



EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS
COUR EUROPÉENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME

FIRST SECTION

Application no. 25088/11
Petimat Khamzatovna BASKHANOVA against Russia
and 14 other applications
(see list appended)

STATEMENT OF FACTS

THE FACTS

The applicants in the present cases are Russian nationals residing in different settlements in the Chechen Republic, Russia, as specified below. Most of the applicants are represented before the Court by lawyers of the Stichting Russian Justice Initiative, a NGO based in the Netherlands with a representative office in Russia.

The facts of the cases pertaining to all the applications, as submitted by the applicants, may be summarised as follows.

Particulars of each application are tabulated in the *Appendix*.

A. Events surrounding the abductions

The applicants are close relatives of men who disappeared in the Chechen Republic after their abduction from home between 2001 and 2006 by groups of servicemen. According to the applicants, the servicemen belonged to the Russian federal troops, as they were wearing camouflage uniforms, had Slavic features and spoke unaccented Russian. Armed with machineguns and sometimes equipped with portable radio sets, the servicemen broke into the applicants' homes, searched the premises, checked the applicants' relatives' identity documents and took the applicants' relatives away in military vehicles, such as armoured personnel carriers (APCs), UAZ cars or URAL lorries. Only a few of the vehicles displayed official registration plates. In a number of cases the registration numbers had been obscured with mud. None of the applicants has seen their missing relatives since.

The abductions took place Chechnya: in the Achkhoy-Martan, Grozny, Naurskiy, Gudermes, Urus-Martan districts and the town of Grozny and its outskirts. In all the cases the abductions were carried out at night or early in the morning, during curfew hours. In some of the cases the applicants submitted that at the material time a special operation had been conducted by Russian servicemen in the area. In the case of *Nuraliyevy v. Russia*, no. 48134/11 the investigative authorities officially acknowledged that a special operation had been carried out in the area at the time of the events. According to witnesses, in the majority of the cases, after the abductions the applicants' relatives were taken to the premises of law-enforcement agencies, such as district departments of the interior, military units or military commander's offices.

B. Main features of the investigation into the abductions

In each of the cases the applicants complained about the abduction to the authorities and an official investigation was instituted. In every case the proceedings, after being suspended and resumed on several occasions, have been pending for several years without attaining any tangible results. The investigations have been repeatedly stayed by the prosecutor's offices owing to their inability to identify the culprits and subsequently resumed by the supervising prosecutors, who have pointed out a number of flaws therein, such as the investigators' failure to question witnesses or to carry out basic expert evaluations. Some applicants were granted victim status in the criminal proceedings. It is unclear whether all of the applicants were questioned by the investigative authorities in connection with the abductions.

It follows from the documents submitted that no active investigative steps have been taken by the authorities other than forwarding formal information requests to their counterparts in various regions of Chechnya and the North Caucasus. Further to such requests, the authorities have generally reported that involvement of servicemen in the abduction has not been established, that no special operations were carried out at the relevant time, that the applicants' relatives had not been arrested or detained on their premises and that there was no information as to the involvement of the applicants' relatives in the activities of illegal armed groups. However, in the cases of *Aguyeva and others v. Russia* (no. 52076/11) and *Sangariyevy v. Russia* (no. 52182/11), the investigative authorities have stated that State servicemen might have been involved in the abductions.

According to the applicants, they have neither been regularly informed of the progress in the investigation nor granted access to the criminal case files. In all of the cases the applicants have requested information about the progress of the proceedings from the investigative authorities; in response they have received formal letters usually stating that the investigation was in progress and that their requests had been forwarded to yet another law-enforcement authority for examination. According to the applicants, the investigators have either failed to take the most important investigative steps, such as questioning of witnesses to the abductions, or they have taken those essential steps with significant and inexplicable delays.

COMPLAINTS

1. Relying on Article 2 of the Convention, the applicants in all the cases complain of the violation of the right to life of their relatives referred to as “abducted persons” in the *Appendix* and submit that the circumstances of their detention indicate that they were abducted by State agents. The applicants further complain that no effective investigation was conducted into their relatives’ abduction and subsequent disappearance.

2. Relying on Article 3 of the Convention, the applicants in all the cases, except for the case of *Alkhotova v. Russia* (no. 64270/11), complain that they have suffered severe mental distress due to the indifference demonstrated by the national authorities in connection with the abduction and subsequent disappearance of their close relatives and the State’s failure to conduct an effective investigation in that respect. Under the same provision, the applicants in the cases of *Aguyeva and others v. Russia* (no. 52076/11) complain that their abducted relatives were subjected to torture.

3. The applicants in all the cases submit that the unacknowledged detention of their relatives referred to as “abducted persons” in the *Appendix* violated all of the guarantees of Article 5 of the Convention.

4. The applicants in all the cases complain under Article 13 of the Convention that they did not have an effective remedy in respect of their complaints under Article 2 of the Convention. The applicants in the case of *Nuraliyevy v. Russia* (no. 48134/11) complain that they did not have an effective remedy in respect of their complaints under Articles 3 and 5 of the Convention.

5. The applicants in the cases *Aguyeva and others v. Russia* (no. 52076/11), *Sangariyevy v. Russia* (no. 52182/11) and *Dashtayev and Others v. Russia* (no. 66831/11) complain under Article 8 about the violation of their right to respect for home on the account of the unlawful search conducted by the abductors.

6. The applicants in the cases of *Aguyeva and others v. Russia* (no. 52076/11) complain under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 of the violation of their right to peaceful enjoyment of property as a result of the abductors’ actions.

QUESTIONS TO THE PARTIES

1. In respect of all the applications, have the applicants complied with the six-month time-limit laid down in Article 35 § 1 of the Convention? In particular, were there “excessive or unexplained delays” on the part of the applicants in submitting their complaints to the Court after the abduction of their relatives? Have there been considerable lapses of time or significant

delays and lulls in the investigative activity which could have an impact on the application of the six-month limit (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *Varnava and Others v. Turkey* [GC], nos. 16064/90, 16065/90, 16066/90, 16068/90, 16069/90, 16070/90, 16071/90, 16072/90 and 16073/90, §§ 162, 165 and 166, ECHR 2009-...)?

2. Having regard to:

(i) the Court's numerous previous judgments in which violations of Article 2 were found in respect of both disappearances of the applicants' relatives as a result of detention by unidentified members of the security forces and the failure to conduct an effective investigation (see, among others, *Bazorkina v. Russia*, no. 69481/01, 27 July 2006; *Imakayeva v. Russia*, no. 7615/02, ECHR 2006-XIII (extracts); *Luluyev and Others v. Russia*, no. 69480/01, ECHR 2006-XIII (extracts); *Baysayeva v. Russia*, no. 74237/01, 5 April 2007; *Elsiyev and Others v. Russia*, no. 21816/03, 12 March 2009; *Asadulayeva and Others v. Russia*, no. 15569/06, 17 September 2009; *Medova v. Russia*, no. 25385/04, ECHR 2009-... (extracts)), and;

(ii) the similarity of the present fifteen applications both to each other and to the cases cited above, as can be derived from the applicants' submissions and the interim results of the respective investigations:

(a) Have the applicants made a *prima facie* case that their relatives (referred to as "abducted persons" in the Appendix) were detained by State servicemen in the course of security operations?

(b) If so, can the burden of proof be shifted to the Government in order to provide a satisfactory and convincing explanation of the circumstances of the applicants' relatives' abductions and ensuing disappearances (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *Varnava and Others v. Turkey* [GC], cited above, § 184)? Is the Government in a position to rebut the applicants' submissions that State agents were involved in the abductions by submitting documents which are in their exclusive possession or by providing a satisfactory and convincing explanation of the events by other means?

(c) Has the right to life, as guaranteed by Article 2 of the Convention, been violated in respect of the applicants' missing relatives?

(d) Having regard to the procedural protection of the right to life under Article 2 of the Convention (see *Salman v. Turkey* [GC], no. 21986/93, § 104, ECHR 2000-VII), was the investigation conducted by the domestic authorities into the disappearances of the applicants' missing relatives sufficient to meet their obligation to carry out an effective investigation, as required by Article 2 of the Convention?

