



## International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

Distr.: General  
23 September 2025

Original: English

### Human Rights Committee

**Views adopted by the Committee under the Optional Protocol, concerning communications No. 3630/2019, No. 3690/2019, No. 3831/2020, No. 3835/2020, No. 3839/2020, No. 3840/2020, No. 3841/2020, No. 3897/2021, No. 3898/2021, No. 3935/2021, No. 3938/2021, No. 3941/2021, No. 3946/2020, No. 3952/2021, No. 3956/2021, No. 3974/2021, No. 3979/2021, No. 4000/2021, No. 4048/2021, No. 4052/2021 and No. 4054/2021<sup>\*</sup>, <sup>\*\*</sup>**

*Communications submitted by:*

Vitaly Amelkovich (communication No. 3630/2019), Grigory Kostusev (communication No. 3690/2019), Oleg Metelitsa (communication No. 3831/2020), Leonid Kulakov (communications No. 3835/2020, No. 3979/2021 and No. 4048/2021), Anatoly Poplavnyi (communication No. 3839/2020), Stanislav Pavlinkovich (communication No. 3840/2020), Dmitry Lyuntov (communication No. 3841/2020), Kristina Kashitskaya (communication No. 3897/2021), Larisa Evnevich (communication No. 3898/2021), Marina Samuseva (communication No. 3935/2021), Tatiana Sevyarynets (communication No. 3938/2021), Aleksandr Dubrovskikh (communication No. 3941/2021), Natalya Strelchenko (communication No. 3946/2021), Oleg Pavlov (communication No. 3952/2021), Sergei Stribulski (communication No. 3956/2021), Sergey Tihanovski (communication No. 3974/2021), Natalia Troshchenko (communication No. 4000/2021), Irina Grishchuk (communication No. 4052/2021) and

\* Adopted by the Committee at its 142nd session (14 October–7 November 2024).

\*\* Pursuant to rule 97 (3) of its rules of procedure and the strategy adopted at its 140th session (A/79/40, para. 22), the Committee decided to join the communications for examination. The following members of the Committee participated in the examination of the communication: Tania María Abdo Rocholl, Wafaa Ashraf Moharram Bassim, Rodrigo A. Carazo, Mahjoub El Haiba, Carlos Gómez Martínez, Laurence R. Helfer, Marcia V.J. Kran, Bacre Waly Ndiaye, Hernán Quezada Cabrera, José Manuel Santos Pais, Tijana Šurlan, Kobauyah Tchamdja Kpatcha, Teraya Koji, Hélène Tigroudja and Imeru Tamerat Yigezu.



	Ekaterina Timoshenko (communication No. 4054/2021)
<i>Alleged victims:</i>	The authors
<i>State Party:</i>	Belarus
<i>Dates of communications:</i>	See annex
<i>Document references:</i>	Decisions taken pursuant to rule 92 of the Committee's rules of procedure, transmitted to the State Party (see dates of transmission in annex) (not issued in document form)
<i>Date of adoption of Views:</i>	7 November 2024
<i>Subject matter:</i>	Sanctions for participation in unauthorized peaceful protests
<i>Procedural issues:</i>	Exhaustion of domestic remedies; substantiation of claims
<i>Substantive issues:</i>	Freedom of expression; right to peaceful assembly
<i>Articles of the Covenant:</i>	14, 19 and 21, in some cases read in conjunction with article 2 (2) and (3)
<i>Articles of the Optional Protocol:</i>	2, 3 and 5 (2) (b)

1.1 The authors of the communications are Vitaly Amelkovich, Grigory Kostusev, Oleg Metelitsa, Leonid Kulakov, Anatoly Poplavnyi, Stanislav Pavlinkovich, Dmitry Lyuntov, Kristina Kashitskaya, Larisa Evnevich, Marina Samuseva, Tatiana Sevyarynets, Aleksandr Dubrovskikh, Natalya Strelchenko, Oleg Pavlov, Sergei Stribulski, Sergey Tihanovski, Natalia Troshchenko, Irina Grishchuk and Ekaterina Timoshenko, all of whom are nationals of Belarus. They claim that the State Party has violated their rights under articles 2, 14, 19 and 21 of the Covenant. The Optional Protocol entered into force for the State Party on 30 December 1992. The authors of communications No. 3690/2019, No. 3831/2020, No. 3840/2020, No. 3841/2020, No. 3938/2021, No. 3941/2021, No. 3952/2021, No. 3974/2021, No. 4000/2021 and No. 4052/2021 are represented by counsel, while the others are not represented.

