Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**Communication No. 2279/2013,** ***Z. v. Australia***

Views adopted: 5 November 2015

Violation:Articles 14 (1), 17, 23 and 24

Remedy:Effective remedy, including to ensure regular contact between the author and his son and to provide adequate compensation to the author

Subject-matter Removal of child from Poland to Australia  
without the father’s consent

Previous follow-up information: None

Submission from the author 21 June 2016

The author claims that the State party failed to implement the Committee’s Views. He notes that the arbitrary and unlawful removal of his child from his parental authority was interference with Polish divorce and custody proceedings in process, in which the best interest of the child was being considered. The author contests the non-respect by the Australian Central authority of the Polish Court’s final order; the refusal of the State party to proceed with the Hague Convention hearing for contact and access; to have him cross-examined in court; and to have the child’s views heard in court as to which of his parents he would wish to live with.

Committee’s assessment:[[4]](#footnote-5)

(a) Effective remedy, including to ensure regular contact between the author and his son and to provide adequate compensation to the author: E

(b) Publication of Views: No information

(c) Non-repetition: E

Committee’s decision: Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

3. Canada

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Communication No. 2091/2011, *A.H.G.*** ***v. Canada*** | |
| Views adopted: | 25 March 2015 |
| Violation: | Article 7 |
| Remedy: | Effective remedy. The State party is under an obligation to make reparation to the author, by allowing him to return to Canada if he so wishes, and to provide adequate compensation to the author. |
| Subject-matter: | Deportation from Canada to Jamaica of a mentally-ill individual |
| Previous follow-up information: | CCPR/C/118/3 |

Submission from: Author’s counsel

20 October 2016

According to the author’s counsel, Canada’s disagreement with the Committee’s Views is not a ground for ignoring its obligations under the Covenant. The State party’s response constitutes re-litigation of the issues which were given thorough consideration prior to the adoption of the Views. The State party’s current position undermines both the efficacy and stature of the Committee and its complaint procedure, as well as the author’s individual rights. The author’s counsel requests the Committee and the Special Rapporteur on follow-up to Views to conduct a meeting with the Canadian Government and to publish the content of such meeting; to discuss the matter in a public session if the State party maintains its refusal to implement the Views: and if need be, request a follow-up mission by a Committee member to Canada, to be attended by the author and/or his representative.

Committee’s decision: Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

4. Denmark

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Communication No. 2379/2014, *Obah Hussein Ahmed* v. *Denmark*** | |
| Views adopted: | 7 July 2016 |
| Violation:  Subject-matter: | Article 7  Deportation to Italy |
| Remedy: | The State party is under an obligation to provide Obah Hussein Ahmed and her four daughters with an effective remedy, including full reconsideration of her claim, taking into account the State party’s obligations under the Covenant, the Committee’s present Views and the need to obtain assurances from Italy if necessary. The State party is also requested to refrain from expelling the author and her four children to Italy while their request for asylum is being reconsidered. |
| Subject-matter: | Deportation to Italy |
| Previous follow-up information: | No previous follow-up information |

Submission from: State party

15 December 2016

The State party submits that it is standard practice that the Danish Refugee Appeals Board reopens all cases in which criticism has been raised by a UN Committee. The relevant case is then heard by an entirely new panel consisting of members who have not previously been involved in the hearing of the case. In the present case, the Refugee Appeals Board (RAB) found no basis to reopen the case. In its decision of 30 August 2016, the RAB noted that “on 10 August 2016, the Board contacted the National Operational Aliens Centre of the North Zealand Police, asking for information as to whether the police were aware of the whereabouts of the author and her children, or whether they were deemed by the police to have left Denmark.

On 12 August 2016, the National Operational Aliens Centre of the North Zealand Police informed the Refugee Appeals Board that the police were not aware of the whereabouts of the family. On 29 August 2016, the Danish Immigration Service informed the Board that it was not aware of the whereabouts of the family.

As the Danish authorities are not aware of the whereabouts of the author and her children, including whether they are still in Denmark, the Board finds no reason to reopen the case (section 33(8) of the Aliens Act provides that a request for reopening will not be considered if the authority that is to make the decision is not aware of the whereabouts of the alien).

The RAB has decided to cancel the suspension of the time limit for the departure of the author and her children.

The Views of the Committee in cases against Denmark involving the RAB are reported in the Board’s annual report, which is distributed to all members of the Board and includes a chapter on cases brought before international bodies. The annual report is available on the website of the Board. The RAB and the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs have also made the Committee’s views publicly available on their individual websites (www.fln.dk and www.um.dk).

In light of the prevalence of the English language in Denmark, the Government sees no reason for a full translation into Danish.

The State party is of the opinion that full effect has been given to the Committee’s Views.

Committee’s assessment:

(a) Effective remedy: A

(b) Publication of Views: A

Committee’s decision: Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**Communication** **No.** **2258/2013,**  ***Rasappu*** v. ***Denmark***

Views adopted: 4 November 2015

Violation Article 7

Subject-matter: Deportation of unaccompanied minors to Sri Lanka

Remedy: The State party is obligated, inter alia, to proceed to a review of the authors’ requests for asylum, taking into account the State party’s obligations under the Covenant and the present Views.

No previous follow-up information

Submission from: State party

17 June 2016

The State party submits that it is standard practice that the Danish Refugee Appeals Board (RAB) reopens all cases in which criticism has been raised by a UN Committee.

In its decision of 12 January 2016, the Board decided to reopen the authors’ asylum cases for review through an oral hearing before a new panel, in order to reconsider the authors’ applications for asylum in light of the Committee’s Views. This hearing took place on 28 April 2016. The Board referred to the Committee’s Views, and to relevant information pertaining to the situation in Sri Lanka. After analysing the relevant information, the Board confirmed the previous analysis, that the authors were not facing personal risk as a result of their father’s activities for the LTTE; the Board further deemed that there had been no deterioration of the situation in Sri Lanka since the previous asylum decision. Accordingly, the Board confirmed its previous decision that the authors’ return to Sri Lanka would not breach article 7 of the Covenant.

No time limit has been set for the authors’ departure. However, they may be forcibly removed if they fail to obtain a residence permit, which they have applied for under section 9(c)(1) of the Aliens Act.

The Views will appear in the annual report of the Refugee Appeals Board, which is distributed to all members of the Board, and includes a chapter on cases brought before international bodies. The annual report is available on the website of the Board. The RAB and the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs have also made the Committee’s views publicly available on their individual websites (www.fln.dk and www.um.dk).

The State party considers that it has given effect to the Views.

Committee’s assessment:

(a) Effective remedy: A

(b) Publication of Views: A

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

**Communication** **No.** **2409/2014,**  ***Abdilafir Abubakar Ali et al. v. Denmark***

Views adopted: 29 March 2016

Violation Article 7

Subject-matter: Deportation to Italy

Remedy: Effective remedy, including full reconsideration of their claim taking into account the State party’s obligations under the Covenant, the Committee’s present Views and the need for assurances from Italy.

No previous follow-up information

Submission from: State party

12 July 2016

The State party submits that it is standard practice that the Danish Refugee Appeals Board (RAB) reopens all cases in which criticism has been raised by a UN Committee. In the present case, however, the RAB found no basis to reopen the case.

In its decision of 22 June 2016, the Board noted that the authors failed to appear at their accommodation centre since 20 January 2016. The Danish authorities are unaware of their place of residence current whereabouts. On 13 June 2016, the Danish Refugee Council informed the RAB that they were also unaware of their whereabouts, and that they may have travelled to Germany.

The RAB thus considered that the authors implicitly waived their application for residence under section 7 of the Aliens Act, and that there is accordingly no basis to reopen the case.

As for publication of the Views, the State party notes that cases against Denmark involving the RAB will be reported in the annual report of the Refugee Appeals Board. The annual report of the Refugee Appeals Board is distributed to all members of the Board for use in their work. The annual report of RAB includes a chapter on cases brought before international bodies. The annual report is available on the website of the Board. The RAB and the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs have also made the Committee’s views publicly available on their individual websites (www.fln.dk and www.um.dk).

Committee’s assessment:

(a) Effective remedy: A

(b) Publication of Views: A

Committee’s decision: Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

5. Estonia

**Communication** **No.** **2040/2011,**  ***Zeynalov* *v. Estonia***

Views adopted: 4 November 2015

Violation: article 14, paragraphs 3(d)

Subject-matter Right of the victim to be represented by a counsel of his choice throughout criminal proceedings; right to adequate time and facilities for the preparation of one’s defence.

Remedy: Adequate compensation

No previous follow-up information

Submission from State party

10 June 2016

The State party submits that the Views were translated to the Estonian language, and published on the website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Views were also disseminated to all relevant authorities and institutions, i.e. the Ministry of Justice, Courts, and the Public Prosecutor’s Office, to raise awareness and help prevent similar cases to occur in the future.

As for adequate compensation, the author had the possibility to use the Views as part of evidence in several ongoing and newly initiated court proceedings, which are directly related to the proceedings reviewed by the Committee. The author has also initiated a review procedure of his case with the Supreme Court.

The State party considers that these measures constitute adequate reparation.

Committee’s assessment:

(a) Effective remedy (adequate compensation): C

(b) Publication of Views: A

(c) Non-repetition: B

Submission from: Author

22 December 2016

The author considers that the State party has failed to implement the Views. According to the Estonian criminal procedure, the violation of the right to defence is an unconditional ground to cancel a sentence. Therefore, to restore legality and justice would require the repeal of Akhliman Zeynalov’s sentence and his release, or a trial de novo.

On 22 April 2016, the author brought a new petition before the Supreme Court, based on the Committee’s Views. Such request was rejected on 28 June 2016. Similar requests were filed on 24 and 27 June 2016, and on 17 and 19 July 2016. On 13 September 2016, the Supreme Court of Estonia dismissed these applications. On 30 September 2016, the author lodged a further application, asking for the reopening of court proceedings based on the Committee’s Views. On 13 December 2016, this application was rejected.