3. In respect of all the applications, has the applicants' mental suffering in connection with the disappearance of their close relatives, the authorities' alleged indifference in that respect and their alleged failure to conduct an effective investigation into their disappearances been sufficiently serious to amount to inhuman and degrading treatment, within the meaning of Article 3 of the Convention? If so, has there been a breach of Article 3 of the Convention in respect of the applicants?

4. In respect of all the applications, were the applicants' missing relatives deprived of liberty within the meaning of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention on the dates listed in the Annex? If so, was such deprivation compatible with the guarantees of Article 5 §§ 1-5 of the Convention?

5. Has there been a violation of the seventh and the eighth applicants' right to respect for home, contrary to Article 8 of the Convention in the case of *Dashtayev and Others v. Russia* (66831/11)? Were effective domestic remedies available to the applicants in respect of the alleged violation of their rights under Article 8 of the Convention? Did the applicants exhaust those remedies?

6. In respect of all the applications, did the applicants have at their disposal effective domestic remedies in respect of their complaints under Article 2, as required by Article 13 of the Convention?

7. Further to the provisions of Article 38 of the Convention, the Government are requested to provide the following information in respect of each of the applications:

(a) any information, supported by relevant documents, which is capable of rebutting the applicants' allegations that their missing relatives were abducted by State servicemen;

and, in any event,

(b) a complete list of all investigative actions taken in connection with the applicants' complaints about the disappearance of their missing relatives, in chronological order, indicating the dates and authorities involved, as well as a brief summary of the findings;

as well as:

(c) copies of documents from the investigation files in respect of all relevant criminal cases, such as, in particular:

(i) the applicants' initial complaints about the disappearance of their relatives which had prompted the opening of the investigation;

(ii) decision(s) to initiate criminal proceedings;

(iii) decision(s) to grant the applicants victim status in the criminal proceedings, if any;

(iv) record(s) of any interviews of State servicemen (such as, for instance, military servicemen, local administration and police officers, servicemen at roadblocks and checkpoints, employees of other law enforcement agencies, etc.) held in connection with the abductions;

(v) statements of the eyewitnesses to the abductions, if any;

(vi) if the crime scene(s) were examined, or expert and/or forensic examinations were ordered in the course of the investigation, copies of all the relevant expert reports and findings;

(vii) where the investigations were suspended and reopened, copies of each and every decision on the suspension/resumption of the proceedings and of the documents containing the reasons for such

decisions (such as prosecutor's orders to resume the investigation and take investigative steps);

(viii) any other documents relevant for the establishment of the factual circumstances of the allegations and the evaluation of the effectiveness of the criminal investigations.

APPENDIX

Summary of the information concerning the applicants, their relatives allegedly abducted by State agents, the circumstances of the alleged abductions and the ensuing investigation

No.	Application no., date of introduction	Applicant's name, year of birth, relation to the disappeared person, place of residence	Represented by	Abducted person(s) (name, year of birth, date and place of the alleged abduction)	Description of the circumstances of the abduction(s) and subsequent developments	Official investigation details, as submitted by the applicants
1.	25088/11 Baskhanova v. Russia 09/01/2009	(1) Ms Petimat Baskhanova (1980), wife, Katyr-Yurt, Achkhoy-Martani district, the Chechen Republic	Not legally represented	(1) Mr Ruslan Baskhanov (1980), abducted from home in Achkhoy-Martani at 3 a.m. on 6 January 2004	<p>At about 3 a.m. on 6 January 2004 a group of about fifteen camouflaged and masked servicemen arrived at the applicants' house in two armoured personnel carriers (APCs) and took away the applicant's husband.</p> <p>The applicant has not seen Mr Ruslan Baskhanov ever since.</p> <p>The account of the events is based on the statement provided by the applicant and copies of documents received from the authorities.</p>	<p>On 15 January 2004 the Achkhoy-Martani inter-district prosecutor's office opened criminal case no. 38002.</p> <p>On 26 April 2004 the military prosecutor's office of military unit no. 20102 stated to the investigators that military servicemen had not been involved in the abduction.</p> <p>On 15 May 2004, 16 July 2008 and 28 March 2009 the investigation was suspended for failure to identify the perpetrators.</p> <p>On 26 November 2008 the Achkhoy-Martani District Court declared Ruslan Baskhanov a missing person.</p> <p>On 24 February 2009 the investigators informed the applicant that she had the right to review only certain documents from the investigation file, but not the entire contents.</p> <p>On 24 March 2009 the supervising prosecutor ordered that the investigation be resumed as the investigators had failed to take a number of basic steps, such as establishing the owners of the APCs used by the abductors and granting the applicant victim status in the criminal case. On the same date the applicant was granted the victim status.</p> <p>On 11 October 2010 the Achkhoy-Martani District Court partially allowed the applicant's complaint against the decision to suspend the investigation of 28 March 2009 and ordered the investigators to take necessary steps.</p> <p><u>Last document:</u> Decision to allow the applicant's complaint in part (see above). The criminal proceedings are currently pending.</p>

2.	<p>44277/11 Idigova and others v. Russia</p> <p>14/07/2011</p>	<p>(1) Ms Khava Idigova (1961), wife, Grozny, the Chechen Republic</p> <p>(2) Mr Ibragim Khamzatov (1999), son, idem</p> <p>(3) Ms Marem Khamzatova (2000), daughter, idem</p>	<p>Stitching Russian Justice Initiative</p>	<p>(1) Mr Magomed Khamzatov (1959), abducted from home at about 5 a.m. on 5 December 2004, Grozny</p>	<p>At the material time the applicants and Mr Magomed Khamzatov lived at no. 93 in Saltykova-Szhedrina Street in the Staropromyslovskiy district of Grozny.</p> <p>At about 5 a.m. on 5 December 2004 the first applicant saw from the window a group of about ten to twelve armed servicemen in military uniforms, masks, bulletproof vest and helmets running down the street and breaking into the neighbouring house, which belonged to the applicants' relatives.</p> <p>Shortly after that the armed men went to the applicants' house demanded that the first applicant opened the door. They said that they were the police conducting identity checks. The intruders, who spoke unaccented Russian, took Magomed outside along with his passport and some clothing. The first applicant followed the abductors and saw that they had arrived in the neighbourhood in a UAZ minivan parked on a neighbouring street. A number of the applicants' neighbours saw the servicemen forcing Magomed Khamzatov in the vehicle and driving away.</p> <p>On the same night the same group of servicemen broke into the house of the applicants' neighbours, the family of Ms A.T., quickly checked identity documents and searched the house.</p> <p>The applicants have not seen Magomed Khamzatov since his abduction on 5 December 2004.</p> <p>The account of the events is based on the statements provided by the applicants, their relatives and neighbours.</p>	<p>At about 11 a.m. on 5 December 2004 an investigation team examined the crime scene and questioned the first applicant and some of her neighbours.</p> <p>On 15 December 2004 (in the documents submitted the date was also referred to as 7 December 2004) the Staropromyslovskiy district prosecutor's office opened criminal case no. 33090. On 18 December 2004 the first applicant was granted victim status.</p> <p>On 24 February 2005 applicant's relative, Magomed Khamzatov's father, wrote to the Federal Service of the Execution of Punishment asking them to confirm whether his son Magomed was detained on the premises of the main Russian military base in Khankala, Chechnya. No reply was given to this request.</p> <p>On 25 March 2005 the first applicant requested that the investigators resumed the investigation of the criminal case. In their reply of 1 April 2005 the investigators informed her that the proceedings were in progress.</p> <p>On 18 July 2005 the applicants were informed that the criminal investigation was resumed.</p> <p>On 10 August 2005 the military prosecutor's office of military unit no. 20102 stated to the applicants that military servicemen had not been involved in the abduction.</p> <p>On 18 January 2006 the Staropromyslovskiy District Court declared Magomed Khamzatov a missing person.</p> <p>On 26 June 2006 the applicants were informed that the investigation had been suspended for failure to identify the perpetrators. It appears that the applicants did not contact the investigation between June 2006 and July 2011.</p> <p><u>Last document:</u> The letter of 26 June 2006 (see above). It appears that the criminal proceedings are currently pending.</p>
----	---	---	---	--	---	--