1.2 The communications were submitted for consideration before the State Party's denunciation of the Optional Protocol became effective, on 8 February 2023. In accordance with article 12 (2) of the Optional Protocol and the Committee's previous jurisprudence,<sup>1</sup> the State Party continues to be subject to the application of the Optional Protocol with regard to the communications considered herein.

1.3 On 17 July 2024, the Committee, pursuant to rule 97 (3) of its rules of procedure and the strategy it adopted at its 140th session aimed at addressing the high number of communications pending consideration,<sup>2</sup> the Committee decided to join 21 communications (see annex) for consideration and the issuance of a joint decision thereon. Pursuant to the strategy, such decisions, to be adopted in a simplified format, relate to communications in which similar factual elements and claims are raised, and for which the Committee has identified the structural nature and policy underlying the violations and has developed consistent jurisprudence over the years.

### **Factual background**

2. Between 2016 and 2020, the authors participated in or made public calls for participation in unauthorized peaceful protests in various cities in the State Party. They were

<sup>1</sup> For example *Sextus v. Trinidad and Tobago* (CCPR/C/72/D/818/1998), para. 10; *Lobban v. Jamaica* (CCPR/C/80/D/797/1998), para. 11; and *Shchiryakova et al. v. Belarus* (CCPR/C/137/D/2911/2016, 3081/2017, 3137/2018 and 3150/2018).

<sup>2</sup> A/79/40, para. 22.

apprehended by the police and charged with an administrative offence under article 23.34 of the Code of Administrative Offences, on violation of the established procedure for conducting public events. All of the authors were tried and sentenced by local district courts to various administrative fines and, in some instances, to administrative arrest ranging from 5 to 15 days. The authors unsuccessfully appealed the decisions of the court of first instance to the appellate courts. The authors submit that they have not attempted to lodge supervisory review appeals with the judicial or prosecutorial authorities. They refer to the ineffectiveness of those remedies, citing the Committee's established jurisprudence, as their reason for not doing so.<sup>3</sup>

### **Complaint**

3.1 All the authors claim that the State Party has violated their rights under articles 19 and 21 of the Covenant.

3.2 The authors of communications No. 3690/2019, No. 3831/2020, No. 3839/2020, No. 3840/2020, No. 3841/2020, No. 3897/2021, No. 3898/2021, No. 3935/2021, No. 3946/2021, No. 3974/2021, No. 3979/2021 and No. 4054/2021 also claim that the State Party has violated their rights under articles 19 and 21, read in conjunction with article 2 (2) and (3), of the Covenant.

3.3 The authors of communications No. 3690/2019, No. 3831/2020, No. 3840/2020 and No. 3841/2020 also claim that the State Party has violated their rights under article 14 (1), read in conjunction with article 2 (2) and (3), of the Covenant.

### **State Party's observations on admissibility and the merits**

4.1 The State Party notes that domestic legislation provides for the possibility to appeal a court ruling concerning an administrative offence to the Chair of a higher court or a prosecutor through a supervisory review procedure. The State Party rejects the authors' assertion that the procedure of supervisory appeal in administrative cases can be considered an ineffective remedy.

4.2 The State Party submits that freedom of opinion and expression and freedom of assembly, when the exercise of those freedoms does not violate law and order and the rights of other citizens of Belarus, are enshrined in articles 33 and 35 of the Constitution. The organization and holding of public events are regulated by the Public Events Act, which includes provisions setting out the conditions for the exercise of the constitutional rights and freedoms of citizens when such events are held in public places, with a view to ensuring public safety and order. Therefore, the State Party concludes that the allegations put forward by the authors concerning violations of their rights under articles 19 and 21 of the Covenant are unsubstantiated.

### **Author's comments on the State Party's observations on admissibility and the merits**

5.1 The authors reject the State Party's assertions about the effectiveness of the supervisory review appeals lodged before judicial and prosecutorial authorities. They note that such appeals depend on the discretionary power of a judge or prosecutor and cannot be considered an effective remedy for the purpose of the exhaustion of domestic remedies, as recognized by the Committee in its jurisprudence.

5.2 The authors reiterate their claims that their rights under articles 19 and 21 of the Covenant have been violated. They also note that the State Party has not complied with the Committee's recommendations to bring the Public Events Act into compliance with the State's obligations under international law.

