

D. Communication No. 170/1984, E.H. v. Finland
(Decision of 25 October 1985, adopted at the
twenty-sixth session)

Submitted by: E.H. [name deleted]

Alleged victim: E.H. [name deleted]

State party concerned: Finland

Date of communication: 16 April 1984

The Human Rights Committee, established under article 28 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights,

Meeting on 25 October 1985,

adopts the following:

Decision on admissibility

1. The author of the communication, dated 16 April 1984, is Mrs. E.H., a member of the 4,000 strong Romany minority in Finland. She is represented by Mr. E.W., a journalist and magazine editor.
2. It is alleged that Mrs. E.H. is a victim of racial discrimination in violation of article 26 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, because she received a heavier sentence for a criminal offence than that meted out to another Finnish woman in a similar case. It is submitted that the offence for which the other woman was found guilty was graver than that for which Mrs. E.H. was convicted. Both cases concerned tax evasion and usury and were concluded in 1983 before different trial courts. On 25 May 1983, the Supreme Court of Finland upheld the decision of the lower court in the case of Mrs. E.H.
3. The author has not furnished the Committee with copies of any judicial decisions relevant to the matter complained of, although repeatedly given an opportunity to do so.
4. Before considering any claims contained in a communication, the Human Rights Committee shall, in accordance with rule 87 of its provisional rules of procedure, decide whether or not it is admissible under the Optional Protocol to the Covenant.
5. A thorough examination of the communication has not revealed any facts in substantiation of the author's claim that on the ground of belonging to the Romany minority in Finland she received a heavier sentence than another accused person in a similar case in violation of the rights protected by the Covenant. The Committee, accordingly, concludes that the author has no claim under article 2 of the Optional Protocol.
6. The Human Rights Committee therefore decides:

The communication is inadmissible.