Committee’s decision: Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**6. Ireland**

**Communication** **No.** **2324/2013, *Mellet* *v. Ireland***

Views adopted: 31 March 2016

Violation: articles 7, 17 and 26

Subject-matter: Termination of pregnancy in a foreign country

Remedy: Adequate compensation and to make available to the author any psychological treatment she needs. The State party should amend its law on the voluntary termination of pregnancy, including if necessary its Constitution, to ensure compliance with the Covenant, ensuring effective, timely and accessible procedures for pregnancy termination in Ireland, and take measures to ensure that health-care providers are in a position to supply full information on safe abortion services without fearing they will be subjected to criminal sanctions, as indicated in the present Views of the Committee

No previous follow-up information

Submission from State party

30 November 2016

The State party recalls that in its legislation, termination of pregnancy is regulated by constitutional and statute law and in particular Article 40.3.3 of the Constitution. The *Protection of Life during Pregnancy Act 2013* restates the general prohibition on abortion in Ireland while regulating access to lawful termination of pregnancy. A foetus with a condition that is incompatible with life, but which is capable of being born alive, and survive even for a very short period, is protected by this provision. Consequently, the State is precluded from offering services within the State to terminate the pregnancies of women in positions similar to Ms. Mellet (absent a qualifying risk to the life of the pregnant woman).

The *Regulation of Information (Services outside the State for Terminations of Pregnancy) Act 1995*was passed following a referendum in 1992 which resulted in the addition of 2 new paragraphs to Article 40.3.3 of the Constitution. Paragraph 3 provides: *“this subsection shall not limit freedom to obtain or make available, in the State, subject to such conditions as may be laid down by law, information relating to services lawfully available in another state*.*”*

The 1995 Act regulated the manner in which information about services for the termination of pregnancy lawfully provides abroad could be sought and obtained in Ireland.

Also regarding general measures, the State party submits that in relation to health services, the Health Service Executive published the National Standards for Bereavement Care following Pregnancy Loss and Perinatal Death in August 2016. The purpose of the standards is to enhance bereavement care services for parents who experience a pregnancy loss or perinatal death. These standards cover all pregnancy loss situations from early pregnancy loss to perinatal death, as well as situations where there is a diagnosis of foetal anomaly that will be life limiting or may be fatal. These services are available to all parents who have suffered bereavement irrespective of when the bereavement occurred.

The standards also make explicit reference that, following termination in Ireland or abroad, women, parents and families are invited to meet with the Bereavement Service Team and are afforded the same level of bereavement care that is given to families who continue their pregnancy. Access to such services may be provided within the maternity or other community based setting.

In cases where women may opt for a termination without ever having first contacted a maternity service, post abortion counselling service is available via the Crisis Pregnancy Programme.

The National Standards referred to above reiterate that women who receive a diagnosis of a fatal foetal abnormality and choose to terminate their pregnancy should be provided with up to date information and contact details of services available abroad and to clinical services as required to discuss the diagnosis.

The Government is very conscious that the lack of access in this country to termination of pregnancy in cases of fatal foetal abnormality is one that has caused significant distress to many like Ms. Mellet. To address this situation would require a change to Article 40.3.3 of the Constitution and such a change would require careful consideration of the social, policy and legal issues involved.

Accordingly the Government has established a Citizens’ Assembly, in line with its Programme for Partnership Government commitment to consider a number of matters including constitutional reform. Under the Assembly’s terms of reference they are directed to first consider the Eighth Amendment of the Constitution (Article 40.3.3) and their conclusions on the matter will be submitted to the Houses of the Oireachtas for further debate[[5]](#footnote-6).

Ms. Justice Mary Laffoy, (Judge of the Supreme Court) will chair the Assembly comprised of 99 citizens randomly chosen from the population. The first meeting of the Assembly took place on 15 October 2016, and the Assembly will continue to meet on a regular basis to complete its work. The Oireachtas will have the opportunity to consider the recommendations from the Assembly in the first part of next year.

As for individual measures, and in acknowledgement of the Committee’s Views, the State party has offered Ms. Mellet the sum of thirty thousand euro (€30,000.00) on an ex gratia basis.

In addition, the State party will direct the Health Service Executive to ensure that Ms Mellet will have timely access to all appropriate psychological services provided by the Health Service Executive.

Submission from Author’s counsel

22 December 2016

The author’s counsel acknowledges that the State party has taken important steps in relation to the provision of compensation to Ms. Mellet, and has made a commitment to provide her with all necessary psychological treatment. However, although these measures are important, the State party has yet to take any of the law reform measures outlined by the Committee and it has not made any commitment to do so at the current time. As a result, in respect of the third, and critically important aspect of its remedial obligations, it has thus far failed to comply with the requirements set out by the Committee.

Concerning compensation and the ex gratia payment of 30,000 euros “in acknowledgment of the Human Rights Committee’s Views”, the author’s counsel notes that the State party confirmed that the funds would not be subject to tax in the State party and by correspondence dated 5 December 2016 Ms. Mellet accepted the Government’s offer of compensation and on 15 December 2016, Ms. Mellet received the funds. The author’s counsel welcomes this important step by the State party and considers this action, in accordance with the Committee’s own assessment criteria, to be satisfactory in complying with the State party’s obligation, as outlined by the Committee, to provide Ms. Mellet with adequate compensation.

Concerning the State party’s offer to provide Ms Mellet with access to any psychological counselling and support services she needs, the author’s counsel notes that for this offer to be accepted, it is critically important for her that she be able to personally identify, and choose, a psychologist. While initial action has been taken by the Government towards providing psychological counselling, it is not yet satisfactory.

Concerning law reform, the Irish Government has reaffirmed that it is currently precluded from legalizing access to abortion in any circumstances other than where the life of a pregnant woman is subject to a real and substantial risk, and is precluded from providing termination of pregnancy services to women in situations such as Ms. Mellet, because of Article 40.3.3 of the Irish Constitution (the 8th Amendment).

As such, according to the author’s counsel, the Government response indicates that none of the law reform measures outlined by the Committee as necessary for State party compliance with its remedial obligations have been adopted. Nor has the Government made any commitment to enact any such law reform measures. On the contrary, it appears to invoke its domestic law, including its Constitution, as justification for its failure to do so and ongoing failure to comply with its international obligations under the Covenant.

The only way in which the Constitution of Ireland can lawfully be changed is through a referendum of the electorate. The Government has made no commitment to hold any such referendum and thereafter reform Irish legislation on abortion. Nor has it established any timeframe within which any such referendum might be held in the future.

The establishment of the Assembly was not a result of the *Mellet v. Ireland* decision, as the Government had, in its May 2016 program for Government, committed to establishing the Citizens’ Assembly.

There is no obligation on either the Government or Parliament to accept, or act on, any of its recommendations. There is currently little information as to how the Citizens’ Assembly will function. It has held two meetings thus far, parts of which have been webcast, and has opened a call for written submissions from individuals and organizations which will be published on its website. The Minister for Health has stated that the Committee’s decision in *Mellet v. Ireland* will be part of the deliberations of the Citizens’ Assembly but no information has been provided as to what this will entail, even following our written request for further information.

The Citizens’ Assembly has been asked to complete its deliberations on the 8th Amendment within 6 months of its first meeting, which took place on 15 October 2016. However, if it requests an extension, then its mandate can be extended beyond 15 April 2017. The subsequent Parliamentary Committee will also be assigned six months for its deliberations, which can also be extended if requested.

Therefore none of the law reform measures outlined by the Committee in Paragraph 9 of its decision have been taken and the State party has made no commitment to do so. As such the State party has failed to date to take any steps to prevent similar violations occurring in the future.

Finally, concerning publication of the Views, while the decision has received significant public attention, inter alia through extensive media coverage, and has been published on the websites of some independent media sources, the Government has not yet published the Views through its official channels of communication.

Submission from: author’s counsel

26 January 2017

The author was informed by the State party that she would be able to freely choose a psychologist for the period of time deemed necessary.

However, the law-reform measures requested by the Committee have yet to be undertaken; Consequently, the author’s counsel asks the Committee to continue to closely scrutinize the State party’s implementation of the Views until effective law reform measures that meet the requirements outlined by the Committee have been adopted.

Submission from: State party

3 March 2017

The State party informs that Ms Mellet can identify a relevant clinician of her choosing for counselling through the Health Service Executive, and that she can pursue counselling sessions for the period of time deemed necessary between Ms Mellet and her clinician.

As for law reform, the State party reiterates that a Citizens’ Assembly was established, and that it is expected that the Assembly will report in June 2017.

The review of the Regulation of Information (Services outside the State for Termination of Pregnancy) Act 1995 is ongoing in the context of a recently initiated Private Member’s Bill: The Health and Social Care Professionals (Amendment) Bill 2016.

The decision of the Committee in this matter has been published on the website of the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, and arrangements will be made to publish the Views on the website of the Department of Health.

Submission from Author’s counsel

7 March 2017

The author’s counsel reiterates that although the State party has taken appropriate measures to comply with the individual remedies of compensation and psychological support, none of the remedial law reforms specified by the Committee have been undertaken by the State party. Until then, there can be no appropriate or satisfactory implementation of the Views, and no discharge by the State party’s remedial obligations to Ms. Mellet under the Covenant.

Committee’s assessment:

1. Effective remedy:

- Adequate compensation and to make available to the author any psychological treatment she needs: A

(b) Publication of Views: A

(c) Non-repetition:

- Amending of the law on the voluntary termination of pregnancy, including if necessary the Constitution: B

- Ensuring effective, timely and accessible procedures for pregnancy termination in Ireland: B

- Taking measures to ensure that health-care providers are in a position to supply full information on safe abortion services without fearing criminal sanctions: B.

**Committee’s decision:**

Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

**7. Lithuania**

***Paksas*, 2155/2012**

ViolationArticle 25 paragraphs (b) and (c).