3.	44284/11 Vezirov and others v. Russia 14/07/2011	<p>(1) Mr Zaurbek Vezirov (1954), the father of the abducted men, Ilyinovskoye (also spelt as Ilyinovka), Naurskiy district, the Chechen Republic</p> <p>(2) Ms Aminat Vezirova (1957), the mother of the abducted men, idem</p> <p>(3) Ms Raisa Bibulatova (1979), the wife of Ms Askhab Vezirov, idem</p> <p>(4) Ms Elisa Vezirova (1990), the sister of the abducted men, idem</p> <p>(5) Ms Elina Vezirova (1990), the sister of the abducted men, idem</p> <p>(6) Ms Rukiyat Vezirova (1986), the sister of the abducted men, the Rostov region</p>	Stitching Russian Justice Initiative	<p>Two men abducted at 4 a.m. on 7 July 2003 from home in Ilyinovskoye:</p> <p>(1) Mr Kharun Vezirov (1977)</p> <p>and</p> <p>(2) Mr Askhab Vezirov (1979)</p>	<p>At about 4 a.m. on 7 July 2003 a group of about ten servicemen arrived at the applicants' house in several UAZ vehicles and a GAZEL minivan. The servicemen, who were armed and in camouflage uniforms and masks, checked identity documents of the family members and then dragged Kharun Vezirov to the backyard, where they subjected him to beatings demanding in unaccented Russian that he showed them firearms allegedly hidden in the house. Having searched the house, the servicemen forced Kharun and Askhab Vezirov in the GAZEL minivan and drove away in the direction of the town of Argun, Chechnya.</p> <p>The applicants have not seen Kharun and Askhab Vezirov since their abduction on 7 July 2003.</p> <p>The account of the events is based on the statements provided by the applicants, their relatives and neighbours.</p>	<p>On 27 February 2004 the Grozny district prosecutor's office opened criminal case no. 34025.</p> <p>On 9 March and 25 May 2004 the third and first applicants accordingly were granted victim status in the criminal case.</p> <p>On 19 August 2004 the applicants were informed that the investigation of the criminal case had been resumed.</p> <p>On 12 March 2007 and 14 April 2011 the applicants were informed that the investigation had been suspended on 19 September 2004 for failure to identify the perpetrators.</p> <p>It appears that the applicant did not contact the investigation from March 2007 to April 2011.</p> <p><u>Last document:</u> The letter of 14 April 2011 (see above). It appears that the criminal proceedings are currently pending.</p>
----	--	--	--------------------------------------	--	---	--

		(7) Ms Zhansari Vezirova (1980), the sister of the abducted men, Grozny				
4.	44313/11 Ismailova and others v. Russia 12/07/2011	<p>(1) Ms Khazan (also spelt as Khaza) Ismailova (1957), aunt, Goyty, the Chechen Republic</p> <p>(2) Ms Medni Isayeva (2003), daughter, idem</p> <p>(3) Ms Zina Ismailova (1939), grandmother, Grozny</p>	Stitching Russian Justice Initiative	<p>(1) Mr Aslambek Isayev (1981), abducted on 16 April 2003 at around 3 a.m. from home in Grozny</p>	<p>At the material time the applicants and Aslambek Isayev lived together in flat no. 8 (in the documents submitted also referred to under no. 11) at 54, Tobolskaya Street in Grozny. The applicants' neighbourhood was surrounded by military checkpoints. The area was under curfew.</p> <p>At about 3 a.m. on 16 April 2003 a group of about ten armed servicemen in camouflage uniforms arrived at the applicants' house in two UAZ vehicles. They broke into the house, asked the applicants in Russian whether any firearms were hidden on the premises and quickly searched it. After that they told the applicants that identity checks had been conducted in the area and that more than fifty persons had been already arrested as the result. Then they said that they would check Aslambek's identity, put him in one of the UAZ cars and drove away.</p> <p>The applicants have not seen Mr Aslambek Isayev since his abduction on 16 April 2003.</p> <p>The account of the events is based on the statements provided by the applicants, their relatives and neighbours.</p>	<p>On 1 May 2003 the Grozny town prosecutor's office opened criminal case no. 40070.</p> <p>On 12 May 2003 the wife of Aslambek Isayev, Ms M.M., requested that the Chechnya Prosecutor assisted her in the search for her husband.</p> <p>On 15 May 2003 the investigators questioned the third applicant who stated, amongst other things, that Aslambek's abductors had informed the applicants about the identity checks in the area resulting in the arrest of about fifty local residents.</p> <p>On the same date, 15 May 2003, the investigators questioned the applicants' relative Ms M.K. who stated that in the morning of 16 April 2003 Aslambek's wife had arrived at her house and told her that Aslambek had been arrested by military servicemen who had arrived in two UAZ vehicles.</p> <p>On 19 May 2003 the wife of Aslambek Isayev, Ms M.M., was granted victim status in the criminal case.</p> <p>On 19 May 2003 the investigators questioned the first applicant whose statement about the events in question was similar to the one given by Ms M.K. on 15 May 2003.</p> <p>On 22 May 2003 the crime scene was inspected. No evidence was collected.</p> <p>On 1 August 2003 the investigation of the criminal case was suspended for failure to identify the perpetrators. The applicants were informed about it on 10 August 2003.</p> <p>On 12 May 2005 the decision to suspend the proceedings was overruled for the investigators' failure to take basic steps.</p> <p>On 7 June and 21 December 2005 the first applicant complained to a number of law-enforcement authorities, including the Chechnya Military Prosecutor, the Chechnya Prosecutor and the Oktyabrskiy district prosecutor about Aslambek's abduction by 'representatives of power structures' and that the investigation into the incident was ineffective.</p>

					<p>On 8 June 2005 the investigators again questioned Ms M.M.</p> <p>On 15 June 2005 the investigation of the criminal case was suspended for failure to identify the perpetrators.</p> <p>On an unspecified date in March 2006 the first applicant again complained to the Chechnya Prosecutor that the investigation was ineffective.</p> <p>On 20 January 2008 Ms M.M. complained to the Oktyabrskiy District Court that the investigation was ineffective. The outcome of this complaint is unknown.</p> <p>On 15 April 2009 the first applicant requested that the investigators allowed her to access the criminal case file. On 20 May 2009 she reiterated her request. No reply was given.</p> <p>On 26 January 2011 Ms M.M. again complained to the Oktyabrskiy District Court that the investigation was ineffective. The outcome of this complaint is unknown.</p> <p><u>Last document:</u> the complaint of 26 January 2011 (see above). It appears that the criminal proceedings are currently pending.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