5.3 The author of communication 3974/2021, in his comments on the State Party's observations on admissibility and the merits, raises a new claim under article 9 (1) of the Covenant, alleging arbitrary deprivation of liberty for participation in a peaceful protest.

---

<sup>3</sup> For additional information on the exhaustion of domestic remedies, including the domestic court proceedings and fines imposed, see the annex to the present document.

### Issues and proceedings before the Committee

6.1 Before considering any claim contained in a communication, the Committee must decide, in accordance with rule 97 of its rules of procedure, whether the communication is admissible under the Optional Protocol. The Committee takes note of the State Party's argument that the authors have failed to seek a supervisory review by the prosecutorial and judicial authorities of the impugned decisions. The Committee recalls its jurisprudence, according to which a petition for supervisory review submitted to the chairperson of a court, directed against court decisions that have entered into force,<sup>4</sup> or to a prosecutor's office, requesting a review of court decisions that have taken effect,<sup>5</sup> constitutes an extraordinary remedy and that the State Party must show that there is a reasonable prospect that such requests would provide an effective remedy in the circumstances of the case. In the absence of any new information from the State Party that would allow the Committee to reach a different conclusion, and given its previous jurisprudence, the Committee considers that the authors have exhausted all available effective domestic remedies and that it is not precluded by article 5 (2) (b) of the Optional Protocol from examining the communications.

6.2 With regard to the new claim raised by the author of communication No. 3974/2021 in his comments on the State Party's observations on admissibility and the merits, the Committee recalls its jurisprudence in which it has stated that authors must raise all of their claims in their initial submission, before the State Party is asked to provide its observations on the admissibility and the merits of the communication, unless the authors can demonstrate why they were unable to raise all of their claims simultaneously.<sup>6</sup> In the present case, the author has not explained why his new claim could not have been raised in his initial submission. Accordingly, the Committee considers that that claim is inadmissible as an abuse of the right of submission under article 3 of the Optional Protocol.

6.3 The Committee notes that the authors of 12 of the communications (see para. 3.2 above) claim that the State Party has violated their rights under articles 19 and 21, read in conjunction with article 2 (3), of the Covenant. It notes that the authors of four of the communications (see para. 3.3) also claim a violation of article 14 (1), read in conjunction with article 2 (3), of the Covenant. In the absence of any further pertinent information on file, however, the Committee considers that these authors have failed to sufficiently substantiate those claims for the purposes of admissibility. Accordingly, it declares those claims inadmissible under article 2 of the Optional Protocol.

6.4 The Committee further notes the claims by the same authors that the State Party has violated their rights under articles 19 and 21, read in conjunction with article 2 (2), of the Covenant. The Committee notes that the authors have alleged a violation of their rights under articles 19 and 21 of the Covenant resulting from the interpretation and application of the existing laws of the State Party. The Committee does not consider the examination of whether the State Party has also violated its general obligations under article 2 (2), read in conjunction with articles 19 and 21, of the Covenant to be distinct from an examination of the violation of the authors' rights under articles 19 and 21,<sup>7</sup> and considers that the authors' claims in this regard are incompatible with article 2 of the Covenant and therefore inadmissible under article 3 of the Optional Protocol.

6.5 The Committee finds the remaining claims, made by all the authors under articles 19 and 21, to have been sufficiently substantiated, and it proceeds with its considerations of the merits.

<sup>4</sup> *Koreshkov v. Belarus* (CCPR/C/121/D/2168/2012), para. 7.3.

<sup>5</sup> *Gryk v. Belarus* (CCPR/C/136/D/2961/2017), para. 6.3; *Tolchin v. Belarus* (CCPR/C/135/D/3241/2018), para. 6.3; *Shchukina v. Belarus* (CCPR/C/134/D/3242/2018), para. 6.3; and *Vasilevich et al. v. Belarus* (CCPR/C/137/D/2693/2015, 2898/2016, 3002/2017 and 3084/2017), para. 6.3.

<sup>6</sup> *D.C. v. Lithuania* (CCPR/C/134/D/3327/2019), para. 8.4; *S.R. v. Lithuania* (CCPR/C/132/D/3313/2019), para. 8.8; *Jazairi v. Canada* (CCPR/C/82/D/958/2000), para. 7.2; and *B v. Australia* (CCPR/C/137/D/2999/2017), para. 8.4

<sup>7</sup> See, for example, *Poliakov v. Belarus* (CCPR/C/111/D/2030/2011), para. 7.4.; *Zhukovsky v. Belarus* (CCPR/C/127/D/2724/2016), para. 6.4; and *Vasilevich et al. v. Belarus*, para. 6.4.