Subject-matter Restrictions to the right to participate in public

Life (former President of Lithuania)

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/116/3 [[6]](#footnote-7)

Submission from author’s counsel

26 March 2016

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.

Mr. Paksas remains a political figure, leader of opposition, and there is no political majority in Parliament to execute the Views. The author’s counsel is of the opinion that it is the Courts of Lithuania which should execute the Views, as opposed to a change of Constitution through an act of Parliament, as the State party suggested. The author’s counsel reiterates that the voting rights of Lithuania to elect Members of the Human Rights Committee should be suspended.

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

8. Nepal

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Communication No. 2077/2011, *Sherpa v. Nepal*** | | |
| Views adopted: | 6 November 2015 | |
| Violation: | Art 7, Art 9 (1), (2), (5), Art 10 (1), Art 17, Art 2 (3), read in conjunction with Art 7, 9 (1), (2) and (5), 10 (1) and 17 | |
| Remedy: | Effective remedy: (a) conduct a thorough and effective investigation; (b) prosecute, try and punish responsible (c) provide adequate compensation and appropriate measures of satisfaction to and (d) ensure necessary and adequate psychological rehabilitation and medical treatment | |
| Subject-matter: | Enforced disappearance | |
| Previous follow-up information  Submission from the author’s counsel: | | CCPR/C/118/3[[7]](#footnote-8)  20 May 2016  The author’s counsel recalls the various judicial applications filed by the author, and stresses that the Supreme Court upheld the verdict of the Court of Appeal, by rejecting to revise the judgments of lower courts. Consequently, reinvestigation and re-prosecution in the same case is not permitted under the Nepalese judicial system. The author has exhausted all available legal avenues, and has failed to receive adequate compensation; also, the facts have yet to be investigated and perpetrators have yet to be prosecuted and punished.  The State party’s assertion that reinvestigation and re-prosecution would not be possible under Nepalese legislation is misleading and ill-conceived. There has never been a thorough investigation and corresponding prosecution in the first place; in addition, reference to limitations under domestic law cannot be invoked to bar investigations into gross human rights violations. The author’s counsel thus requests the Committee to grade the implementation with an E, and to ask the State party, ex-officio, to submit information about the steps taken to initiate investigations into the facts and prosecute perpetrators. |
|  | | 1. On 5 May 2016, the author’s wife submitted a letter to the Office of the Attorney General, seeking a thorough investigation into the arbitrary arrest, tortuire and ill-treatment, inhuman detention and harassment of the victim. No response was received. 2. As for compensation, the author’s counsel welcomes the additional amount offered by the State party, consisting of 20,000 rupees, (in addition to the 20,000 rupees which the Committee deemed inadequate). However, such amount (which corresponds to approximately 200 USD) is not commensurate with the gravity of the violations suffered. The mere offer of such a nominal amount of money is itself a mockery in the face of the author’s acute suffering. The author thus requests the Nepalese Ministry of Home Affairs to reconsider this amount, to take into account the gravity of the violations suffered and included, in accordance with the UN principles on reparations, at least, compensation for the psychological and mental harm, the loss of opportunities, material damage, and loss of earnings, as well as moral damages, as well as the costs incurred to date for medical care and legal assistance. The author’s counsel asks the Committee to offer the State party clear guidelines about the most appropriate method to calculate compensation.   On 5 May 2016, the author’s wife sent a letter to the Human Rights Unit of the Office of the Prime Minister, seeking compensation. No response was received. On 9 May 2016, the author’s wife met with a representative of this department, who informed her that the author would receive an additional 20,000 rupees. When she replied that this was insufficient, the author’s wife was informed that the Government was not considering increasing this amount.  Furthermore, no measure of satisfaction was offered. The author requests a public ceremony, in which the Nepalese authorities would recognize their responsibility, and express apologies to restore the victim’s dignity and reputation. This request was formally made to the Nepalese authorities, but received no answer. The author also asks the Committee to specify the nature of the measures of satisfaction expected from the State party.  Regarding psychological rehabilitation and medical treatment, the State party has submitted no information. It should bear the costs of a thorough medical and psychological examination, to be conducted in a public health institution agreed to by both parties, which should serve as a basis to assess the victim’s long term psychological and medical needs. The author currently experiences ongoing pain in his joints, and has difficulty walking. He also has sleeping difficulties. To date, he has received neither adequate psychological rehabilitation nor medical treatment, and has not been able to engage in a meaningful dialogue with the authorities in this respect.  Regarding measures of non-recurrence, the 2014 draft Bill is at odds with international standards, and torture continues to be treated as a civil tort. In addition, torture is subjected to an overly restrictive statute of limitation of 35 days.  Despite its submission of 22 March 2016, in which it claims that it shall translate and disseminate the Views, the author claims that this has yet to be done. The author’s wife filed a request in this regard before the Ministry of Law and Justice, but received no reply.  Concerning protection from acts of reprisals and intimidation, the author requests the State party to establish direct contact with him, with a view to designing a plan to protect hum and his family. |
| Committee’s decision: | | Follow-up dialogue ongoing  Send a reminder to the State party. |

9. Spain

**Communication No. 2008/2010, *Aarrass* *v. Spain***

Views adopted: 21 July 2014

Violation:

Subject-matter Extradition to Morocco

Violation Article 7

Remedy: Effective remedy, including by providing adequate compensation; and 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/118/3[[8]](#footnote-9)

Submission from author’s counsel:

31 August and 21 October 2016

In October 2016, Ali Aarrass was transferred from the Prison of Salé II, where he had been incarcerated since 2010, to the prison of Tiflet II, without specific reason. Mr. Aarrass is now subjected to a strict isolation regime, although he was in a conventional detention regime in Salé. He is held in a 2/3 m cell, alone, and without any contact. He has lost his voice as a result of isolation. He is only allowed to be outside for one hour a day. He is only entitled to one shower weekly. The food quality is extremely poor, with no fresh vegetables or fruits. He has no mattress and is forced to sleep on concrete.

According to the author’s counsel, this transfer to such harsh conditions of detention without any reason constitute reprisals, as well as inhumane treatment, or at least degrading treatment.

According to the author’s counsel, the State party has not ensured a proper follow-up to the situation of Mr. Aarrass. His cassation appeal is still pending, after four years.

On 29 June 2016, the Moroccan authorities refused to allow the visit of Mr. Aarrass by representatives of the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This arbitrary refusal indicates the will to isolate Mr. Aarrass, and to deny him any effective protection against daily acts of ill-treatment.

As for Spain, which was requested by the Committee to compensate the victim and to ensure that he is not subjected to ill-treatment, the Spanish authorities have merely sought general updates from the Moroccan authorities.

The author’s counsel reiterates her previous requests (see CCPR/C/116/3) for the Committee to impress upon the Spanish authorities to: visit the victim regularly to ensure his well-being and decent conditions of detention; to assist Mr. Aarrass with his requests to the Moroccan authorities, in particular with respect to his health; to request all medical data from the Moroccan detention authorities; to visit the victim with a Spanish doctor with experience in forensic examination of torture victims, who is able to report independently on the health condition and needs of the victim; to ensure that the victim’s conditions of detention are satisfactory; and to inquire on the progress in the cassation proceedings filed in Morocco in 2012 against his conviction and imprisonment, and concerning the investigation for torture allegations.

Committee’s decision:Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

17. Turkmenistan

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Communication No. 2218/2012, *Zafar Abdullayev v. Turkmenistan*** | |
| Views adopted: | 25 March 2015 |
| Violation: | Articles 7, 10 (1), 14 (7) and 18 (1) |
| Remedy: | Effective remedy, to include an impartial, effective and thorough investigation of the author’s claims falling under article 7, prosecution of any person(s) found to be responsible; expunging of his criminal record; and full reparation, including appropriate compensation. |
| Subject matter: | Conscientious objection to compulsory military service; inhuman and degrading treatment; conviction for the same offence twice. |
|  | No previous follow-up information |
| Submission from the author’s counsel: | 9 April 2016  The author’s counsel submits that Zafar Abdullayev’s record has not been expunged, nor has he received any compensation. However, since the adoption of the Committee’s Views in this case, the State party has no longer imprisoned any Jehovah witness for their conscientious objection to military service. Although several Jehovah witnesses have been convicted for refusing military service, in each case the courts have ordered the young men to perform “corrective labour” under article 219 of the Criminal Code, for a period of one to two years. The sentence of corrective labour is not a prison sentence. Instead, the conscientious objector remains free, but is required to pay 20 percent of his monthly salary from regular employment to the State budget.  On 4 April 2016, the author submitted a letter to the Prosecutor General of Turkmenistan and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Turkmenistan, requesting a meeting to discuss what steps could be taken to fully implement the Committee’s Views. No answer has been received as of yet. |

Committee’s decision:Follow-up dialogue ongoing

Follow-up activities under the Optional Protocol

**Annexe to CCPR/C/119/3 (ENGLISH ONLY)**

1. The table below displays a complete picture of Views adopted, where the Committee concluded to a violation of the Covenant, up to the 119th session (6-29 March 2017). It also indicates whether the dialogue between the State party and the Committee continues, or if it has been suspended or closed.

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. At its 118th session, on 4 November 2016, the Committee decided to revise its assessment criteria.