5.	48134/11 Nuraliyevy v. Russia 13/07/2011	<p>(1) Ms Maret Nuraliyeva (1970), sister, Grozny, the Chechen Republic</p> <p>(2) Ms Aset Nuraliyeva (1972), sister, Dyshne-Vedeno, the Chechen Republic</p>	Materi Chechni	<p>(1) Mr Daud Nuraliyev (1979), abducted from home in Chechen-Aul on 16 June 2002</p> <p>(2) Mr Khalid Nuraliyev (1974), abducted from the street in Chechen-Aul on 23 June 2002</p>	<p>At the material time the applicants and their brothers Daud and Khalid lived together in Chechen-Aul.</p> <p>Between 10 and 24 June 2002 the Russian military forces conducted a ‘sweeping-up’ operation in Chechen-Aul. The temporary headquarters of the operation was stationed at the outskirts of the village.</p> <p>On 16 June 2002 a group of about ten armed military servicemen in camouflage uniforms arrived at the applicants’ house in two APCs. The servicemen, some of whom were masked, searched the house and demanded Daud in unaccented Russian to proceed with them for an identity check; Daud was put in one of the APCs which drove away towards the temporary military headquarters.</p> <p>On 23 June 2002 at the corner of Sadovaya and Sovkhoznaya Streets the same group of military servicemen in APCs detained Khalid Nuraliyev and took him to the temporary headquarters.</p> <p>According to the applicants, at some point in 2005 they found out that after the abduction Khalid Nuraliyev had been detained in a prison in the Rostov region. In response to their requests to the authorities asking to confirm this information, the applicant received negative replies.</p> <p>The applicants have not seen their brothers since their abduction in June 2002.</p> <p>The account of the events is based on the statements provided by the applicants, their relatives and neighbours.</p>	<p>On 28 June 2002 the Grozny district prosecutor’s office opened criminal case no. 56099. The document stated that Khalid Nuraliyev had been abducted ‘by unidentified persons during the special operation’.</p> <p>It is unclear whether the applicants contacted the authorities between July 2002 and May 2010.</p> <p>On 26 May 2010 the first applicant complained to the Grozny district prosecutor that the investigation of her brothers’ abduction by servicemen during the special operation was ineffective and requested to be informed of its progress.</p> <p>On 3 June 2010 the investigators replied to the applicant stating that they had taken all possible measures to have the crime resolved.</p> <p>On 11 November 2010 the first applicant was granted victim status in the criminal case.</p> <p>On 18 October 2010 the investigation of the criminal case was suspended for failure to identify the perpetrators.</p> <p>On 11 November 2010 the supervising prosecutor overruled the decision to suspend the proceedings for the investigators’ failure to take basic steps and ordered its resumption.</p> <p>On 14 November 2010 the investigation was again suspended for failure to identify the perpetrators.</p> <p>On 24 February 2011 the first applicant complained to the Grozny District Court that the investigation of criminal case no. 56099 was ineffective and requested the court to order the authorities to effectively investigate the crime.</p> <p>On 14 March 2011 the District Court rejected the applicant’s complaint stating that the investigation had been resumed. On 13 April 2011 this decision was upheld on appeal by the Chechnya Supreme Court.</p> <p><u>Last document:</u> The decision of 13 April 2011 (see above). The criminal proceedings are currently pending.</p>
----	--	---	-------------------	---	---	---

6.	49486/11 Khamstkhanova v. Russia 18/07/2011	(1) Ms Arbiyat Khamstkhanova (1960), wife, Grozny, the Chechen Republic	Mr Dokka Itslayev, a lawyer practising in Grozny	<p>1) Mr Iles Khamstkhanov (1960, in the documents submitted the date of birth was also stated as 1955), abducted from home at 11 p.m. on 12 January 2006, Grozny</p> <p>At about 11 p.m. on 12 January 2006 a group of ten armed servicemen in bulletproof vests and special helmets (the uniform usually worn by special forces) arrived at the applicant's house in three UAZ vehicles. One of the vehicles was armoured, the others were equipped with radio stations.</p> <p>The servicemen smashed windows and broke into the house. They grabbed Iles and dragged him outside; two of the intruders held the applicant's son Khussein at gun point and ordered him not to move. The servicemen put Iles in one of the vehicles and drove away in the direction of the Oktyabrskiy district department of the interior in Grozny (the ROVD). The applicant's son Khussein immediately went to the ROVD with his relatives; there they were told that Iles had been arrested by mistake and that he would be released soon.</p> <p>The applicant has not seen her husband Iles Khamstkhanov since his abduction on 12 January 2006.</p> <p>The account of the events is based on the statements provided by the applicant and her relatives and copies of documents received from the authorities.</p>	<p>The applicant and her relatives immediately lodged a written complaint about the abduction with the ROVD. On 14 January 2006 investigators arrived at the applicant's house and questioned her, her daughter and her son Khussein.</p> <p>On 23 January 2006 the applicant complained about the abduction to Chechnya prosecutor.</p> <p>On 30 January 2006 the Oktyabrskiy district prosecutor's office in Grozny opened criminal case no. 52007. On 31 January 2006 the applicant was granted victim status.</p> <p>On 31 January and 10 March 2006 the Chechnya prosecutor's office forwarded the applicant's complaints about the abduction to the district prosecutor's office for examination.</p> <p>On 20 April 2006 the applicant was informed that on an unspecified date the investigation of the abduction was resumed.</p> <p>On 20 May 2006 the applicant was informed that the investigation of the criminal case was suspended for failure to identify the perpetrators.</p> <p>On 29 May 2006 the applicant was informed that on 25 May 2006 the supervising prosecutor overruled the decision to suspend the investigation and that the proceedings had been resumed.</p> <p>It is unclear whether the applicant contacted the investigative authorities between August 2006 and January 2011.</p> <p>On 25 February 2011 the applicant complained to the Oktyabrskiy District Court in Grozny that the investigation of her husband's abduction by representatives of power structures was ineffective and requested that it be resumed and carried out in an effective manner. On 27 April 2011 the court rejected the applicant's complaint stating that the investigation had been resumed on 26 April 2011.</p> <p>On 6 May 2011 the investigation of the criminal case was suspended.</p> <p><u>Last document</u>: the decision to suspend the investigation of 6 May 2011 (see above). The criminal proceedings are currently pending.</p>
----	---	--	--	--	--

7.	52051/11 Akhilgovy v. Russia 01/08/2011	<p>(1) Mr Bayal (in the documents submitted also spelt as Bayali) Akhilgov (1958), father, Urus-Martani, the Chechen Republic</p> <p>(2) Ms Bikhana Akhilgova (1958), mother, idem</p>	Mr Dokka Itslayev, a lawyer practising in Grozny	<p>(1) Mr Lom-Ali Akhilgov (1986), abducted from home on 8 January 2003 at around 3 a.m., Urus-Martani</p>	<p>At the material time the united military alignment (the UGA) ‘West’ (<i>‘3anad’</i>) was stationed in Urus-Martani, in about one km from the applicants’ house. The area was under curfew; checkpoints were situated on all roads leading to and from the town.</p> <p>On 8 January 2003 the applicants and their sons Lom-Ali and Magomed were at home. At about 3 a.m. a group of armed servicemen in khaki-coloured camouflage uniforms arrived at the neighbourhood in several vehicles, including an APC, a URAL lorry and a UAZ minivan. Some of them were in masks. The soldiers, who spoke unaccented Russian, broke into the house, pointed their guns at the first applicant and took Lom-Ali outside. They told the second applicant that she would find her son on the following day at the Zavodskoy district department of the interior in Grozny (the Zavodskoy ROVD). Then they walked out to the street with the applicant’s son in the direction of the UGA headquarters; they dragged him over the bridge and then put in the UAZ minivan. According to the applicants’ neighbours, another group of soldiers, about twenty, was waiting for the first group in about 300 metres from the applicants’ house.</p> <p>The applicants have not seen their son Lom-Ali Akhilgov since his abduction on 8 January 2003.</p> <p>The applicants’ account is based on statements provided by them, their relatives and neighbours.</p>	<p>In the morning of 8 January 2003 the applicants went to the Zavodskoy ROVD looking for Lom-Ali. The police denied his arrest or detention on their premises. On 10 January 2003 the applicants complained about the abduction to the Urus-Martani prosecutor.</p> <p>On 30 January 2003 the Urus-Martani district prosecutor’s office opened criminal case no. 34009 (in the documents submitted also referred to under no. 63044).</p> <p>On 30 March 2003 the investigation of the criminal case was suspended for failure to identify the perpetrators.</p> <p>At some point between April 2003 and July 2009 the investigation of the criminal case was transferred to the Achkhoy-Martani inter-district prosecutor’s office.</p> <p>On 9 July 2009 the first applicant complained to the Achkhoy-Martani inter-district prosecutor’s office that the investigation of his son’s abduction by federal servicemen was ineffective and requested that the authorities granted him victim status and informed him about the progress in the proceedings. On 20 July 2009 the investigators replied that the investigation had been resumed for failure to take basic steps, such questioning of the witnesses to the abduction and crime scene examination.</p> <p>From the documents submitted it follows that the investigation was suspended from 30 April 2003 to 20 July 2009. It is unclear whether the applicants contacted the authorities during this period.</p> <p>On 28 July 2009 the first applicant was granted victim status in the criminal case.</p> <p>On 30 July 2009 the investigators requested that remand prison IZ-15/1 in Vladikavkaz, North Ossetia, informed them whether Lom-Ali Akhilgov was detained on their premises. The outcome of this request is unknown.</p> <p>On 20 August 2009 the investigation was again suspended for failure to identify the perpetrators.</p> <p>On 3 September 2009 the first applicant complained to the head of the Achkhoy-Martani inter-district investigations department that the investigation was ineffective and requested to be allowed to review the case file.</p> <p>On 15 September 2009 the investigators replied to the applicant that he had the right to access only the documents which reflected investigative steps taken with this participation.</p>
----	---	---	--	---	--	--

