



## International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

Distr.: General  
27 October 2009

Original: English

---

### Human Rights Committee Ninety-seventh session

#### Summary record of the 2665th meeting

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Friday, 16 October 2009, at 3 p.m.

*Chairperson:* Mr. Iwasawa

### Contents

Consideration of reports submitted by States parties under article 40 of the Covenant  
(*continued*)

*Sixth periodic report of the Russian Federation (continued)*

---

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent *within one week of the date of this document* to the Editing Unit, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the public meetings of the Committee at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

*The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.*

**Consideration of reports submitted by States parties under article 40 of the Covenant**  
(continued)

*Sixth periodic report of the Russian Federation (continued) (CCPR/C/RUS/6;  
CCPR/C/RUS/Q/6 and Add.1)*

1. *At the invitation of the Chairperson, the members of the delegation of the Russian Federation resumed their places at the Committee table.*

2. **Mr. Davidov** (Russian Federation), clarifying an earlier statement, explained that he had not said that abolition of the death penalty in the face of public opinion would be undemocratic, but rather that further debate on the matter was needed. He agreed that the Government had the right to move ahead of public opinion, but it should move carefully in doing so in order to avoid any kind of social conflict, and it should ensure that a significant proportion of the population was fully prepared for the change. He agreed that the Government should carry out more awareness-raising work aimed at the legal abolition of the death penalty. More than 15 years had passed since the moratorium on the death penalty had begun and a whole generation of Russian citizens had grown up with an entirely new attitude towards the death penalty. Foreign and international human rights laws and international approaches to the issue of capital punishment were studied in schools. He therefore believed that it was only a matter of time before public opinion in the Russian Federation was ready for abolition. The important point was that the death sentence was not being carried out in practice, and he was convinced that that would continue to be the case.

3. In relation to efforts to combat corruption in the judicial system, a federal programme envisaging a whole range of regulatory measures against such corruption had begun in 2007. The programme included stricter requirements being applied to judges and candidates for judicial office. Judges were obliged to inform the parties if any approaches were made to them outside judicial proceedings, and if those approaches were liable to create a conflict of interests the parties could decide to file an objection against the judge. Judges' legal immunities had in the past exceeded what was necessary or envisaged under the Constitution, and they had been restricted.

4. The Council of Judges was the only body with the authority to take disciplinary measures against a judge and, according to the Council's statistics, 358 judges had been found to be culpable in 2008, a figure which included 56 judges who had been removed for activities incompatible with their office. Judges found culpable had the right of appeal to a body within the Supreme Court. He would request statistical information on such appeals.

5. **Mr. Sizov** (Russian Federation) said that his country's counter-terrorism measures were indeed stringent, but they were necessary in the current situation and did not in any way contravene the Covenant. A number of measures were in place for ensuring that information obtained in counter-terrorist investigations was not made public: first, those who held such information were personally liable for any divulgence of it; second, information could not be used against a citizen, including for the purpose of bringing a criminal case against him or her, if it was not obtained in accordance with criminal investigation procedure. He stressed that the counter-terrorist provisions did not allow any breach of the constitutional right to privacy of communications, and that investigators were required to provide evidence in order to obtain a judicial warrant to conduct their inquiries.

6. With regard to the issue of extremist crimes and publications, he acknowledged that expert opinions could be biased, and could also be flawed in other ways, such as through incompetence. In his view, however, Russian legislation contained sufficient measures to prevent such situations: the criminal liability of experts was clearly provided for;

investigators and prosecutors analysed the expert evidence; and it was for the court to decide what weight to give that evidence.

7. **Ms. Kurovskaya** (Russian Federation) stressed that no unofficial extradition relationships existed between the Procurator-General's Office of the Russian Federation and foreign States. That Office conducted investigations into the legality of and justification for extradition requests. Extradition between States belonging to the Commonwealth of Independent States was governed by the Minsk Convention, and guarantees were required for all the conditions set out in international law, inter alia that the individual would not be subjected to torture or liable to the death penalty. There was a right of appeal to the Supreme Court against an extradition order.