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/118/3) 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 |  |  |  | X A/64/40 | X |
|  | 1297/2004, *Medjnoune*  A/61/40 |  |  |  | X A/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 | X A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1781/2008, *Berzig* A/67/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1791/2008, *Sahbi* A/68/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1796/2008, *Zerrougui* A/69/40 |  |  |  | Not due yet | X |
|  | 1798/2008, *Azouz* A/69/40 |  |  |  | Not due yet | X |
|  | 1806/2008, *Saadoun* A/68/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1807/2008, *Mechani* A/68/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1811/2008, *Djebbar and Chihoub* A/67/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1831/2008, *Larbi* A/69/40 |  |  |  | Not due yet | X |
|  | 1874/2009, *Mihoubi* A/69/40 |  |  |  | Not due yet | X |
|  | 1884/2009, *Faraoun* A/69/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1889/2009, *Marouf* A/69/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1899/2009, *Lakhdar-Chaouch* A/69/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1900/2009, *Mehalli* A/69/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1905/2009, *Ouaghlissi* A/67/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | CCPR/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 |
| Angola (2) | 711/1996, *Dias*  A/55/40 | X A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1128/2002, *Marques* A/60/40 | X A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Argentina (4) | 400/1990, *Mónaco de Gallichio* A/50/40 | X A/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/66/40  Follow-up dialogue was closed with a note of satisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/69/40). | X A/68/40 |  |  |  |  |
| Australia (37) | 560/1993, *A.*  A/52/40 | X A/53/40, A/55/40, A/56/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 900/1999, *C*. A/58/40 | X A/58/40, CCPR/C/80/FU/1, A/60/40, A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 930/2000, *Winata et al.* A/56/40 | X CCPR/C/80/FU/1, A/57/40, A/60/40 A/62/40 and A/63/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 941/2000, *Young* A/58/40 | X A/58/40, A/60/40, A/62/40 and A/63/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1011/2001, *Madafferi*  Satisfactory response received. A residence permit was granted | X |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1014/2001, *Baban et al*. A/58/40 | X A/60/40, A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1020/2001, *Cabal and Pasini* A/58/40 | X A/58/40, CCPR/C/80/FU/1 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1036/2001, *Faure*  A/61/40 | X A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1050/2002, *Rafie and Safdel* A/61/40 | X A/62/40 and A/63/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1069/2002, *Bakhitiyari* A/59/40 | X A/60/40, A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1157/2003, *Coleman* A/61/40 | X A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1184/2003, *Brough* A/61/40 | X A/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 | X A/63/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1324/2004, *Shafiq* A/62/40 | X A/62/40 and A/63/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1347/2005, *Dudko* A/62/40 | X A/63/40, A/64/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1442/2005, *Kwok* A/65/40  Follow-up dialogue was closed with a note of satisfactory implementation of the recommendation  (see A/67/40, chap. VI). | X  A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1629/2007, *Fardon* A/65/40  Follow-up dialogue was closed with a note of unsatisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/69/40). | X A/66/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  | A/68/40 |
|  | 1557/2007, *Nystrom et al.* A/66/40  Follow-up dialogue was closed with a note of unsatisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/68/40). |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1635/2007, *Tillman* A/65/40  Follow-up dialogue was closed with a note of unsatisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/69/40). | X A/66/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  | A/68/40 |
|  | 1885/2009, *Horvath* A/69/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | CCPR/C/112/D/1968/2010, *Blessington and Elliot*  CCPR/C/112/D/1973/2010, *Griffiths* |  |  |  |  | X  X |
|  | 2094/2011, *Abdul Gafoor, Faleel Khan et al.* A/69/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 2136/2012, *Mofis, Mohammad Mufis et al.* A/69/40 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CCPR/C/113/D/1875/2009, *M.G.C*. CCPR/C/113/D/1937/2010, *Leghaei* |  |  |  |  | X X |
|  | CCPR/C/115/2005/2010, *Hicks* |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | CCPR/C/116/2229/2013, *Nasir* |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | CCPR/C/116/2233/2013, *Javadi*  CCPR/C/115/2279/2013, *Zoltowski et al.* |  |  |  |  | X  X |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Austria (4) | 415/1990, *Pauger* A/57/40 | X A/47/40, A/52/40, A/66/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 716/1996, *Pauger* A/54/40 | X A/54/40, A/55/40, A/57/40, A/66/40, CCPR/C/80/FU/1 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 965/2001, *Karakurt* A/57/40 | X A/58/40, CCPR/C/80/FU/1, A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1454/2006, *Lederbauer* A/62/40 | X A/63/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Azerbaijan (2) | 1633/2007, *Avadanov* A/66/40  CCPR/C/112/D/1972/2010, *Quliyev* |  |  |  | X | X A/68/40 |
| Belarus (88) | 780/1997, *Laptsevich* A/55/40 |  |  |  | X A/56/40, A/57/40 | X |
|  | 814/1998, *Pastukhov* A/58/40 |  |  |  | X A/59/40 | X |
|  | 886/1999, *Bondarenko* A/58/40 Case closed (ninety-second session) | X A/59/40, A/62/40 and A/63/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 887/1999, *Lyashkevich* A/58/40 Case closed (ninety-second session) | X A/59/40, A/62/40 and A/63/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 921/2000, *Dergachev* A/57/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 927/2000, *Svetik* A/59/40 | X A/60/40, A/61/40 and A/62/40 |  |  | X | X A/62/40 |
|  | 1009/2001, *Shchetko* A/61/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1022/2001, *Velichkin* A/61/40 |  |  |  | X A/61/40 | X |
|  | 1039/2001, *Boris et al*. A/62/40 | X A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1047/2002, *Sinitsin*, *Leonid* A/62/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1100/2002, *Bandazhewsky* A/61/40 | X A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1178/2003, *Smantser* A/64/40 | X A/65/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1207/2003, *Malakhovsky* A/60/40 | X A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1226/2003, *Korneenko* A/68/40 |  |  |  | X | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1274/2004, *Korneenko* A/62/40 | X A/62/40 |  |  |  | X A/62/40 |
|  | 1296/2004, *Belyatsky* A/62/40 | X A/63/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1311/2004, *Osiyuk* A/64/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1316/2004, *Gryb* A/67/40 |  |  |  | X | X A/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 | X  A/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1502/2006, *Marinich* A/65/40 | X  A/66/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1553/2007, *Korneenko* *and Milinkevich* A/64/40 | X  A/65/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1592/2007, *Pichugina* A/69/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1604/2007, *Zalesskaya* A/66/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1750/2008, *Sudalenko* A/67/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1772/2008, *Belyazeka* A/67/40  CCPR/C/112/D/1773/2008, *Kozulina* |  |  |  | X  X | X X  A/68/40 |
|  | 1784/2008, *Schumilin* A/68/40 |  |  |  | X |  |
|  | 1785/2008, *Oleshkevish* A/68/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1787/2008, *Kovsh (Abramova)* A/68/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1790/2008, *Govsha et al.* A/68/40 |  |  |  | X | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1820/2008, *Krassovskaya* A/67/40 | X |  |  |  | A/68/40 |
|  | 1808/2008, *Kovalenko* A/69/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1830/2008, *Pivonos* A/68/40 |  |  |  | X | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1835-1837/2008, *Yasinovich* A/68/40 |  |  |  | X | X X |
|  | 1836/2008, *Katsora* A/68/40 |  |  |  | X | A/68/40 |
|  | 1838/2008, *Tulzhenkova* A/67/40 |  |  |  | X | XX X |
|  | 1839/2008, *Komarovsky* A/69/40 |  |  |  | X X |  |
|  | 1851/2008, *Sekerko* A/69/40 |  |  |  | X | X X |
|  | 1864/2009, *Kirsanov* A/69/40 |  |  |  | X |  |
|  | 1867/2009, 1936, 1975, 1977-1891/2010**,** 2010/2010, *Levinov* A/68/40 |  |  |  | X | A/68/40 |
|  | CCPR/C/114/D/1902/2009, *Bakur* |  |  |  | X |  |
|  | 1903/2009, *Youbko* A/69/40  CCPR/C/112/D/1906/2010, *Yuzepchuk* |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1910/2009, *Zhuk* A/69/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1919-1920/2009, *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* |  |  |  | X X  X  X | X  X |
|  | 1948/2010, *Turchenyak* A/69/40  CCPR/C/112/D/1952/2010, *Symonik*  CCPR/C/111/D/1976/2010, *Kuznetsov et al.*  CCPR/C/111/D/1985/2010, *Koktish*  CCPR/C/111/D/1986/2010, *Kozlov*  CCPR/C/112/D/1987/2010, *Stambrovsky*  CCPR/C/111/D/1991/2010, *Volchek*  CCPR/C/111/D/1993/2010, *Mikhailovskaya and Volchek*  CCPR/C/112/D/1999/2010, *Evrezov, Nepomnyaschikh, Polyakov, and Rybchenko* |  |  |  | X X  X  X  X  X | X X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
|  | CCPR/C/114/1950/2010, *Timoshenko* |  |  |  | X |  |
|  | CCPR/C/114/1969/2010, *Surgan* |  |  |  | X |  |
|  | CCPR/C/114/1982/2010, *Mikhalchenko* |  |  |  |  | Not due yet |
|  | CCPR/C/114/1984/2010, *Pugach* |  |  |  | X |  |
|  | CCPR/C/114/1988/2010, *Evrezov* |  |  |  | X |  |
|  | CCPR/C/115/1996/2010, *Kruk* |  |  |  |  | Not due yet |
|  | CCPR/C/115/2011/2010, *Romanovsky* |  |  |  |  | Not due yet |
|  | CCPR/C/115/2016//2010,*Sudalenko* |  |  |  |  | Not due yet |
|  | CCPR/C/114/2017/2010, *Burdyko* |  |  |  |  | Not due yet |
|  | CCPR/C/115/2019//2010,*Poplavny* |  |  |  |  | Not due yet |
|  | CCPR/C/112/D/2029/2011, *Praded*  CCPR/C/111/D/2030/2010, *Poliakov* |  |  |  |  | X  X |
|  | CCPR/C/114/2036/2011, *Yusupova* |  |  |  |  | Not due yet |
|  | CCPR/C/115/2076/2011, *Derzhavtsev* |  |  |  |  | Not due yet |
|  | CCPR/C/116/2092/2011, *Androsenko* |  |  |  |  | Not due yet |
|  | 2065/2011, *Kvasha* A/68/40  CCPR/C/111/D/2103/2010, *Poliakyov*  CCPR/C/112/D/2114/2011, *Sudalenko* |  |  |  |  | X  X |
|  | CCPR/C/115/2133/2012, *Statkevich and Matskevich* |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | CCPR/C/115/2141/2012, *Kostenko* |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 2120/2011, *Kovalev* A/68/40  CCPR/C/112/D/2153/2012, *Kalyakin*  CCPR/C/112/D/2156/2012, *Nepomnyaschikh*  CCPR/C/112/D/2165/2012, *Pinchuk*  CCPR/C/113/D/1949/2010, *Kozlov et al.*  CCPR/C/113/D/1992/2010, *Sudalenko*  CCPR/C/113/D/2013/2010, *Grishkovtsov* |  |  |  | X  X  X  X |  |
|  | CCPR/C/115/2289/2013, *Selyun* |  |  |  | Not due yet |  |
| Belgium (1) | 1472/2006, *Sayadi* A/64/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
| Benin (1) | CCPR/C/111/D/2055/2011, *Zinsou* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bolivia (Plurinational State of) (1) | 176/1984, *Peñarrieta* A/43/40 | X A/52/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina (9) | 1917-1918-1925/2008, *Prutina et al.* A/68/40  1955/2010, *Al-Gertani* A/69/40  CCPR/C/111/D/1956/2010, *Duric*  CCPR/C/112/D/1966/2010, *Hero*  CCPR/C/112/D/1970/2010, *Kožljak* |  |  |  |  | X  X  X |
|  | 1997/2010, *Rizvanović et al*  A/69/40  CCPR/C/111/D/2003/2010, *Selimović et al.*  CCPR/C/113/D/2022/2011, *Hamulić et al.*  CCPR/C/113/D/2028/2011*, Ičić et al.* |  |  |  |  | X  X  X |
| Bulgaria (1) | 2073/2011, *Naidenova et al.*  A/68/40 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Burkina Faso (1) | 1159/2003, *Sankara et al.* A/61/40  Follow-up dialogue was closed with a note of satisfactory implementation of the Committee’s recommendation.  (A/63/40) | X A/63/40 |  |  |  |  |