					<p>On 18 November 2009 the first applicant complained to the Achkhoy-Martan District Court that the investigation was ineffective and requested the court to order the investigators to resume the proceedings and allow him to review the case file. On 11 December 2009 the court allowed the complaint stating that for more than six years the investigation had been unlawfully suspended and that the applicant was entitled to review the entire contents of the case file.</p> <p>On 11 November 2010 the first applicant again complained to the Achkhoy-Martan District Court that the investigation was ineffective.</p> <p>On 19 May 2011 the investigation of the criminal case was resumed. On 20 May 2011 the court rejected the applicant’s complaint stating that the investigation had been resumed on 19 May 2011. On 15 June 2011 this decision was upheld on appeal by the Chechnya Supreme Court.</p> <p><u>Last document:</u> The decision of 15 June 2011 (see above). The criminal proceedings are currently pending.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

8.	52076/11 Aguyeva and others v. Russia 11/08/2011	<p>(1) Mr Khedi Aguyeva (1960), mother, Malorechnaya, Kurchaloy district, Chechnya</p> <p>(2) Mr Inderpash Ismailov (1956), father, Tsotsi-Yurt, Kurchaloy district, Chechnya</p> <p>(3) Ms Marusa Aguyeva (1921), grandmother, Malorechnaya, Kurchaloy district, Chechnya</p> <p>(4) Ms Luiza Makhmadova (in the documents submitted also spelt as Makhamdova) (1985), Dzhandar Ismailov's wife, Gudermes, Chechnya</p>	Stitching Russian Justice Initiative	<p>Two brothers abducted on 21 January 2003 at about 6 a.m. from home in Gudermes:</p> <p>(1) Mr Dzhandar Ismailov (1979) and</p> <p>(2) Mr Dzhalil Ismailov (1982)</p>	<p>At the material time the town of Gudermes was under curfew; it was surrounded by military checkpoints. A special military unit no. 291 of the 42nd regiment of the motorised infantry division of the Russian Ministry of Defence called 'Battalion Vostok' (<i>батальон 291-го мотострелкового полка 42-ой гвардейской мотострелковой дивизии Министерства Обороны РФ</i>) was stationed in the settlement. According to the applicants, the battalion was involved in special operations of the Russian federal forces. Dzhandar and Dzhalil Ismailov lived with their families, including the applicants, on the second floor of block of flats at no. 52 in Kavkazskaya Street in Gudermes.</p> <p>In the early hours of 21 January 2003 a group of about ten to fifteen servicemen in camouflage uniforms and masks arrived at the applicants' address in a grey UAZ vehicle with smeared registration numbers. The only one serviceman without mask had dark hair and a clearly visible scar on the left cheek. The intruders, who were armed with machineguns, dispersed throughout the building on each floor. Then they broke into the applicants' flat; quickly searched it and took away gold jewellery and 250,000 Russian rubles (RUB) (about EUR 6,500). They were in a rush and gave no explanations for their actions; after the search they took Dzhandar and Dzhalil outside without allowing them to put on warm clothing. They forced the brothers in the UAZ vehicle and drove away in the direction of Grozny.</p> <p>About two of three months after the abduction the second applicant was informed by Mr A.Kh., an officer from the Vostok battalion, that his sons</p>	<p>On 21 January 2003 the applicants complained in person about the abduction to the Argun district prosecutor's office.</p> <p>On 23 January 2003 the Gudermes district prosecutor's office opened criminal case no. 32005. On 24 January 2003 the second applicant was granted victim status in the criminal case.</p> <p>On 6 March 2003 the first applicant complained to the Gudermes prosecutor and the Chechnya prosecutor about the abduction of her sons by representatives of power structures.</p> <p>On 2 December 2004 the investigators informed the applicants that the investigation of the criminal case had been suspended on 23 April 2003 for failure to identify the perpetrators.</p> <p>On 11 September 2008 the first applicant complained to the Gudermes inter-district investigations department that the investigation of her sons' abduction was ineffective and requested the authorities to allow her to review the case file. On 11 October 2008 the investigators replied that the proceedings had been suspended on 23 April 2003 and that she could review the file in their office.</p> <p>On 23 March 2009 the investigators informed the first applicant that she could not review the case file as she did not have the victim status in the criminal case.</p> <p>On 5 April 2009 the first applicant again complained to the investigators that the investigation was ineffective and requested to be allowed to review the case file. On 21 April 2009 the first applicant was granted victim status in the criminal case.</p> <p>On 8 May 2009 the investigators informed the applicants that the investigation had established a possible involvement of representatives of law-enforcement agencies in the abduction.</p> <p>On 1 June 2009 the first applicant's lawyer requested that the investigators granted him access to the case file. No reply was given to this request.</p> <p>From the documents submitted it follows that the investigation was suspended from 23 April 2003 to 11 June 2009. On 14 February 2011 the first applicant requested that the investigators provided her with an update on the progress of the proceedings. No reply was given to this request.</p> <p><u>Last document:</u> The request of 14 February 2011 (see above). It appears that the criminal proceedings are still pending.</p>
----	--	--	--------------------------------------	---	---	--

		(5) Mr Atama Ismailov (2003), Dzhandar Ismailov's son, idem			<p>were detained by the battalion's commander Dzhabrail Yamadayev.</p> <p>The applicants have not seen their relatives since their abduction on 21 January 2003.</p> <p>The account of the events is based on the statements provided by the applicants, their relatives and neighbours.</p>	
9.	52182/11 Sangariyev y v. Russia 11/08/2011	<p>(1) Ms Zulay Sangariyeva (1957), mother of Said-Ibragim Sangariyev, Stariye Atagi, Grozny district, the Chechen Republic</p> <p>(2) Ms Zulikhan Sangariyeva (1986), sister of Said-Ibragim Sangariyev, idem;</p> <p>(3) Ms Aminat Sangariyeva (1983), sister of Said-Ibragim Sangariyev, idem;</p> <p>(4) Mr Islam Sangariyev (1981), brother</p>	Stitching Russian Justice Initiative	<p>Two cousins abducted on 12 February 2001 at 6 a.m. from home in Stariye Atagi:</p> <p>(1) Mr Said-Ibragim Sangariyev (1978) and</p> <p>(2) Mr Idris Sangariyev (1977)</p>	<p>The applicants are two related families. On the night between 11 and 12 February 2001 two cousins Said-Ibragim and Idris were staying at the house of their uncle Said-Khussein in Stariye Atagi.</p> <p>At 6 a.m. a group of about forty to fifty military servicemen arrived in three APCs at Said-Khussein's house. Other military vehicles and URAL lorries cordoned off the neighbourhood; the servicemen ordered the neighbours to stay inside.</p> <p>The servicemen climbed over the fence and broke into the house. Threatening to blow up the dwelling, they took Said-Khussein outside and put him on the knees against the wall demanding that he told them where were his nephews Said-Ibragim and Idris. Then the servicemen searched the house looking for the two cousins; about an hour later they found them and dragged them outside. Then the servicemen reported the arrest to their superiors via portable radios using code numbers '22-23-43'. After that they took Said-Ibragim's VAZ-2107 car with registration number C96 AP 20RUS, put both cousins there and drove them away in the direction of Grozny. According to the documents submitted, the applicants' relatives were taken to Khankala, the headquarters of the Russian federal forces in Chechnya.</p> <p>In less than a month after the abduction, the</p>	<p>On 14, 19, 22 and 28 March and then on various dates in June, August, October –December 2001 the applicants complained about their relatives' abduction by military servicemen to a number of law-enforcement agencies, including various public and military prosecutors' offices in Chechnya.</p> <p>On 9 April 2001 the Grozny district prosecutor's office opened criminal case no. 19045 (in the documents submitted also referred to under no. 42229). From the documents submitted it follows that criminal case no. 19045 was opened in connection with not only the abduction of the applicants' relatives, but also the abduction of a number of other residents of Stariye Atagi perpetrated by the same group of men on the same date.</p> <p>On 21 December 2001 the first applicant complained to the Chechnya prosecutor that the investigation of the abduction was ineffective and that the investigators failed to provide her with updates on its progress.</p> <p>On various dates between 2002 and 2005 the applicants complained about ineffectiveness of the investigation of the abduction by the State servicemen to a number of the public and military prosecutors' offices, the police, the military commanders' offices and the Federal Security Service (the FSB) departments of different levels. In their complaints the applicants described the circumstances of the abduction and stressed that the perpetrators had belonged to the State authorities, driven around in military vehicles and used portable radio stations. In reply the authorities forwarded the applicants' complaints to the investigators or other law enforcement agencies for examination.</p> <p>On 1 August and 9 October 2002 the Chechnya prosecutor informed the applicants that on 6 June 2001 the investigation had been suspended and that on 1 August 2002 the proceedings had been resumed for the investigators' failure to take a number of necessary steps.</p> <p>On 14 May 2003 the investigators informed the applicants that the investigation had been resumed. The letter also stated that 'the investigation has</p>