8. As to the criminal investigation of torture, her Government always made a point of ensuring that such crimes were objectively investigated. There was now a special procedure for bringing complaints against officials, and the new special investigation committee had been separated from the Procurator-General's Office to ensure its independence. In addition, complainants had the right to appeal against any improper action or lack of action in relation to their case.

9. **Ms. Korunova** (Russian Federation) said that the annual report of the Russian Federation's Human Rights Ombudsman contained only general statistics concerning complaints received; there was an average of 30,000 complaints a year. Representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs met regularly with the Ombudsman and would ask him to provide more detailed statistics on complaints received. She emphasized, however, that the Ombudsman was independent and that the Ministry could therefore only request, not require, the Ombudsman to provide such data. It was her understanding that the Ombudsman had submitted a written report to the State Duma rather than introducing it orally, a method that was permissible under federal law. The State Duma's busy legislative agenda might have been a factor influencing the decision to take that course.

10. On the question of domestic violence against women, she drew attention to the important role played by women, who made up 54 per cent of the population, in the economy, the civil service and the legal system, for example. There were more women than men with higher education in her country and women held three key ministerial posts. She stressed that women in the Russian Federation did not live in a state of fear or consider themselves second-class citizens. The level of violent crime remained relatively high, but such crimes were not exclusively directed against women. Three generations of Russian families often lived under one roof, and so it was not only women, but also the elderly and children who were liable to be subjected to domestic violence. The importance attached by the Government to the issue was shown by its designation of 2008 as the "Year of the Family", with special events, programmes and plans of action, and by the priority given to the visit in 2007 of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on violence against women, whose recommendations were now being implemented.

11. **Mr. Matyushkin** (Russian Federation), referring to the unlawful killings in the North Caucasus, said that his Government had complied with the presumptions of death reached by the European Court of Human Rights, despite the fact that domestic remedies in that connection had not been exhausted. The Government had been taking individual and general measures in accordance with the decisions of the European Court. Internal investigations into individual cases were continuing.

12. The President of the Russian Federation had directed a working group set up under the Ministry of Justice to draft a bill on compensation to citizens harmed during counter-terrorist operations in the Chechen Republic. The aim was to provide an effective domestic remedy for citizens whose rights had been violated.

13. On the subject of mass graves in the North Caucasus, he said that the relevant investigation committee had received only two reports. In one case the site in question had proved to be an old cemetery, while the other case was still under investigation.

14. With regard to the May 2009 statement by a State official that “the Wahhabis would be killed”, he explained that, for historical reasons, in the North Caucasus region the term “Wahhabi” did not have a religious meaning; rather it was used to refer to armed terrorists. In those circumstances, and in accordance with domestic legislation and international obligations, armed terrorists who resisted the security forces would indeed be killed.

15. He made reference to the case of Mr. Gasaev, who had been extradited to the Russian Federation from Spain on the condition that Spanish officials would visit him in detention to ensure that he was being treated appropriately. The Russian Federation’s Procurator-General’s Office was working on developing a similar procedure whereby Russian officials would be able to visit individuals extradited to other countries in order to monitor compliance with extradition guarantees more effectively.

16. With regard to the case of Ms. Kudeshkina, who had appealed to the European Court of Human Rights against her removal from her post as a judge, he said that she had appealed on the basis of alleged breaches of articles 6 and 10 of the European Convention, but the Court had only recognized a breach of article 10, which guaranteed free speech. There had thus been no breach of judicial procedure in her removal from office. He noted that the decision of the Court in relation to article 10 had been reached only by a majority of four to three, which suggested that the situation had not been unambiguous.

17. **The Chairperson** invited the delegation to respond to questions 18–30 of the list of issues (CCPR/C/RUS/Q/6).