| Cameroon (8) | 458/1991, *Mukong* A/49/40 |  |  |  | X A/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 had complied with the Views (A/59/40). | X A/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 | X A/65/40 |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1397/2005, *Engo* A/64/40 | X A/67/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1813/2008, *Akwanga* A/66/40  CCPR/C/112/D/1965/2010, *Monika* |  |  |  | X | X A/68/40 |
| Canada (15) | 27/1978, *Pinkney* Fourteenth sessiona |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 167/1984, *Lubicon Lake Band*  A/45/40 | X A/59/40, A/61/40, A/62/40 |  |  |  | X A/62/40 |
|  | 694/1996, *Waldman* A/55/40 | X A/55/40, A/56/40, A/57/40, A/59/40, A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 829/1998, *Judge* A/58/40 | X A/59/40, A/60/40 |  |  |  | XA/60/40 |
|  | 1051/2002, *Ahani* A/59/40 | X A/60/40, A/61/40 |  |  |  | XbA/60/40 |
|  | 1465/2006, *Kaba* A/65/40 | X A/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1467/2006, *Dumont* A/65/40  Follow-up dialogue was closed with a note of satisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/69/40). | X A/66/40, A/67/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1544/2007, *Hamida* A/65/40 | X A/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1763/2008, *Pillai et al*. Follow-up dialogue was closed with a note of satisfactory implementation of the recommendation (see A/68/40). | X A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1792/2008 *Dauphin* A/64/40 | X A/65/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1881/2009, *Masih*  A/69/40 | Not due |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1898/2009, *Choudhary* A/69/40 | Not due |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1912/2009, *Thuraisamy* A/68/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1959/2010, *Warsame* A/66/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | CCPR/C/113/D/2091/2011, *A.H.G.* |  |  |  |  | X |
| Central African Republic (1) | 1587/2007 *Mamour* A/64/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
| Colombia (17) | 45/1979, *Suárez de Guerrero* Fifteenth sessiona | X A/52/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 46/1979, *Fals Borda*  Sixteenth sessiona | X A/52/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 64/1979, *Salgar de Montejo* Fifteenth sessiona | X A/52/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | X (A/68/40) |
|  | 161/1983, *Herrera Rubio*  Thirty-first sessionc | X A/52/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 181/1984, *Sanjuán Arévalo* *brothers* A/45/40 | X A/52/40, A/64/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 195/1985, *Delgado Páez* A/45/40 | X A/52/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 514/1992, *Fei* A/50/40 | X A/51/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 612/1995, *Arhuacos* A/52/40 | X  A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 687/1996, *Rojas García* A/56/40 | X A/58/40, A/59/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 778/1997, *Coronel et al*. A/58/40 | X A/59/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 848/1999, *Rodríguez Orejuela*,A/57/40 | X A/58/40, A/59/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 859/1999, *Jiménez Vaca* A/57/40 | X A/58/40, A/59/40, A/61/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1298/2004, *Becerra* A/61/40 | X A/62/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1361/2005, *Casadiego* A/62/40 | X A/63/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1611/2007, *Bonilla Lerma* A/66/40 | X |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1641/2007, *Calderón Bruges* A/67/40 | X A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | CCPR/C/114/2134/2012,  *Molina et al*. |  |  |  | X |  |
| Côte d’Ivoire (1) | 1759/2008, *Traoré* A/67/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
| Croatia (2) | 727/1996, *Paraga* A/56/40 | X A/56/40, A/58/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1510/2006, *Vojnović*,  A/64/40 | X A/65/40, A/66/40 |  |  |  |  |
| Czech Republic (27)d | 516/1992, *Simunek et al.* A/50/40 | X A/51/40, A/57/40, A/58/40, A/61/40, A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 586/1994, *Adam* A/51/40 | X A/51/40, A/53/40, A/54/40, A/57/40, A/61/40, A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 747/1997,  *Des Fours Walderode* A/57/40 | X A/57/40, A/58/40,  A/61/40, A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 757/1997, *Pezoldova* A/58/40 | X A/60/40, A/61/40 and A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 765/1997, *Fábryová* A/57/40 | X A/57/40, A/58/40,  A/61/40, A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 823/1998, *Czernin* A/60/40 | X A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 857/1999, *Blazek et al*. A/56/40 | X A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 945/2000, *Marik* A/60/40 | X A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 946/2000, *Patera* A/57/40 | X A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1054/2002, *Kriz* A/61/40 | X A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1445/2006, *Polacek* A/62/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1448/2006, *Kohoutek* A/63/40 | X A/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 |
|  | 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 (15)e | 16/1977, *Mbenge* Eighteenth sessionc |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 90/1981, *Luyeye* Nineteenth sessionc |  |  |  | X A/61/40 | X |
|  | 124/1982, *Muteba* Twenty-second sessionc |  |  |  | X A/61/40 | X |
|  | 138/1983, *Mpandanjila et al.* Twenty-seventh sessionc |  |  |  | X A/61/40 | X |
|  | 157/1983, *Mpaka Nsusu* Twenty-seventh sessionc |  |  |  | X A/61/40 | X |
|  | 194/1985, *Miango* Thirty-first sessionc |  |  |  | X A/61/40 | X |
|  | 241/1987, *Birindwa* A/45/40 |  |  |  | X A/61/40 | X |
|  | 242/1987, *Tshisekedi* A/45/40 |  |  |  | X A/61/40 | X |
|  | 366/1989, *Kanana* A/49/40 |  |  |  | X A/61/40 | X |
|  | 542/1993, *Tshishimbi* A/51/40 |  |  |  | X A/61/40 | X |
|  | 641/1995, *Gedumbe* A/57/40 |  |  |  | X A/61/40 | X A/68/40 |
|  | 933/2000, *Mundyo Busyo et* *al.*(68 judges) A/58/40 |  |  |  | X A/61/40 | X |
|  | 962/2001, *Mulezi* A/59/40 |  |  |  | X A/61/40 | X |
|  | 1177/2003, *Wenga and Shandwe* A/61/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1890/2009, *Kitenge* A/69/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | CCPR/C/115/2214/2012, *Lumbala* |  |  |  | X |  |
| Denmark (10)) | 1554/2007, *El-Hichou* A/65/40 | X A/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 2007/2010, *J.J.M.* A/69/40  Follow-up dialogue closed at the 115th session with a note of satisfactory implementation of the Committee’s recommendation  CCPR/C/112/D/2243/2013, *Husseini*  CCPR/C/113/D/2001/2010, *Q* |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | CCPR/C/114/2389/2014,  *X.* | X |  |  |  | X |
|  | CCPR/C/116/2409/2014, *Ali et al.* | X |  |  |  | X |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CCPR/C/114/2360/2014,  *Jasin* | X |  |  |  | X |
|  | CCPR/C/114/2343/2014,  *H.E.A.K.*, | X |  |  |  | X |
|  | CCPR/C/115/2258/2013, *Rasappu et al.* | X |  |  |  | X |
|  | CCPR/C/114/2288/2013,  *Omo-Amenaghawon et al.* | X  X |  |  |  | X  X |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dominican Republic (2) | 193/1985, *Giry* A/45/40 | X A/52/40, A/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 449/1991, *Mojica* A/49/40 | X A/52/40, A/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Ecuador (3) | 277/1988, *Terán Jijón* A/47/40 | X A/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 319/1988, *Cañón García* A/47/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | CCPR/C/116/2244/2013, *Dassum* |  |  |  | X | X |
| Equatorial Guinea (3) | 414/1990, *Primo Essono* A/49/40 | A/62/40f |  |  | X | X |
|  | 468/1991, *Oló Bahamonde* A/49/40 | A/62/40f |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1152 and 1190/2003,  *Ndong et al*. and *Mic Abogo* A/61/40 | A/62/40f |  |  | X | X |
| Estonia (1) | CCPR/C/115/2040/2011, *Zeynalov* | X |  |  |  | X |
| Finland (1) | 779/1997, *Äärelä et al*. A/57/40 | X A/57/40, A/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
| France (6) | 1620/2007, *J.O.* A/66/40 | X A/67/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1760/2008, *Cochet* A/66/40 |  |  |  | X | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1852/2008, *Singh* A/68/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1876/2009, *Singh* A/66/40 | X A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1928/2010, *Singh* A/69/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1960/2010, *Ory* A/69/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
| Georgia (3) | 626/1995, *Gelbekhiani* A/53/40 | X  A/54/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 627/1995, *Dokvadze* A/53/40 | X A/54/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 975/2001, *Ratiani* A/60/40 | X A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Germany (1) | 1482/2006, *Gerlach* A/63/40 | X A/64/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Ghana (1) | 2177/2012*, Johnson* A/69/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
| Greece (4) | 1070/2002, *Kouldis* A/61/40 | X A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1486/2006, *Kalamiotis* A/63/40 | X  A/64/40 A/68/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1558/2007, *Katsaris* A/68/40 | X |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1799/2008, *Georgopoulos et al.* A/65/40 | X A/66/40, A/67/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
| Guyana (9) | 676/1996, *Yasseen and Thomas* A/53/40 | A/60/40*f* A/62/40 |  |  | X A/60/40 | X |
|  | 728/1996, *Sahadeo* A/57/40 | A/60/40*f*  A/62/40 |  |  | X A/60/40 | X |
|  | 811/1998, *Mulai*,  A/59/40 | A/60/40*f*  A/62/40 |  |  | X A/60/40 | X |
|  | 812/1998, *Persaud* A/61/40 | A/60/40*f* A/62/40 |  |  | X | X |
|  | 862/1999, *Hussain and Hussain* A/61/40 | A/60/40*f* A/62/40 |  |  | X | X |
|  | 838/1998, *Hendriks* A/58/40 | A/60/40*f* A/62/40 |  |  | X A/60/40 | X |
|  | 867/1999, *Smartt* A/59/40 | A/60/40*f* A/62/40 |  |  | X A/60/40 | X |
|  | 912/2000, *Ganga* A/60/40 | A/60/40*f* A/62/40 |  |  | X A/60/40 | X |
|  | 913/2000, *Chan* A/61/40 | A/60/40*f* A/62/40 |  |  | X | X |
| Hungary (3) | 410/1990, *Párkányi* A/47/40 | X |  |  |  | X |
|  | 521/1992, *Kulomin* A/51/40 | X A/52/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 852/1999, *Borisenko* A/58/40 | X A/58/40, A/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Iceland (1) | 1306/2004, *Haraldsson and Sveinsson*, A/62/40  Follow-up dialogue ed, with a partly satisfactory implementation of the recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI). | X A/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 | X A/55/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Jamaica (98) | 92 casesg |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 695/1996, *Simpson* A/57/40 | X A/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 | X A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Kazakhstan (7) | CCPR/C/111/D/2009/2010, *Ilyasov*  2024/2011, *Israil* A/67/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 2104/2011, *Valetov* A/69/40  CCPR/C/112/D/2131/2012, *Leven*  CCPR/C/112/D/2137/2012, *Toregozhina* |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | CCPR/C/116/2129/2012, *Esergepov* |  |  |  | Not due yet | X |
|  | CCPR/C/115/2304/2013, *Dzhakishev* |  |  |  | Not due yet | X |
| Kyrgyzstan (17) | 1275/2004, *Umetaliev and Tashtanbekova* A/64/40 | X A/65/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1312/2004, *Latifulin* A/65/40 | X A/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1338/2005, *Kaldarov* A/65/40 | X A/66/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1369/2005, *Kulov* A/65/40 | X A/66/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1402/2005, *Krasnov*  A/66/40 | X A/66/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1461, 1462, 1476 and 1477/2006, *Maksudov*, *Rakhimov*, *Tashbaev*, *Pirmatov* A/63/40 | X A/65/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1470/2006, *Toktakunov* A/66/40  Follow-up dialogue closed with satisfactory implementation of the recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI) | X A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1503/2006, *Akhadov* A/66/40 | X A/67/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1545/2007, *Gunan* A/66/40 | X A/67/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1547/2007, *Torobekov* A/67/40 | X |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1756/2008, *Moidunov and Zhumbaeva* A/66/40  CCPR/C/113/D/2054/2011, *Ernazarov* | X A/67/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40  X |