		<p>of Said-Ibragim Sangariyev, idem;</p> <p>(5) Ms Raisa Sangariyeva (1950), mother of Idris Sangariyev, idem;</p> <p>(6) Mr Said-Magomed Sangariyev (1950), father of Idris Sangariyev, idem</p>		<p>fourth applicant saw that Said-Ibragim's car was driven around by a group of military servicemen of Slavic appearance, whose uniform had small stars on the shoulder straps.</p> <p>The applicants have not seen their relatives since their abduction on 12 February 2001.</p> <p>The account of the events is based on the statements provided by the applicants, their relatives and neighbours.</p>	<p>been unable to establish exactly which law enforcement agency abducted the two men... in connection with this the investigation was suspended on 30 January 2003'.</p> <p>On 17 May 2003 the investigation was again suspended.</p> <p>On various dates in November 2003 the Departments of the Execution of Punishment of the Rostov and the Volgograd Regions informed the applicants that their abducted relatives were not detained in their remand prisons. On 13 December 2003 the investigation was resumed.</p> <p>On 27 December 2003 the Chechnya FSB replied to the applicants that Said-Ibragim and Idris Sangariyev were not listed in their data base persons involved in illegal activities.</p> <p>On 20 January 2004 the first applicant was granted victim status in the criminal case. She was questioned only in March 2008 (see below).</p> <p>On 17 March and 17 May 2004 and 15 February 2005 the military prosecutor's office of the United Group Alignment (the UGA) and the military prosecutor's office of military unit no. 20102 replied to the applicants that their inquiries had not established the involvement of military servicemen in the abduction.</p> <p>On 25 March 2004 the investigation was again suspended. On 27 September 2004 the investigation was again resumed following the supervising prosecutor's orders to this end.</p> <p>On 5 October 2005 the investigation was again resumed following the supervising prosecutor's orders to this end. On 26 November 2005 and 26 August 2006 it was again suspended.</p> <p>On 14 February 2008 the first applicant complained to the Grozny District Court that the investigation was ineffective and requested that it be resumed and conducted effectively.</p> <p>On 19 March 2008 the first applicant was questioned by the investigators. She provided detailed description of the events and stated that the abductors had been military servicemen who had used armoured vehicles. On the same date the second applicant was questioned, who also asserted that his relatives had been abducted by military servicemen in armoured vehicles.</p> <p>On 5 April 2008 the investigation was again suspended.</p> <p>On 14 February 2011 the first applicant requested the investigators to inform her about the progress in the criminal proceedings. It is unclear whether any</p>
--	--	---	--	--	---

						<p>reply was given to the request.</p> <p><u>Last document:</u> the request of 14 February 2011 (see above). It appears that the criminal proceedings are currently pending.</p>
10.	<p>53322/11 Asukhanov a v. Russia</p> <p>04/08/2011</p>	<p>(1) Ms Zargan Asukhanova (1950), wife, Urus-Martan, the Chechen Republic</p>	<p>Not legally represented</p>	<p>(1) Mr Magomed Asukhanov (1947), abducted at about 7 a.m. on 10 June 2002 from home in Urus-Martan</p>	<p>At the material time the town of Urus-Martan was under curfew; it was surrounded by military checkpoints. A number of law-enforcement agencies, including the military commander’s office, were operating in the settlement.</p> <p>At about 7 a.m. on 10 June 2002 a group of ten to fifteen armed servicemen in camouflage uniforms and masks arrived at the applicant’s house in a khaki-coloured UAZ minivan with registration plate which contained numbers ‘23-75’. The intruders, who spoke unaccented Russian, took the applicant’s husband Magomed outside and put him in the minivan saying that they were taking him to the military commander’s office. Then the servicemen drove away in the northern direction.</p> <p>The applicant has not seen her husband since his abduction on 10 June 2002.</p> <p>The account of the events is based on the statements provided by the applicant and her neighbours.</p>	<p>On 11 June 2002 the applicant complained to the Urus-Martan prosecutor and the Urus-Martan district military commander about her husband’s abduction by military servicemen in the UAZ minivan with registration number ‘23-75’.</p> <p>On 13 June 2002 the Urus-Martan district prosecutor’s office opened criminal case no. 61100. On 28 August 2002 the applicant was granted victim status in the criminal case.</p> <p>A number of times between 2002 and 2003 the applicant complained to various law-enforcement authorities, including the prosecutors’ offices and the police departments of different levels, about her husband’s abduction by military servicemen and pointed out that in spite of having all the necessary information pointing out to the perpetrators, the investigation of the crime was ineffective.</p> <p>On an unspecified date in 2002 or 2003 the investigation of the criminal case was suspended for failure to identify the perpetrators. On 1 August 2003 it was resumed. On 1 September 2003 it was again suspended.</p> <p>On 10 February 2004 the Urus-Martan Town Court declared Magomed Asukhanov a missing person as of 10 June 2002.</p> <p>On 4 August 2004 and 2 June 2005 the applicant complained to the Chechnya prosecutor about the abduction stating that the perpetrators must have belonged to the federal forces as they had been able to pass through checkpoints in the area during curfew and that they had driven around as a large group in the UAZ minivan usually used by the military. She further stated that the investigation was ineffective and that the authorities had failed to take the most basic steps to identify the perpetrators. On 1 September 2004 and 17 June 2005 accordingly the investigators replied to the applicant that the investigation was in progress and that they were taking all possible measures to have the crime resolved.</p> <p>On 1 September 2006 the applicant complained to the Urus-Martan district prosecutor that the investigation into her husband’s abduction was ineffective. On 8 September 2006 the investigators informed her that the proceedings had</p>

					<p>been suspended.</p> <p>On 30 August 2007 the investigation was resumed for the investigators' failure to take a number of basic steps, such as the examination of the theory of possible involvement of the federal servicemen in the abduction.</p> <p>On 30 September 2007 the investigation was again suspended. On 29 October 2007 it was again resumed by the supervising prosecutor who criticised the suspension as unlawful and premature. On 30 November 2007 the investigation was again suspended.</p> <p>On several occasion in 2009 and 2010 the applicant complained to the supervising prosecutor that the investigation was ineffective. In reply she was informed that the investigators were taking all possible measures to have the crime resolved.</p> <p>On 22 June 2010 and 18 March 2011 the applicant complained to the Achkhoy-Martan District Court that the investigation was ineffective, that it had been unlawfully suspended and that she was deprived of access to the case file. On 13 July 2010 the court partially allowed the complaint of 22 June 2010 and ordered that the investigators allowed the applicant to review the case file; the complaint of 18 March 2011 was rejected on 28 March 2011 as the investigators had resumed the proceedings on the same date.</p> <p><u>Last document:</u> the decision to resume the criminal investigation of 28 March 2011 (see above). The criminal proceedings are currently pending.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