18. **Mr. Ankudinov** (Russian Federation) said that he would first address a question raised by Ms. Keller regarding social groups. Article 136 of the Criminal Code punished discrimination on grounds of sex, race, ethnic origin, language, official status, place of residence, religious or other convictions, or membership of an association or social group. The term “social group” was somewhat vague and had given rise to serious difficulties of interpretation. The matter could only be resolved by a ruling of the Supreme Court. For the time being, however, there was little practical experience to report since scarcely anybody had been charged with the offence of discrimination against a social group. With regard to the case of Mr. Sawa Terentiev, he had been convicted of incitement to hatred of police officers not as a social group but as a group occupying an official position in society.

19. The law guaranteed full access to lawyers for suspects and convicted persons. All persons were entitled upon arrest or when criminal proceedings were instituted to seek the assistance of counsel or to have legal assistance assigned to them. Problems admittedly existed but they were organizational rather than systemic. Where no duty lawyers were available, the investigation could not proceed since the outcome would be declared inadmissible.

20. In response to question 21 of the list of issues, he said that the amendments to the Law concerning Lawyers’ Activity and the Bar in the Russian Federation had entered into force in January 2009. They would not adversely affect the independence of members of the legal profession but would actually extend their authority.

21. It was unfortunately true that a number of lawyers had been murdered. In the most recent case, which was currently before the courts, two lawyers had been killed by a gang whose members actually included other lawyers. A case had also occurred in Moscow in 2008 and another in Vladivostok some years previously. The killings were doubtless in some way related to the lawyers’ professional activities, but it was unclear whether they had tried to prevent gangs from operating or to take over the gangs’ activities.

22. Turning to the events at the Dubrovka theatre in Moscow in 2002, he said that more than 40 terrorists had taken an audience of over 1,000 people hostage for several days. They had threatened to kill members of the audience unless the Government met their demands. The authorities had intervened to free the hostages and had killed all the terrorists, but unfortunately a large number of the hostages had also lost their lives. An investigation had been conducted to ascertain whether the authorities' action had been justified. Persons who had assisted the terrorists had been tried and sentenced to life imprisonment, but no member of the State agencies involved in the decision to use force in order to release the hostages had been found guilty of negligence or unwarranted action because the situation had constituted an emergency.

23. The circumstances had been similar in the case of the Beslan school hostage crisis. Only one terrorist had been brought to justice and sentenced to life imprisonment. The investigation had concluded that the victims had died as a result of the terrorist acts. The terrorists had used explosives and had opened fire on children who had tried to escape. A total of 332 hostages had been killed. More than 1,000 people had been questioned during the parliamentary inquiry and its conclusions had given rise to some 2,000 publications. The case had not yet been closed.

24. **Mr. Gaidov** (Russian Federation) said that his country had ratified the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the 2004 Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children supplementing the Convention. Russian legislation also fully reflected the country's international obligations to combat enforced disappearances. The Criminal Code defined the offences of abduction and human trafficking, and about a dozen criminal groups had been brought to justice for involvement in trafficking in persons for sexual exploitation within the country or abroad. The Russian Federation was participating in the human trafficking cooperation programme of the Commonwealth of Independent States for the period 2007–2010. It also cooperated with law enforcement agencies in Germany, Israel, the United Kingdom, the United States and other countries. At the end of 2004, a Russian national contact point for cooperation with the European Law Enforcement Organisation (Europol) on issues such as illegal labour and human trafficking had been established at the Ministry of Internal Affairs. A downward trend had been recorded in the number of crimes relating to abduction, illegal sequestration, trafficking and illegal labour. Thus, 2,400 cases had been recorded in 2006, 2,027 in 2007, 1,551 in 2008 and just over 800 cases in the first six months of 2009.

25. Human trafficking crimes also included organized prostitution and the illegal production, dissemination and sale of pornographic material. About 1,000 cases of child pornography on the Internet had been recorded since 2006 and the Ministry of Internal Affairs was conducting investigative work with representatives of foreign law enforcement agencies (e.g. those of Canada and Switzerland) to identify offenders and close down the Internet sites. There were plans for closer cooperation between the law enforcement agencies and national and international NGOs such as Save the Children. A large number of measures had been taken to protect potential victims and to reduce the number of women and children involved in prostitution; they included action to improve family living standards and awareness-raising campaigns. An important role was played by social protection agencies, which organized social, psychological and physical rehabilitation schemes for the victims of human trafficking as well as legal aid. The Ministry of Internal Affairs also cooperated with the International Organization for Migration (IOM), and a special IOM rehabilitation centre had been established in Moscow in 2007 to provide medical, psychological and social assistance to victims of trafficking. For instance, 14 Moldovan girls had been freed from sexual slavery in 2007 and returned to their homes after receiving rehabilitative treatment at the centre.