|  | CCPR/C/115/2052/2011, *Akmatov* |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | CCPR/C/116/2231/2012, *Askarov* |  |  |  |  | X |
| Latvia (2) | 884/1999, *Ignatane* A/56/40 | X A/57/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1621/2007, *Raihman* A/66/40 |  |  |  | X | X A/68/40 |
| Libya (20) | 440/1990, *El-Megreisi* A/49/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1107/2002, *El Ghar* A/60/40 | X A/61/40, A/62/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1143/2002, *Dernawi* A/62/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 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/66/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1755/2008, *El Hagog Jumaa* A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1776/2008, *Ali Bashasha and Hussein Bashasha* |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1782/2008, *Aboufaied* A/67/40 A/66/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1804/2008, *Il Khwildy* A/68/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1805/2008, *Benali* A/68/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1832/2008, *Al Khazmi*  A/69/40  CCPR/C/111/D/1860/2009, *Al Rabassi* |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1880/2009, *Nenova et al.* A/67/40  CCPR/C/111/D/1882/2009, *Al Daquel* |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1913/2009, *Abushala* A/68/40  CCPR/C/111/D/1958/2010, *El Hojouj et al.*  CCPR/C/112/D/2046/2011, *Hmeed*  2006/2010, *Almegaryaf and Matar*  A/69/40 |  |  |  |  | X  X  X |
| Lithuania (1) | 2155/2012, *Paksas* A/69/40 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Madagascar (4) | 49/1979, *Marais* Eighteenth sessionc |  |  |  | Xh | X |
|  | 115/1982, *Wight* Twenty-fourth sessionc |  |  |  | Xh | X |
|  | 132/1982, *Jaona* Twenty-fourth sessionc |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 155/1983, *Hammel* A/42/40*c* |  |  |  | X | X |
| Mauritius (1) | 1744/2007, *Narrain et al.* A/68/40 | X A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
| Nepal (12) | 1469/2006, *Sharma* A/64/40 | X A/64/40, A/66/40, A/67/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1761/2008, *Giri et al.* A/66/40 | X A/67/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1863/2009, *Maharjan* A/68/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1865/2009, *Sedhai* A/69/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1870/2009, *Sobhraj* A/65/40  CCPR/C/112/D/2018/2010, *Chaulagain*  CCPR/C/112/D/2031/2011, *Bhandari*  CCPR/C/112/D/2051/2011, *Basnet*  CCPR/C/112/D/2111/2011, *Tripathi et al.*  CCPR/C/113/D/2000/2010, *Katwal* | X A/66/40, A/67/40, A/68/40  X  X  X  X |  |  |  | X A/68/40  X |
|  | CCPR/C/114/2038/2011,  *Tharu et al.* | X |  |  |  | X |
|  | CCPR/C/115/2077/2011, *A.S.* | X |  |  |  | X |
| Netherlands (6) | 786/1997, *Vos* A/54/40 | X A/55/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 976/2001, *Derksen* A/59/40 | X A/60/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1238/2003, *Jongenburger Veerman* A/61/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1564/2007, *X.H.L.* A/66/40 | X A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1797/2008, *Mennen* A/65/40  CCPR/C/111/D/2097/2011, *Timmer* |  |  |  | X | X |
| New Zealand (2) | 1368/2005, *Britton* A/62/40 | X A/63/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1512/2006, *Dean* A/64/40 | X A/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 | X A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1542/2007, *Aboushanif* A/63/40  Follow-up dialogue was closed with a note of satisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/69/40). | X A/65/40 |  |  |  |  |
| Panama (2) | 289/1988, *Wolf* A/47/40 | X A/53/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 473/1991, *Barroso* A/50/40 | X A/53/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Paraguay (3) | 1407/2005, *Asensi*  A/64/40 | X A/65/40, A/66/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1828/2008, *Domínguez* A/67/40 | X A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1829/2008, *Benítez Gamarra* A/67/40 | X A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
| Peru (15) | 202/1986, *Ato del Avellanal* A/44/40 | X A/52/40, A/59/40, A/62/40 and A/63/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 203/1986, *Muñoz Hermosa* A/44/40  Follow-up dialogue was closed with a note of unsatisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/69/40). | X A/52/40, A/59/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | A/68/40 |
|  | 263/1987, *González del Río* A/48/40 | X A/52/40, A/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 309/1988, *Orihuela Valenzuela* A/48/40 | X A/52/40, A/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 540/1993, *Celis Laureano* A/51/40 | X A/59/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | X  A/68/40 |
|  | 577/1994, *Polay Campos* A/53/40 | X A/53/40, A/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 678/1996, *Gutiérrez Vivanco* A/57/40 | X A/58/40, A/59/40, A/64/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 688/1996, *Arredondo* A/68/40 | X A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 906/1999, *Vargas-Machuca* A/57/40 |  |  |  | X A/58/40, A/59/40 | X |
|  | 981/2001, *Gómez Casafranca* A/58/40 | X A/59/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1058/2002, *Vargas* A/61/40 | X A/61/40 and A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1125/2002, *Quispe* A/61/40 | X A/61/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1126/2002, *Carranza* A/61/40 | X A/61/40, A/62/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1153/2003, *K.N.L.H.* A/61/40 | X A/61/40, A/62/40 and A/63/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1457/2006, *Poma* *Poma* A/64/40 | X A/65/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
| Philippines (11) | 788/1997, *Cagas* A/57/40 | X A/59/40, A/60/40, A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 868/1999, *Wilson* A/59/40 | X A/60/40, A/61/40, A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 869/1999, *Piandiong et al*. A/56/40 | X N/A |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1089/2002, *Rouse* A/60/40 |  |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1320/2004, *Pimentel et al*. A/62/40  The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of a unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI). | X A/63/40, A/64/40, A/66/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1421/2005, *Larrañaga* A/61/40 | X |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1466/2006, *Lumanog and Santos* A/63/40 | X A/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 | X A/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1815/2008, *Adonis* A/67/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
| Portugal (1) | 1123/2002, *Correia de Matos* A/61/40 | X A/62/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
| Republic of Korea (12) | 518/1992, *Sohn* A/50/40 | X A/60/40, A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 574/1994, *Kim* A/54/40 | X A/60/40, A/62/40, A/64/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 628/1995, *Park* A/54/40 | X A/54/40, A/64/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 878/1999, *Kang* A/58/40 | X A/59/40, A/64/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 926/2000, *Shin* A/59/40 | X A/60/40, A/62/40, A/64/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1119/2002, *Lee* A/60/40 | X A/61/40, A/64/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1321 and 1322/2004, *Yoon*, *Yeo-Bzum and* *Choi*, *Myung-Jin* A/62/40 | X A/62/40 and A/63/40 A/64/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1593 to 1603/2007, *Jung et al*. A/65/40 | X A/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1642-1741/2007, *Jeong et al*. A/66/40 | X A/67/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1786/2008, *Kim et al.* A/68/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1908/2009, *X.* A/69/40  Case closed at the 116th session  with a finding of satisfactory implementation of the Committee’s recommendation  CCPR/C/112/D/2179/2012, *Young-kwan Kim  et al*. |  |  |  |  | X |
| Romania (1) | 1158/2003, *Blaga* A/60/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
| Russian Federation (29) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 712/1996, *Smirnova* A/59/40 | X A/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 | X A/60/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 815/1997, *Dugin* A/59/40 | X A/60/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 889/1999, *Zheikov* A/61/40 | X A/62/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1218/2003, *Platanov* A/61/40 | X A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1232/2003, *Pustovalov* A/65/40 | X A/66/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1278/2004, *Reshnetnikov* A/64/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1304/2004, *Khoroshenko* A/66/40 |  |  |  | X | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1310/2004, *Babkin* A/63/40 | X  A/64/40, A/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1410/2005, *Yevdokimov and Rezanov* A/66/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1447/2006, *Amirov*  A/64/40 | X A/65/40, A/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1548/2007, *Kholodov* A/68/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1577/2007, *Usaev* A/65/40 | X A/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1605/2007, *Zyuskin* A/66/40 |  |  |  | X | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1628/2007, *Pavlyuchenkov* A/68/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1795/2008, *Zhirnov* A/69/40 |  |  |  | X (24/02) | X |
|  | 1856/2008, *Sevostyanov* A/69/40 |  |  |  | X (24/02) | X |
|  | 1866/2009, *Chebotareva* A/67/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1873/2009, *Alekseev* A/69/40 |  |  |  | X (24/02) | X |
|  | 1932/2010, *Fedotova* A/68/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 2041/2011, *Dorofeev*  2126/2011, *Kesmatulla* |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CCPR/C/116/1941/2010,  *Neporozhnev* |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | CCPR/C/114/2036/2011, *Yusupova* |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | CCPR/C/116/2059/2011,  *Mamonov* |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | CCPR/C/116/2099/2011  *Polskikh* |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | CCPR/C/115/2141/2012,  *Kostenko* |  |  |  | X | X |
| Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (1) | 806/1998, *Thompson* A/56/40 |  |  |  | X A/61/40 | X |
| Serbia (1) | 1556/2007, *Novaković* A/66/40 | X A/66/40, A/67/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
| Sierra Leone (3) | 839/1998, *Mansaraj et al*. A/56/40 | X A/57/40, A/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 840/1998, *Gborie et al*. A/56/40 | X A/57/40, A/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 841/1998, *Sesay et al*. A/56/40 | X A/57/40, A/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
| South Africa (1) | 1818/2008, *McCallum* A/66/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
| Spain (25) | 493/1992, *Griffin* A/50/40 | X A/59/40, A/58/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 526/1993, *Hill* A/52/40 | X A/53/40, A/56/40, A/58/40, A/59/40, A/60/40, A/61/40, A/64/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 701/1996, *Gómez Vásquez* A/55/40 | X A/56/40, A/57/40, A/58/40, A/60/40, A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 864/1999, *Ruiz Agudo* A/58/40 |  |  |  | X A/61/40 | X |
|  | 986/2001, *Semey* A/58/40 | X A/59/40, A/60/40, A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1006/2001, *Muñoz* A/59/40 |  |  |  | X A/61/40 | X |
|  | 1007/2001, *Sineiro Fernando* A/58/40 | X A/59/40, A/60/40, A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1073/2002, *Terón Jesús* A/60/40 |  |  |  | X A/61/40 | X |
|  | 1095/2002, *Gomariz* A/60/40 |  |  |  | X A/61/40 | X |