6.6 The Committee has considered the communications in the light of all the information submitted to it by the parties, in accordance with article 5 (1) of the Optional Protocol. The Committee notes that it has found a violation of articles 19 and 21 of the Covenant in similar cases in respect of the same laws and practices of the State Party in a number of previous communications.<sup>8</sup> There is nothing in the factual background or legal claims of the communications concerned that would lead the Committee to a different conclusion on the merits of the claims therein. Having considered the communications in the light of all the information made available to it by the parties and having due regard for its previous jurisprudence on the subject, the Committee considers that by sanctioning the authors for participation in peaceful – albeit unauthorized – protests, the State Party has violated their rights under articles 19 and 21 of the Covenant.

7. Pursuant to article 2 (3) (a) of the Covenant, the State Party is under an obligation to provide the authors with an effective remedy. This requires it to make full reparation to individuals whose Covenant rights have been violated. Accordingly, the State Party is obligated to take appropriate steps to reimburse the current value of the fines and any legal costs incurred by the authors in relation to the domestic proceedings against them, as well as to compensate the authors who were subjected to administrative arrest with an amount commensurate with the time spent in detention (see annex). The State Party is also under an obligation to take all steps necessary to prevent similar violations from occurring in the future. The Committee therefore recommends that the State Party revise its normative framework, in particular the Public Events Act, consistent with its obligation under article 2 (2) of the Covenant, with a view to ensuring that the rights under articles 19 and 21 may be fully enjoyed in the State Party.

8. On becoming a party to the Optional Protocol, the State Party recognized the competence of the Committee to determine whether there had been a violation of the Covenant. The communications considered in the present Views were submitted for consideration before the State Party's denunciation of the Optional Protocol became effective, on 8 February 2023. Given that, pursuant to article 2 of the Covenant, the State Party has undertaken to ensure to all individuals within its territory and subject to its jurisdiction the rights recognized in the Covenant and to provide an effective and enforceable remedy when it has been determined that a violation has occurred, the Committee wishes to receive from the State Party, within 180 days, information about the measures taken to give effect to the Committee's Views. The State Party is also requested to publish the present Views and to have them widely disseminated in the official languages of the State Party.

---

<sup>8</sup> *Malei v. Belarus* (CCPR/C/129/D/2404/2014), paras. 9.4 and 9.7; *Tolchina et al. v. Belarus* (CCPR/C/132/D/2857/2016), paras. 7.6 and 7.9; *Zavadskaya et al. v. Belarus* (CCPR/C/132/D/2865/2016), paras. 7.6 and 7.9; and *Vasilevich et al. v. Belarus*, paras. 7.7 and 7.10.

## Annex

### Key procedural information and additional details, by communication

<i>Author</i>	<i>Communication No.</i>	<i>Counsel representation</i>	<i>Date of communication (initial submission)</i>	<i>Date of transmission to the State Party</i>	<i>Relevant court decisions</i>	<i>Type of sanction</i>	<i>Applicable domestic law</i>
Vitaly Amelkovich	3630/2019	Not represented by counsel	17 June 2019	13 November 2019	First instance: 29 March 2017, Slutsk District Court  Appeal: 21 April 2017, Minsk Regional Court  Further appeals: 16 October 2017 (Chair of Minsk Regional Court)	Fine of 345 Belarusian roubles (approximately \$175)	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (1)
Grigory Kostusev	3690/2019	Represented by counsel, Boris Bukhel	24 September 2018	7 January 2020	First instance: 21 July 2016, Sovetsky District Court  Appeal: 2 September 2016, Minsk City Court  First instance: 4 July 2018, Partizansky District Court  Appeal: 31 August 2018, Minsk City Court	Fine of 420 Belarusian roubles (approximately \$210)  Fine of 735 Belarusian roubles (approximately \$370)	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (1)  Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (1)
Oleg Metelitsa	3831/2020	Represented by counsel, Boris Bukhel	31 March 2018	23 October 2020	First instance: 16 March 2017, Leninsky District Court  Appeal: 28 March 2017, Mahiliou Regional Court	Administrative arrest of 12 days	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (1)