26. **Mr. Filimonov** (Russian Federation), responding to questions 19 and 20 of the list of issues, said that the prison population, which had increased during the period 2006–2008, had declined by 10,128 since the beginning of 2009. There were also fewer people in pretrial detention. The federal budget allocations for the penal correction system had been increased with a view to improving conditions for both suspects and convicted persons. The allocation had more than doubled between 2005 and 2009 despite the global economic crisis. Under a special programme to improve pretrial detention conditions, provision had been made for an increase in accommodation facilities of 176,000 square metres. Newly built cells would comply fully with international standards. Ten such facilities had already been built with 3,558 pretrial detention cells. Overcrowding was still a problem, however, in five regions. Food rations for persons in pretrial detention had been increased in 2005. Bedding, crockery, cutlery and toiletries were provided free of charge.

27. Ms. Keller had inquired about the *Lantsova v. Russian Federation* case considered by the Committee in 2002. Mr. Lantsov had died of pneumonia in 1995 in a pretrial detention centre in Moscow. According to medical professionals, he had not asked for medical assistance in time and when his condition had been noticed it had been too late for effective treatment. The Committee had urged the Russian Federation to improve conditions of detention so as to ensure that such cases did not recur. In 2005 the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Health and Social Development had issued a joint decree on medical treatment for detainees in both pretrial detention centres and prisons. As a result, every detainee underwent a medical examination. At the first sign of illness, medical treatment was provided either in the detention centre or in a hospital. Medical personnel did a round of the cells every day. Detainees had a general medical check-up every month and a detailed check-up every two months.

28. Persons deprived of their liberty could complain to the Procurator-General's Office, the authorities responsible for monitoring pretrial detention centres or the Federal Commissioner for Human Rights (the Ombudsman). A federal law enacted in 2008 provided for public oversight of compliance with human rights in places of detention. An oversight commission had been established and its members had paid more than 400 visits to detention centres during the first half of 2009.

29. There were currently some 25,000 disabled persons in prison. Under the early release programme for those whose condition prevented them from completing their sentence, about 500 disabled prisoners had been released in 2009. Those prisoners enjoyed several privileges, such as additional food. Workshops targeting their needs enabled them to acquire skills despite their disabilities. They also received disability allowances and medicines, as they would outside prison.

30. **Mr. Demidov** (Russian Federation) said that, as a result of amendments to the Federal Law on Guarantees of the Rights of Numerically Small Indigenous Peoples, article 4 of the Law was no longer in force. Under legislation adopted in 2009, his Government had drawn up a list of places of residence and traditional economic activities of several indigenous peoples, which reinforced their rights in relation to land and resources. The Government's policy was to promote the sustainable development of those communities and their traditional use of natural resources, respecting their habitat and traditional ways of life while improving their quality of life, reducing child mortality and increasing life expectancy. The process of consolidating the constituent territories of the Russian Federation through the absorption of national autonomous areas had not had any negative effect on the rights of indigenous peoples. The authorities were obliged to assist indigenous peoples to preserve their traditional ways of life, including their languages and cultures. Some local agencies had been established to that end. At the federal level, measures taken to assist the communities of small indigenous peoples of the North, Siberia and the Russian Far East had included support for numerous festivals celebrating aspects of indigenous

cultures and efforts to raise awareness of international standards relating to indigenous rights. In 2009, the Government had allocated some 600 million roubles for subsidies to promote the economic and social development of the small indigenous communities of the North.

31. **Ms. Motoc** asked whether the State party planned to increase its current allocation of resources to tackle human trafficking, given that the problem was so widespread in its territory.