|  | 1101/2002, *Alba Cabriada* A/60/40 |  |  |  | X A/61/40 | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1104/2002, *Martínez Fernández* A/60/40 |  |  |  | X A/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 | X A/66/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1364/2005, *Carpintero* A/64/40 | X A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1381/2005, *Hachuel* A/62/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1473/2006, *Morales Tornel*, A/64/40  Follow-up dialogue was closed with a note of unsatisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/69/40). | X A/66/40, A/68/40 |  |  |  | A/68/40 |
|  | 1493/2006, *Williams Lecraft* A/64/40  Case was closed during the ninety-ninth session, in the light of the measures taken by the State party (A/66/40). | X A/65/40, A/66/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1531/2006 *Cunillera Arias* A/66/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1945/2010, *Achabal* A/68/40  CCPR/C/111/D/2008/2010 *Aarrass* |  |  |  |  | X |
| Sri Lanka (15) | 916/2000, *Jayawardena* A/57/40 | X A/58/40, A/59/40, A/60/40, A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 950/2000, *Sarma* A/58/40 | X A/59/40, A/60/40, A/63/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 909/2000, *Kankanamge* A/59/40 | X A/60/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1033/2001, *Nallaratnam* A/59/40 | X A/60/40, A/64/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1189/2003, *Fernando* A/60/40 | X A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1249/2004, *Immaculate Joseph et al.* A/61/40 | X A/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 | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1406/2005, *Weerawanza*, A/64/40 |  |  |  | X | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1426/2005, *Dingiri Banda* A/63/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1432/2005, *Gunaratna* A/64/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1436/2005, *Sathasivam* A/63/40 |  |  |  | X A/65/40 | X |
|  | 1862/2009, *Pathmini Peiris et al.* A/67/40  CCPR/C/113/D/2087/2011, *Guneththige* |  |  |  |  | X |
| Suriname (8) | 146/1983, *Baboeram* Twenty-fourth sessionc | X A/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 sessionc | X A/51/40, A/52/40, A/53/40, A/55/40, A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Sweden (3) | 1416/2005, *Alzery* A/62/40 | X A/62/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1833/2008, *X.* A/67/40  Follow-up dialogue was closed with a note of satisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/69/40). | X A/68/40 |  |  |  | A/68/40 |
|  | 2149/2012, *Islam* A/69/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
| Tajikistan (22) | 964/2001, *Saidov* A/59/40  The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI). | X A/60/40, A/62/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 973/2001, *Khalilova* A/60/40  The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI). | X A/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 unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI). | A/62/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1042/2002, *Boimurudov* A/61/40  The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI) | X A/62/40, A/63/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1044/2002, *Nazriev* A/61/40 | X A/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 unsatisfactory 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/62/40  The Committee decided to close the follow-up dialogue concerning the case of Mr. A. Davlatov and to suspend the dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation, concerning Mr. Karimov, Mr. Askarov and Mr. N. Davlatov (see A/67/40, chap. VI) | X A/63/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1117/2002, *Khomidova* A/59/40  The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI) | X A/60/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1195/2003, *Dunaev*  A/64/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1200/2003, *Sattorova* A/64/40  The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI) | X A/65/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1208/2003, *B.* *Kurbanov* A/61/40  The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI) | X A/62/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1209/2003, 1231/2003 and 1241/2004, *Rakhmatov, Safarov and Salimov* and *Mukhammadiev* A/63/40  The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI) | X A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1263/2004 and 1264/2004,  *Khuseynov* and *Butaev* A/64/40  The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI) | X A/65/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1276/2004, *Idiev* A/64/40  The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI) | X A/65/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1348/2005, *Ashurov* A/62/40  The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI) | X A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1401/2005, *Kirpo* A/65/40  The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI) | X A/66/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1499/2006, *Iskandarov* A/66/40 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1519/2006, *Khostikoev* A/65/40  The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI) | X A/66/40, A/67/40 |  |  |  |  |
| Togo (4) | 422 to 424/1990,  *Aduayom et al*. A/51/40 | X A/56/40, A/57/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 505/1992, *Ackla* A/51/40 | X A/56/40, A/57/40 |  |  |  | X |
| Trinidad and Tobago (23) | 232/1987, *Pinto* A/45/40 and 512/1992, *Pinto* A/51/40 | X A/51/40, A/52/40, A/53/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 362/1989, *Soogrim* A/48/40 | X A/51/40, A/52/40 A/53/40, A/58/40 |  |  | X | X |
|  | 434/1990, *Seerattan* A/51/40 | X A/51/40, A/52/40, A/53/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 523/1992, *Neptune* A/51/40 | X A/51/40, A/52/40 A/53/40, A/58/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 533/1993, *Elahie* A/52/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 554/1993, *La Vende* A/53/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 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 |  |  |  | X A/58/40 | X |
|  | 899/1999, *Francis et al*. A/57/40 |  |  |  | X A/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 |  |  |  | X A/51/40, A/53/40 | X |
| Turkey (2) | 1853/2008 and 1854/2008, *Atasoy* and *Sarkut*  A/67/40 | X A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
| Turkmenistan (10) | 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/67/40  CCPR/C/112/D/2069/2011, *Shikhmuradov*  CCPR/C/113/D/2079/2011, *Khadzhiev*  CCPR/C/113/D/2218/2012, *Abdullayev* |  |  |  |  | X  X  X |
|  | CCPR/C/115/2221/2012,  *M. Hudaybergenov* | X |  |  |  | X |
|  | CCPR/C/115/2222/2012,  *A.Hudaybergenov* | X |  |  |  | X |
|  | CCPR/C/115/2223/2012, *Japparow* | X |  |  |  | X |
| Ukraine (5) | 781/1997, *Aliev* A/58/40 | X A/60/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1405/2005, *Pustovoit* A/69/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1412/2005, *Butovenko* A/66/40 |  |  |  | X | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1535/2006, *Shchetka* A/66/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1803/2008, *Bulgakov* A/68/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
| Uruguay (39) | A.[5/1977, *Massera* Seventh session 43/1979, *Caldas* Nineteenth session 63/1979, *Antonaccio* Fourteenth session 73/1980, *Izquierdo* Fifteenth session 80/1980, *Vasiliskis* Eighteenth session 83/1981, *Machado* Twentieth session 84/1981, *Dermit Barbato* Seventeenth session 85/1981, *Romero* Twenty-first session 88/1981, *Bequio* Eighteenth session 92/1981, *Nieto* Nineteenth session 103/1981, *Scarone* Twentieth session 105/1981, *Cabreira* Nineteenth session 109/1981, *Voituret* Twenty-first session 123/1982, *Lluberas* Twenty-first session] | X 43 follow-up replies received  A/59/40i |  |  |  | X |
|  | B.[103/1981, *Scarone* 73/1980, *Izquierdo* 92/1981, *Nieto* 85/1981, *Romero*] |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | C.[63/1979, *Antonaccio* 80/1980, *Vasiliskis* 123/1982, *Lluberas*] |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | D.[4/1977, *Ramirez* Fourth session 6/1977, *Sequeiro* Sixth session 25/1978, *Massiotti* Sixteenth session 28/1978, *Weisz*  Eleventh session 32/1978, *Touron* Twelfth session  33/1978, *Carballal* Twelfth session 37/1978, *De Boston* Twelfth session 44/1979, *Pietraroia*  Twelfth session 52/1979, *Lopez Burgos* Thirteenth session 56/1979, *Celiberti* Thirteenth session 66/1980, *Schweizer* Seventeenth session 70/1980, *Simones* Fifteenth session 74/1980, *Estrella* Eighteenth session 110/1981, *Viana* Twenty-first session 139/1983, *Conteris* Twenty-fifth session 147/1983, *Gilboa* Twenty-sixth session 162/1983, *Acosta* Thirty-fourth session] |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | E.[30/1978, *Bleier* Fifteenth session 84/1981, *Dermit Barbato* Seventeenth session 107/1981, *Quinteros* Nineteenth session] |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 159/1983, *Cariboni* A/43/40*c* |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 322/1988, *Rodríguez* A/51/40, A/49/40 |  |  |  | X A/51/40 | X |
|  | 1887/2009, *Peirano Basso* A/66/40 |  |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 1637/2007, 1757/2008, and 1765/2008, *Canessa Albareda et al.* A/67/40 |  |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
| Uzbekistan (34) | 907/2000, *Siragev* A/61/40 | X A/61/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 911/2000, *Nazarov* A/59/40 | X A/60/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 915/2000, *Ruzmetov* A/61/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 917/2000, *Arutyunyan* A/59/40 | X A/60/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 931/2000, *Hudoyberganova* A/60/40 | X A/60/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 959/2000, *Bazarov* A/61/40 | X A/62/40 |  |  |  | X A/62/40 |
|  | 971/2001, *Arutyuniantz* A/60/40 | X A/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 | X A/62/40 |  |  |  | X A/62/40 |
|  | 1071/2002, *Agabekov* A/62/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1140/2002, *Khudayberganov* A/62/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1150/2002, *Uteev* A/63/40 | X A/64/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1163/2003, *Isaev and Karimov* A/64/40 | X A/65/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1225/2003, *Eshonov* A/65/40 | X A/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1280/2004, *Tolipkhudzhaev* A/64/40 | X A/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1284/2004, *Kodirov* A/65/40 | X A/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 | X A/65/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1418/2005, *Iskiyaev* A/64/40 | X A/65/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1449/2006, *Umarov* A/66/40 | X A/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1478/2006, *Kungurov* A/66/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1552/2007, *Lyashkevich* A/65/40 | X A/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1585/2007, *Batyrov* A/64/40 | X A/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1589/2007, *Gapirjanov* A/65/40 | X A/66/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1769/2008, *Ismailov* A/66/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1914-1915-1916/2009, *Musaev* A/67/40 | X A/68/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | CCPR/C/116/2044/2011,  *T.V. and A.G.* | Not due yet |  |  |  | X |
|  | CCPR/C/114/2234/2013, *M.T.* | Not due yet |  |  |  | X |
| Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) (3) | 156/1983, *Solórzano* A/41/40*c* | X A/59/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1940/2010, *Cedeño* A/68/40 |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | CCPR/C/112/D/2085/2011 *García Bolívar* |  |  |  |  | X |
| Zambia (6) | 390/1990, *Lubuto* A/51/40 | X A/62/40 |  |  | X | X |
|  | 821/1998, *Chongwe* A/56/40 | X A/56/40, A/57/40, A/59/40, A/61/40, A/64/40, A/66/40 |  |  |  | X A/68/40 |
|  | 856/1999, *Chambala* A/58/40 | X A/62/40 |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1132/2002, *Chisanga* A/61/40 | X A/61/40, A/63/40, A/64/40, A/65/40 |  |  |  | X |
|  | 1303/2004, *Chiti* A/68/40 |  |  |  | X | X |
|  | 1859/2009, *Kamoyo* A/67/40 |  |  |  | X | X |