<i>Author</i>	<i>Communication No.</i>	<i>Counsel representation</i>	<i>Date of communication (initial submission)</i>	<i>Date of transmission to the State Party</i>	<i>Relevant court decisions</i>	<i>Type of sanction</i>	<i>Applicable domestic law</i>	
Leonid Kulakov	3835/2020	Not represented by counsel	26 May 2017	3 November 2020	First instance: 5 January 2016, Pervomaysky District Court	Fine of 6.3 million old Belarusian roubles (approximately \$320)	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (3)	
	3979/2021		17 March 2018	13 July 2021	Appeal: 29 January 2016, Minsk City Court			
	4048/2021				First instance: 10 March 2016, Central District Court (Minsk)	Fine of 10.5 million old Belarusian roubles (approximately \$530)	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (3)	
					Appeal: 5 April 2016, Minsk City Court			
					First instance: 24 March 2016, Central District Court (Minsk)	Fine of 10.5 million Belarusian roubles (approximately \$530)	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (3)	
					Appeal: 19 April 2016, Minsk City Court			
					First instance: 22 August 2016, Pervomaysky District Court	Fine of 840 Belarusian roubles (approximately \$420)	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (3)	
			Appeal: 20 September 2016, Minsk City Court					
			First instance: 8 November 2016, Pervomaysky District Court	Fine of 840 Belarusian roubles (approximately \$420)	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (3)			
			Appeal: 6 December 2016, Minsk City Court					

<i>Author</i>	<i>Communication No.</i>	<i>Counsel representation</i>	<i>Date of communication (initial submission)</i>	<i>Date of transmission to the State Party</i>	<i>Relevant court decisions</i>	<i>Type of sanction</i>	<i>Applicable domestic law</i>
					First instance: 17 November 2016, Pervomaysky District Court	Fine of 1,050 Belarusian roubles (approximately \$530)	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (3)
					Appeal: 30 December 2016, Minsk City Court		
					First instance: 9 December 2016, Pervomaysky District Court	Fine of 1,050 Belarusian roubles (approximately \$530)	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (3)
					Appeal: 7 February 2017, Minsk City Court		
					First instance: 14 December 2016, Pervomaysky District Court	Fine of 1,050 Belarusian roubles (approximately \$530)	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (3)
					Appeal: 24 January 2017, Minsk City Court		
					First instance: 2 December 2019, Pervomaysky District Court	Fine of 1,275 Belarusian roubles (approximately \$640)	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (3)
					Appeal: 11 February 2020, Minsk City Court		
					First instance: 27 December 2019, Pervomaysky District Court	Administrative arrest of 10 days	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (3)
					Appeal: 4 February 2020, Minsk City Court		



<i>Author</i>	<i>Communication No.</i>	<i>Counsel representation</i>	<i>Date of communication (initial submission)</i>	<i>Date of transmission to the State Party</i>	<i>Relevant court decisions</i>	<i>Type of sanction</i>	<i>Applicable domestic law</i>
					First instance: 27 December 2019, Pervomaysky District Court	Fine of 1,275 Belarusian roubles (approximately \$640)	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (3)
					Appeal: 6 March 2020, Minsk City Court		
Anatoly Poplavnyi	3839/2020	Not represented by counsel	18 May 2017	12 November 2020	First instance: 17 March 2017, Central District Court (Homiel)	Administrative arrest of 10 days	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (1)
					Appeal: 29 March 2017, Homiel Regional Court		
					First instance: 23 March 2017, Sovetsky District Court	Administrative arrest of five days	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (1)
					Appeal: 19 April 2017, Homiel Regional Court		
Stanislav Pavlinkovich	3840/2020	Represented by counsel, Boris Bukhel	31 March 2018	9 November 2020	First instance: 13 September 2017, Leninsky District Court	Fine of 460 Belarusian roubles (approximately \$240)	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (1)
					Appeal: 2 November 2017, Mahiliou Regional Court		
Dmitry Lyuntov	3841/2020	Represented by counsel, Boris Bukhel	27 June 2018	12 November 2020	First instance: 16 March 2017, Leninsky District Court	Administrative arrest of 15 days	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (2)
					Appeal: 18 April 2017, Mahiliou Regional Court		