11.	<p>55055/11 Nutayevy v. Russia</p> <p>23/08/2011</p>	<p>(1) Mr Sultan Nutayev (1958) father, Stariye Atagi, Grozny district, the Chechen Republic</p> <p>(2) Ms Tamara Nutayeva (1959) mother, idem</p>	<p>Stitching Russian Justice Initiative</p>	<p>(1) Mr Saykhan Nutayev (1983) abducted at 5 a.m. on 26 February 2003 from home in Stariye Atagi</p> <p>At the material time the village of Stariye Atagi was under curfew. It was surrounded by military checkpoints situated in all roads leading to and from the settlement. A military unit of the Russian federal forces was stationed at the outskirts of the village, on the premises of the former mill factory ('the mill'). According to the applicants, the mill was used as a filtering point by the military for the processing and detention of local residents detained during special operations.</p> <p>At about 5 a.m. on 26 February 2003 a group of about twenty armed military servicemen in camouflage uniforms arrived at the applicants' house in two grey UAZ minivans and two VAZ-2121 ('Niva') cars. The vehicles surrounded the house. Some of the servicemen were wearing masks; some of them had helmets on. The servicemen broke into the applicants' house and ordered everyone to show their identity documents. Then they grabbed Saykhan, forced him outside and put him into one of the vehicles. The applicants, accompanied by a neighbour, also got in a car and followed the abductors to the premises of the military unit at the mill. There they tried to gain access to the military compound, but to no avail. On-duty servicemen denied having seen any cars leaving or entering the premises.</p> <p>The applicants have not seen their son since his abduction on 26 February 2003.</p> <p>The account of the events is based on the statements provided by the applicants and their neighbours.</p>	<p>On 4 March 2003 the applicants complained about their son's abduction buy military servicemen to the Grozny district prosecutor. On 11 March 2003 the Grozny district prosecutor's office opened criminal case no. 42043.</p> <p>On 16 April 2006 the investigation of the criminal case was suspended for failure to identify the perpetrators.</p> <p>On 30 June 2008 the military prosecutor's office of military unit no. 20102 informed the applicants that due to the rules of jurisdiction they did not have any information about the investigation.</p> <p>On 17 December 2009 and 17 August 2010 the applicants requested the investigators to update them on the progress of the proceedings. On 12 January 2010 and 23 August 2010 accordingly the authorities replied that the investigation had been suspended and that the applicants had the right to review certain documents from the case file.</p> <p>On 11 March 2011 the applicants again requested the investigators to update them on the progress of the proceedings. The outcome of this request is unknown.</p> <p><u>Last document:</u> the request of 11 March 2011 (see above). The criminal proceedings are currently pending.</p>
-----	---	--	---	---	--

12.	<p>56574/11 Saltuyevy v. Russia</p> <p>18/08/2011</p>	<p>(1) Ms Khadisht Saltuyeva (1955), mother, Urus-Martani, the Chechen Republic</p> <p>2) Mr Abdul-Khalim Saltuyev (1946), father, idem</p>	Not legally represented	<p>(1) Mr Aslanbek Saltuyev (1981) abducted at 2.30 a.m. on 14 October 2002 from home in Urus-Martani</p>	<p>At the material time the town of Urus-Martani was under curfew; it was surrounded by military checkpoints. A number of law-enforcement agencies, including the military commander's office, were operating in the settlement.</p> <p>At about 2.30 a.m. on 14 October 2002 a group of ten armed servicemen in camouflage uniforms, with flashlights attached to their foreheads, broke into the applicants' house and took away their son, Aslanbek Saltuyev. The intruders, who were equipped with portable radios, took Aslanbek to the UAZ minivan which was waiting in the street and drove away. The applicants saw that the servicemen had also arrived in an APC, a URAL lorry and another UAZ vehicle.</p> <p>The applicants have not seen their son since his abduction on 14 October 2002.</p> <p>The account of the events is based on the statements provided by the applicants and the copies of documents received from the authorities.</p>	<p>On 14 October 2002 the applicants complained about the abduction to a number of law-enforcement agencies, including the Urus-Martani district department of the interior (the ROVD), the Urus-Martani district prosecutor's office and the district military commander's office.</p> <p>On 7 November 2002 the Urus-Martani district prosecutor's office opened criminal case no. 61141.</p> <p>On various dates between October and December 2002 the investigators requested that a number of law-enforcement agencies in Chechnya, including the district departments of the interior, military commanders' offices and the FSB departments informed them whether they had detained the applicants' son. Negative replies were received.</p> <p>On 27 December 2002 the investigators granted the first applicant victim status in the criminal case and questioned her.</p> <p>On 7 January 2003 the investigation of the criminal case was suspended for failure to identify the perpetrators. On 19 June 2003 it was resumed. On 25 July 2003 it was again suspended. On 6 June 2005 it was again resumed by the supervising prosecutor and the investigators were ordered to take a number of basic steps. On 6 July 2005 the investigation was again suspended.</p> <p>On a number of occasions between 2003 and 2007 the applicants complained to the prosecutors of various levels that the investigation of the abduction was ineffective.</p> <p>On 28 April 2011 the applicants complained to the head of the Achkhoy-Martani investigations department that they did not have information about the progress of the investigation and requested to be allowed to review the case file. On 5 May 2011 their complaint was rejected.</p> <p>On 17 May 2011 the applicants complied to the Urus-Martani District Court that the investigation of their son's abduction was ineffective and requested that it be resumed and that they were permitted to review the case file. On 25 May 2011 the court allowed the complaint and on the same date the investigation was resumed. The investigators forwarded numerous requests to various law enforcement authorities concerning possible detention of the applicant's son on their premises. On 3 June 2011 the investigation was suspended again.</p> <p><u>Last document:</u> the decision to suspend the investigation of 3 June 2011 (see above). The criminal proceedings are currently pending.</p>
-----	--	---	-------------------------	--	---	--

13.	64266/11 Salamov and Others v. Russia 15/09/2011	<p>(1) Mr Khalit Salamov (1938), father, Katyr-Yurt, Achkhoy-Martani district, the Chechen Republic</p> <p>(2) Ms Bikazhu Dzhambulatova (1946), mother, idem</p> <p>(3) Mr Imran Salamov (1977), brother, Grozny, the Chechen Republic</p>	Materi Chechni	<p>(1) Mr Usman Salamov (1977) abducted at 4 a.m. on 12 November 2002 from home in Katyr-Yurt</p>	<p>At the material time Katyr-Yurt was under curfew. At about 4 a.m. on 12 November 2002 a group of armed servicemen in camouflage uniforms and masks arrived at the applicants' house in two APCs and a VAZ car. They broke into the house, quickly searched it, took Usman Salamov outside, forced him in one of the APCs and drove away.</p> <p>The applicants have not seen their son since his abduction on 12 November 2002.</p> <p>The account of the events is based on the statements provided by the applicants and their neighbours and the copies of documents received from the authorities.</p>	<p>On 29 January 2003 the Achkhoy-Martani inter-district prosecutor's office opened criminal case no. 44015.</p> <p>On 28 April 2003 the first applicant was granted victim status in the criminal case.</p> <p>On 29 April 2003 the investigation was suspended for failure to identify the perpetrators.</p> <p>It is unclear whether the applicants contacted the authorities between May 2003 and June 2009.</p> <p>On 16 July 2009 the applicants complained to the head of the Achkhoy-Martani investigations department that they did not have information about the progress of the investigation and requested to be allowed to review the case file. On the same date the investigators replied that the applicants could obtain copies of a few documents from the file. On the same date, 17 July 2008, the investigation was again suspended.</p> <p>On 2 February 2010 the applicants complained to the Achkhoy-Martani District Court that the investigation of their son's abduction was ineffective and requested that it be resumed.</p> <p>On 7 June 2010 the supervising prosecutor criticised the progress of the investigation and ordered its resumption.</p> <p>On 10 June 2010 the complaint of 2 February 2010 was rejected by the District Court as the investigation had been resumed on 7 June 2010.</p> <p>On 15 July 2010 the investigation was suspended again. The applicants appealed against this decision to the District Court which rejected their complaint on 30 August 2010.</p> <p>On 28 January 2011 the applicants again complained to head of the Achkhoy-Martani investigations department that the investigation was ineffective and requested to be allowed to review the case file. On 9 February 2011 the investigators replied that the applicants could obtain copies of a few documents from the file.</p> <p>On 25 July 2011 the applicants complied to the Urus-Martani District Court that the investigation of their son's abduction was ineffective and requested that they be provided with access to the case file. On 1 August 2011 their complaint was rejected.</p> <p><u>Last document:</u> the court decision of 1 August 2011 (see above). The criminal proceedings are currently pending.</p>
-----	--	---	-------------------	--	---	--