32. She wished to know whether efforts would be made to make civilian service an attractive alternative to military service.

33. The Committee would welcome additional information on the representation of indigenous peoples in the media.

34. **Ms. Keller**, referring to the written replies to question 26 of the list of issues, said it was striking that the State party had affirmed in so many cases that the journalists' murders had had nothing to do with their professional activities. While she understood that the murderers themselves might have been motivated by other factors, she asked how thorough the authorities' investigations had been. On what basis could they ascertain that the attacks had not been related to the journalists' work? Turning to the information provided in paragraph 395 of the written replies, she asked why the case of the murder of Anna Politkovskaya had been heard in the Moscow district military court. It would be useful to know the exact length of the prison terms to which Mr. Domnikov's murderers had been sentenced. Paragraph 396 stated that the investigations into the death of Mr. Ifanov had been closed "for lack of criminal event". She asked what had led the investigators to reach that conclusion. The same paragraph indicated that pretrial investigations into the death of Mr. Safronov were continuing, having begun in March 2007. She enquired why there was such a delay in bringing charges. In addition, she requested information on the cases of Abdulla Alishayev, Malik Akhmedilov, Natalia Estemirova, Marina Pisareva, Ilias Shurpaiev, Vyacheslav Yaroshenko and Magomed Yevloyev.

35. She would like to know how burdensome the reporting requirements were for NGOs that had connections with foreign countries under the 2006 law governing the activities of non-commercial organizations.

36. She requested additional information on the effect law enforcement officials' actions could have on the enjoyment of the right to freedom of assembly and expression, particularly their actions requiring official permission for assemblies where none was required by law, moving assemblies to isolated venues, demanding that slogans be modified, requiring notification of the estimated number of participants, intimidating prospective demonstrators prior to their assembly and using disproportionate force to disperse demonstrators.

37. **Mr. Lallah** asked why it was difficult to honour the right to have recourse to a defence counsel from the first moment of a person's physical restraint, as indicated in paragraph 361 of the written replies. He requested clarification of paragraph 362 of the written replies, particularly the meaning of the term "a known suspect", and whether such a suspect had the right to a defence counsel from the moment of physical restraint. He also wished to know how the right to legal counsel was upheld, given that the regulations for police custody in temporary holding cells and pretrial detention centres included the concept of quarantine. He asked whether those regulations did not violate article 9 (1 and 2) of the Covenant.

38. The Committee would appreciate further details of the bill on Lawyers' Activity and the Bar in the Russian Federation. He asked whether it enabled the State registration agency to bring a court action to remove a lawyer's licence to practise without the approval of the

Bar. He also requested confirmation of reports that the bill would allow the State registration agency to obtain access to lawyers' files on cases under investigation and to demand that they should answer questions on any cases in which they were involved, which would clearly be a fundamental violation of article 14 of the Covenant.

39. **Mr. Thelin** asked how the profession of journalism was defined in the State party, whether journalists were accredited and, if so, by which body. If there was an accreditation system, he asked whether accreditation could be withdrawn, with or without early warning, and whether such a decision could be appealed.

40. The Committee would appreciate information on the investigations, indictments and convictions relating to the murdered journalists as compared with other murders. It would be useful to learn whether the murders of journalists were pursued as vigorously and with the same effectiveness in terms of results as other murders. He recommended that the State party should decriminalize defamation, making it a civil action. He asked how many civil lawsuits were brought against journalists each year. He also recommended that, instead of protecting public officials who were the subject of libel suits, those officials should be scrutinized; the relevant legislation should be brought into line with international standards. He asked whether the damages of up to 1 million euros that were reportedly payable by journalists and media organizations convicted in civil suits brought in connection with elections were in line with average damages in other cases. Lastly, he wished to know what measures the authorities took to ensure that reporters covering demonstrations could carry out their work without interference.

41. **Mr. Rivas Posada**, referring to the written reply to question 20 (para. 355 of the written replies), asked why the term "administrative arrest" was used for an arrest which was issued by a court. It would be useful to learn whether the term "administrative detention" (para. 357) referred to a different type of detention from that indicated by the term "administrative arrest". He asked why some people were exempt from administrative arrest, as listed in paragraph 356 of the written replies.