a See *Selected Decisions of the Human Rights Committee under the Optional Protocol* (vol. 1) (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.84.XIV.2).

b The State party went some way to implementing the Views: the Committee has not specifically said implementation is satisfactory.

c See *Selected Decisions of the Human Rights Committee under the Optional Protocol* (vol. 2) (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.89.XIV.1).

dFor all of these property cases, see also follow-up to concluding observations for the State party’s reply in A/59/40.

eSee A/59/40 for details of follow-up consultations.

fThe State party has not replied in writing, but it has met several times with the Special Rapporteur.

g 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, that it would investigate; in 1, that the author would be released (592/1994, *Clive Johnson*; see A/54/40). There were 36 general replies indicating that death sentences had been commuted. There were no follow-up replies in 31 cases.

h According to the information provided in A/52/40, the author had been released. No further has been information provided.

i Follow-up information was provided on 17 October 1991 (unpublished). Regarding 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. Regarding the list of cases under C, these individuals were released on 14 March 1985; their cases were included under Act 15.737. Regarding the list of 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 that 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 $200,000. The suit filed by Lilian Celiberti is still pending. Besides the aforementioned cases, no other victim has filed a lawsuit against the State claiming compensation. Regarding the list of 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.

1. Except for later submissions (from March 2017) in the *Mellet* case, incorporated after preparation of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. CCPR/C/115/3: The authors’ counsel had reported that after they petitioned different governmental entities to remind them of the need to implement the Committee’s Views, Ms. Zahra Boudehane and Ms. Sakina Belhmir Bourefis, both wives of disappeared victims, were summoned by the Office of the Prosecutor of the Republic in January 2015, with a request to report to the Office on 9 February 2015. On this occasion, both were interrogated on the reasons for their filing a complaint before the Committee. Mr. Khalifa Fedsi, father of the two Fedsi brothers, summarily executed by Algerian State agents, was also summoned by the same Prosecutor on 19 February 2015, and similarly interrogated on the circumstances of the case. On 5 March 2015, the Committee, acting through the Special Rapporteur on follow-up to Views, had requested the State party to ensure that the authors of the above mentioned communications, as well as members of their families, were not subjected to legal procedures, nor to any form of pressure or intimidation in the exercise of their right to submit communications before the Committee, and with a deadline to inform the Committee by 6 April 2015 on the measures undertaken in accordance with this request. No response was received from the State party. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. On 10 February 2016, the State party had submitted that all but four of the authors (authors 1, 7, 27 and 30) had been released from immigration detention. For each individual released, the Minister for Immigration and Border protection made a decision to grant a visa, taking into consideration the issuance by the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation (ASIO) of a security assessment. Three of the four remaining authors have had their security assessments affirmed by the Independent Reviewer. The appropriateness of their detention will continue to be reviewed. In the fourth case, ASIO has furnished a qualified security assessment to the Department of Immigration and Border protection, in respect of his suitability to hold a visa. This author remains in detention pending appropriate immigration processing, and the Minister’s decision on the grant of a visa. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. This assessment is based on a submission by the State party, dated 5 July 2016, which the State party requested not to be published, due to restrictions under domestic law (ongoing family law court proceedings). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. http://www.citizensassembly.ie [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. The assessment of the State’s response during the 113th session 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-7)
7. The Committee’s assessment of the State party’s response was as follows: (a) Thorough investigation: C1; Prosecution and punishment of those responsible: C1; Adequate compensation: B2; Rehabilitation and medical treatment: C1; Appropriate measures of satisfaction: C1; Publication of the Views: B1; Non-repetition: C1. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. |  |  |
   | --- | --- |
   | Committee’s assessment: | 1. Adequate compensation: B2 2. Taking all possible steps to cooperate with the Moroccan authorities to ensure effective oversight of the author’s treatment in Morocco: B2 3. Publication of Views: A 4. Non-repetition: B1 |

   [↑](#footnote-ref-9)