14.	<p>64270/11 Alkhotova v. Russia</p> <p>14/09/2011</p>	<p>(1) Ms Ayna Alkhotova (1975), wife, Grozny, the Chechen Republic</p>	<p>Not legally represented</p>	<p>(1) Mr Ayndi (also spelt Aindi) Diniyev (1971), abducted at 1 a.m. on 16 August 2003 from home in Pugacheva Street in the Staropromyslovskiy district of Grozny</p>	<p>At the material time Grozny was under curfew. At about 1 a.m. on 16 August 2003 a group of about ten to fifteen armed servicemen in camouflage uniforms and masks arrived at the applicant's block of flats in three grey UAZ vehicles. They broke into the applicant's flat, quickly searched it, took Ayndi Diniyev outside, forced him in one of their vehicles and drove away.</p> <p>The applicant has not seen her husband since his abduction on 16 August 2003.</p> <p>The account of the events is based on the statement provided by the applicant and the copies of documents received from the authorities.</p>	<p>On 28 August 2003 the Staropromyslovskiy district prosecutor's office in Grozny opened criminal case no. 50094.</p> <p>On 22 September 2003 the applicant was granted victim status in the criminal case.</p> <p>On 7 December 2004 the Staropromyslovskiy District Court in Grozny declared Ayndi Diniyev a missing person as of 16 August 2003.</p> <p>On 29 October 2003 the investigation was suspended for failure to identify the perpetrators. On 12 May 2005 it was resumed. On 12 June 2005 the investigation was again suspended.</p> <p>On 8 April 2008 the Leninskiy inter-district investigations department in Grozny forwarded to the applicant copies of two documents from the investigation file.</p> <p>On 1 June 2011 the investigation was resumed and then on 7 July 2011 it was again suspended.</p> <p>On 14 July 2011 the applicant complained to the Leninskiy District Court in Grozny that the investigation of the abduction was ineffective and requested that the proceedings be resumed. On 2 August 2011 the investigation was resumed. On the same date the court rejected the applicant's complaint owing to the resumption of the criminal proceedings.</p> <p>On 2 September 2011 the investigation was suspended again.</p> <p>It is unclear whether the applicant contacted the authorities between October 2003 and March 2008.</p> <p><u>Last document:</u> the decision to suspend the investigation of 2 September 2011 (see above). The criminal proceedings are currently pending.</p>
-----	--	--	--------------------------------	---	--	--

15.	66831/11 Dashtayev and others v. Russia 21/10/2011	<p>(1) Mr Islam Dashtayev (1991), son of Imran Dashtayev, Noviye Atagi, the Chechen Republic</p> <p>(2) Mr Bislan Dashtayev (1993), son of Imran Dashtayev, idem</p> <p>(3) Mr Yusup Dashtayev (1994), son of Imran Dashtayev, idem</p> <p>(4) Mr Shamkhan Dashtayev (1997), son of Imran Dashtayev, idem</p> <p>(5) Mr Khamzat Dashtayev (1999), son of Imran Dashtayev, idem</p> <p>(6) Ms Kulsum</p>	Stitching Russian Justice Initiative	<p>Two men abducted from home in Noviye Atagi at 5 a.m. on 20 July 2003</p> <p>(1) Mr Idris Akhmadov (1982)</p> <p>(2) Mr Imran Dashtayev (1955)</p>	<p>According to the applicants, who live in the same street, on 20 July 2003 the Russian federal forces conducted a sweeping-up operation in Noviye Atagi, as the result of which at least three local residents were arrested, including the applicants' relatives. Military checkpoints were situated in all of the roads leading to and from the settlement. The area was under curfew.</p> <p>At about 5 a.m. on 20 July 2003 a convoy of military vehicles, consisting of at least three APCs (with hull numbers 100, 101 and F-121), one URAL lorry (with registration number 75-99 6 RUS) and a UAZ all-terrain car, arrived at the applicants' street. A group of about fifty heavily-armed military servicemen in camouflage uniforms got out of the vehicles and broke into at least four houses in the street, including those of the applicants.</p> <p>A group of about fifteen servicemen climbed over the fence and broke into the house of the Akhmadov family. They checked identity documents of the male residents, quickly searched the house without producing any warrant or giving explanations to their actions and took Idris Akhmadov outside. The servicemen also took some of the family valuables. They put Idris into the UAZ minivan, and then they dragged him out and forced him into the APC and drove away.</p> <p>At about 5.30 a.m. group of fifteen to twenty servicemen in a yellow UAL lorry with registration number 75 99 86 broke in the house of the Dashtayev family. Several APCs and a UAZ minivan were waiting in a neighbouring street. They found in the yard Imran Dashtayev; they demanded his passport. Imran's passport was</p>	<p>On 21 July 2003 the sixth applicant complained about the abduction of Imran Dashtayev by federal servicemen in military vehicles to the Shali military commander.</p> <p>On 21 July 2003 the Shali district prosecutor's office opened criminal case no. 22106 to investigate the abduction of Idris Akhmadov and Imran Dashtayev. On the same date the sixth applicant was granted victim status.</p> <p>On 4 January 2004 the eighth applicant complained to the head of the military base in Khankala about his son's abduction by federal servicemen. He described in detail the circumstances of the events and pointed out that the servicemen had unlawfully searched the house and taken away some of the family valuables including jewellery. On 25 March 2004 the military authorities in Khankala replied to the applicant that the involvement of military servicemen in the abduction was not confirmed; the letter did not contain any reply to the applicants' allegations of the unlawful search.</p> <p>On 21 September 2003 the investigation was suspended for failure to identify the perpetrators. On 23 March 2004 it was resumed.</p> <p>On 8 February 2005 the eighth applicant complained about the abduction to the Russian Prosecutor General. He pointed out that his son had been abducted by military servicemen, described the abductors' vehicles and complained that the investigation had not been taking basic steps to identify the vehicle's owners. He also stated that the abductors had unlawfully searched the house and taken away family valuables. In reply of 25 April 2005 the investigators informed the applicant that the investigation had been resumed on 22 April 2005. On 6 July 2005 it was again suspended.</p> <p>On 21 July 2005 the eighth applicant was granted victim status in the criminal case.</p> <p>On 19 March 2008 the investigation was resumed. On 26 June 2008 it was again suspended.</p> <p>In replies to the applicants' complaints about the abduction lodged on various dates between 2004 and 2011, the investigators gave similar replies to the effect that the investigation was in progress and that they were taking all possible measures to have the crime resolved.</p> <p><u>Last document:</u> the investigators' reply to the applicants' information request dated 24 July 2011 stating that the investigation had been suspended on 26 June 2008. The criminal proceedings are currently pending.</p>
-----	--	---	--------------------------------------	--	---	---

		<p>Abubakarova (1957) wife of Imran Dashtayev, idem</p> <p>(7) Ms Yakhita Abdurzakova (in the documents submitted also spelt as Akhmadova), (1954), mother of Idris Akhmadov, idem</p> <p>(8) Mr Musaid Akhmadov (1953), father of Idris Akhmadov, idem</p>		<p>submitted for renewal, so the servicemen told his relatives that they would take him for an identity check. Then they forced Imran in the yellow lorry and drove away.</p> <p>The applicants have not seen their relatives since their abduction on 20 July 2003.</p> <p>The account of the events is based on the statement provided by the applicants, their relatives and neighbours and the copies of documents received from the authorities.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--