42. **Ms. Wedgwood** emphasized the need to encourage NGOs, and not restrict them through stringent registration rules or by limiting foreign funding. NGOs provided essential feedback to Governments in bureaucratic societies.

43. She asked to what extent Federal Security Service (FSB) agents were in reality exempt from the law.

44. She would appreciate the delegation's comments on the Mikhail Khodorkovsky case, particularly in view of a survey in which some 60 per cent of respondents had expressed the view that the new case, coming so close to the end of his prison sentence, had been initiated for mercenary purposes only.

45. Affirming that all people should have a nationality, she expressed concern about stateless persons, drawing particular attention to the illegal status of non-Russians who had been residing in what was now the Russian Federation since the break-up of the Soviet Union and Georgian refugees from the Abkhazian war of 1992–1993 who had entered the country before 2002. She encouraged the State party to take steps to regularize the situation of such groups.

46. Lastly, she expressed the view that only specific acts should be prosecutable under legislation. Using an abstract notion such as "extremism" to denote a punishable offence had the potential to threaten freedom of speech, particularly that of NGOs.

47. **Sir Nigel Rodley** requested statistics on people detained in remand and penal institutions and information on any detention facilities where population exceeded capacity. Would the rehabilitation function of the former penal colonies be continued by the institutions being created to replace them, or would they focus on the control,

administration and maintenance of detention? In view of allegations that many of the persons convicted for terrorist crimes in the North Caucasus had been subjected to practices such as unlawful detention or torture in order to obtain confessions, he asked whether the State party was considering a systematic review of all such convictions.

48. Further to a question posed earlier by Ms. Keller, he asked who selected the experts responsible for determining what constituted extremism, who made up a particular social group, and whether defendants were able to call on their own experts to argue a diverging view. Although he welcomed moves to seek not only assurances but also guarantees before people were returned to countries they might not otherwise be sent back to, he recalled the Committee's consistently expressed opinion that the more systematic the practice of return to such countries, the less effective those guarantees were likely to be. Lastly, while welcoming the payment of compensation to people affected by anti-terrorist operations, he urged the State authorities to bring terrorists to justice, thereby ending their impunity.

49. **Mr. Fathalla** asked for clarification regarding the concept and nature of criminal arbitration courts and queried the legal provisions allowing defendants to be represented by any individual, whether or not he or she was legally qualified.

50. **Mr. Bouzid** wished to know the proportion of judicial decisions that were not implemented in practice.

51. **Ms. Majodina** expressed concern at the vague and excessive restrictions established in section 51 of the law on the media, prohibiting journalists from concealing information and discrediting private individuals. That limited the scope for imparting information of all kinds, as provided for in article 19 of the Covenant. Echoing Mr. Thelin's comments regarding the higher levels of protection against defamation accorded to officials, which could lead to self-censorship among the media, she asked whether the State party intended to amend its legislation in order to conform to international standards.

52. **Ms. Vagina** (Russian Federation) outlined the amendments made to legislation governing the activities of non-commercial organizations as of August 2009 and the procedure which had led to their introduction, which included consultations in a working group comprising representatives of the Government, parliament and civil society. The registration procedure for such organizations had been simplified, and it was intended that similar amendments would be made to legislation on specific forms of non-commercial organization, for example religious groups. Scheduled verifications of the activities of non-commercial groups were now permitted only once every three years.

53. In order to ensure transparency and accountability, non-commercial organizations receiving State funding were obliged to submit public accounts and reports on their activities regularly, but reporting procedures had been simplified and updated to take account of technological developments. For organizations with an annual turnover of less than 3 million roubles and those that did not receive funding from foreign sources, reporting to the regional authorities was sufficient. There were no legislative provisions restricting the allocation of State grants, or any other forms of financing provided for in law, to non-commercial organizations that received foreign funding. Contrary to allegations of bureaucratic barriers being placed on registration, State registration procedures were highly regulated. The relevant rules were prepared and amended taking into account the views of NGOs, a fact that would apply equally to the amendments that had come into force in August 2009. Decisions to refuse registration could be appealed. Complaints that public and religious organizations were disproportionately refused registration were unfounded: the proportion of applications refused had remained at around 0.1 per cent since 2005.