<i>Author</i>	<i>Communication No.</i>	<i>Counsel representation</i>	<i>Date of communication (initial submission)</i>	<i>Date of transmission to the State Party</i>	<i>Relevant court decisions</i>	<i>Type of sanction</i>	<i>Applicable domestic law</i>
Kristina Kashitskaya	3897/2021	Not represented by counsel	20 October 2020	3 March 2021	First instance: 28 August 2020, Zhlobinsky District Court  Appeal: 30 September 2020, Homiel Regional Court	Fine of 270 Belarusian roubles (approximately \$135)	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (1)
Larisa Evnevich	3898/2021	Not represented by counsel	23 October 2020	4 March 2021	First instance: 14 September 2020, Zheleznodorozhny District Court  Appeal: 14 October 2020, Homiel Regional Court	Fine of 270 Belarusian roubles (approximately \$135)	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (1)
Marina Samuseva	3935/2021	Not represented by counsel	7 November 2020	3 June 2021	First instance: 28 September 2020, Zheleznodorozhny District Court  Appeal: 30 October 2020, Homiel Regional Court	Fine of 540 Belarusian roubles (approximately \$270)	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (1)
Tatiana Sevyarynets	3938/2021	Represented by counsel, Pavel Levinov	20 February 2020	22 March 2023	First instance: 9 January 2020, Pervomaysky District Court  Appeal: 5 February 2020, Vitebsk Regional Court	Fine of 810 Belarusian roubles (approximately \$410)	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (1)
Aleksandr Dubrovskikh	3941/2021	Represented by counsel, Pavel Levinov	26 March 2020	12 April 2022	First instance: 29 January 2020, Zheleznodorozhny District Court  Appeal: 19 February 2020, Vitebsk Regional Court	Fine of 810 Belarusian roubles (approximately \$410)	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (1)

<i>Author</i>	<i>Communication No.</i>	<i>Counsel representation</i>	<i>Date of communication (initial submission)</i>	<i>Date of transmission to the State Party</i>	<i>Relevant court decisions</i>	<i>Type of sanction</i>	<i>Applicable domestic law</i>
Natalya Strelchenko	3946/2021	Not represented by counsel	7 July 2020	3 June 2021	First instance: 10 January 2020, Dubrovensky District Court  Appeal: 5 February 2020, Vitebsk Regional Court	Fine of 675 Belarusian roubles (approximately \$340)	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (1)
Oleg Pavlov	3952/2021	Represented by counsel, Pavel Levinov	6 February 2020	10 June 2021	First instance: 15 January 2020, Zheleznodorozhny District Court  Appeal: 29 January 2020, Vitebsk Regional Court	Fine in of 675 Belarusian roubles (approximately \$340)	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (1)
Sergei Stribulski	3956/2021	Not represented by counsel	16 January 2020	23 June 2021	First instance: 11 October 2016, Moskovsky District Court  Appeal: 15 November 2016, Minsk City Court	Fine of 525 Belarusian roubles (approximately \$265)	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (1)
Sergey Tihanovski	3974/2021	Represented by counsel, Natalia Matskevich	20 May 2020	12 July 2021	First instance: 27 December 2019, Sovetsky District Court  Appeal: 29 January 2020, Homiel Regional Court  Further appeals: 24 March 2020 (Chair of the Homiel Regional Court) and 8 May 2020 (Chair of the Supreme Court)	Administrative arrest of 15 days	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (1)

<i>Author</i>	<i>Communication No.</i>	<i>Counsel representation</i>	<i>Date of communication (initial submission)</i>	<i>Date of transmission to the State Party</i>	<i>Relevant court decisions</i>	<i>Type of sanction</i>	<i>Applicable domestic law</i>
					First instance: 10 January 2020, Sovetsky District Court  Appeal: 7 February 2020, Homiel Regional Court  Further appeals: 24 March 2020 (Chair of the Homiel Regional Court) and 8 May 2020 (Chair of the Supreme Court)	Administrative arrest of 15 days	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (1)
Natalia Troshchenko	4000/2021	Represented by counsel, Pavel Levinov	17 February 2020	26 August 2021	First instance: 16 January 2020, Zheleznodorozhny District Court  Appeal: 5 February 2020, Vitebsk Regional Court	Fine of 648 Belarusian roubles (approximately \$325)	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (1)
Irina Grishchuk	4052/2021	Represented by counsel, Pavel Levinov	30 December 2020	8 December 2021	First instance: 15 September 2020, Berezovsky District Court  Appeal: 16 October 2020, Brest Regional Court	Fine of 216 Belarusian roubles (approximately \$110)	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (1)
Ekaterina Timoshenko	4054/2021	Not represented by counsel	9 December 2020	8 December 2021	First instance: 16 November 2020, Zheleznodorozhny District Court  Appeal: 2 December 2020, Homiel Regional Court	Fine of 270 Belarusian roubles (approximately \$135)	Code of Administrative Offences, art. 23.34 (1)