54. In response to Mr. Lallah's questions concerning the bill relating to lawyers' activities and the Bar, she replied that no provisions of the kind he had mentioned were contained in the draft.

55. **Mr. Filimonov** (Russian Federation) said that, although overall figures for prison populations compared with prison capacity indicated that some space still remained available, the distribution of detainees was uneven. Five regions, for which he gave specific figures, experienced a degree of overcrowding, which the Government intended to address. Additional data would be provided in writing.

56. **Mr. Matyushkin** (Russian Federation) added that a wide programme of reform of the penitentiary system was planned, including the elimination of penal colonies remaining from Soviet times. A fundamental aim of the reform was to provide different detention facilities for two categories of offenders: repeat offenders and first-time offenders who, in the court's view, merited a custodial sentence. For the second group, there would be a greater focus on work and rehabilitation.

57. **Mr. Gaidov** (Russian Federation) explained that, despite the similarity in terminology, administrative arrest and administrative detention were different concepts. Administrative arrest was one of nine possible penalties for an administrative offence, while administrative detention was a means of ensuring that procedures could be carried out effectively. For example, if medical procedures were required to assess a suspect's condition, that person could be placed in administrative detention. Administrative arrest could last up to 15 days, except in specific circumstances such as a state of emergency or anti-terrorist operations, and could only be imposed by a court. Administrative detention could be imposed by the police and other law enforcement officials for a maximum of 3 hours, or 40 hours in special circumstances, if approved by a prosecutor. Procedures for imposing a sentence of administrative arrest were currently regulated by government decree, but a bill on their regulation was before parliament, in accordance with the constitutional principle that individuals could only be deprived of their liberty or have their rights curtailed under federal legislation and by a court decision.

58. **Ms. Korunova** (Russian Federation) said that her Government fully recognized the scale of the problem of trafficking in human beings, particularly women, into and out of the Russian Federation. She emphasized, however, that accurate figures for the number of women trafficked were difficult to come by because of the hidden nature of the problem. Government estimates were in the tens of thousands per annum, rather than the half a million alleged in a report by the former High Commissioner for Human Rights, suggesting that the situation was not significantly worse in the Russian Federation than in other countries. Nevertheless, resources were and would continue to be allocated to combating the problem and providing support for victims.

59. **Mr. Matyushkin** (Russian Federation), replying to Mr. Bouzid, said that improvements in legislation and changes in relevant procedures and institutions had increased the rate of implementation of national court decisions in civil cases from 50 per cent a few years previously to around 70 per cent. With sufficient investment, an implementation rate of 80 per cent was a realistic target.

60. Another aspect of the problem was the Russian Federation's recurrent failure to honour judgement debts, in respect of which aggrieved parties had no effective domestic remedy, according to the European Court of Human Rights, which had considered more than 200 such cases brought by Russian citizens. Its judgement in the test case of *Burdov v. Russia (No. 2)*, which had become final on 4 May 2009, called on the State to set up an effective domestic remedy or remedies which secured adequate and sufficient redress for non-enforcement or delayed enforcement of domestic judgements within six months of the Court's judgement becoming final. It also called on the State, within one year, to grant such redress to all victims of non-payment or unreasonably delayed payment by State authorities of a judgement debt in their favour who had lodged their applications with the Court before the delivery of the present judgement and whose applications were communicated to the

Government under rule 54 (2) (b) of the Court's rules. A bill relating to that question had been drafted and would be submitted to parliament shortly.

61. In conclusion, he expressed gratitude to the Committee for the fruitful dialogue that had taken place and reaffirmed his Government's commitment to strengthening respect for human rights. The reporting process under the Covenant would be valuable in further developing its legislation and practice.

*The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.*