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

Communicated on 8 July 2014

FIRST SECTION

Application no. 6737/11
Vadim Vasilyevich KHAYRULLIN against Russia
and two other applications
(see list appended)

STATEMENT OF FACTS

A list of the applicants is set out in the appendix.

A. The circumstances of the case

The facts of the case, as submitted by the applicants, may be summarised as follows.

On 5 March 2010 several opposition parties notified the Kaliningrad Town Administration of their intention to organise a meeting on 20 March 2010 in front of the House of Soviets in the town centre. The Kaliningrad Town Administration refused to approve the location and proposed two alternative locations in the suburbs. The organisers decided to cancel the meeting.

On 15 March 2010 the third applicant notified the Kaliningrad Town Administration of his intention to organise a picket on 20 March 2010 from 1 to 3 p.m. on Zarayskaya Street near the House of Soviets. A hundred people were expected to attend. The aim of the picket was to protest against corruption and to promote civil society in Russia.

On the same day the head of the Kaliningrad Town Administration refused to approve the location, noting that a weekly market was to be held on that day on Zarayskaya Street and that many marriage registrations were scheduled in the nearby Marriage Registration Office. A lot of vehicles and pedestrians were therefore expected on Zarayskaya Street on 20 March 2010. The picket on that location would hinder pedestrian traffic, create inconveniences for the market visitors and present a danger to their security. The Kaliningrad Town Administration suggested that the applicant changed either the location or the date of the picket. It proposed two locations for the picket on 20 March 2010 in the town parks. In the alternative, it suggested that the picket be postponed to 22 March 2010, in which case it could be held on Zarayskaya Street.

On 16 March 2010 the third applicant replied in writing that the Town Administration’s suggestion to change either the location or the date was

unlawful. He therefore maintained his intention to hold a picket on 20 March 2010 on Zarayskaya Street.

On 17 March 2010 the police gave a written warning to the third applicant. It stated that under Russian law the organisers had no right to hold an assembly if the location and time of the assembly had not been agreed upon following a reasoned suggestion for their change by the competent regional or municipal authorities. If they breached domestic law, the organisers might be held liable.

At about 1 p.m. on 20 March 2010 about 3,000 people gathered in front of the House of Soviets and hold a flash mob. They waved oranges and chanted "Putin, resign!" and "[The Governor of the Kaliningrad region], resign!".

Meanwhile, from noon to 4 p.m., the Governor of the Kaliningrad region was holding a question and answer session by videoconference. People could ask him questions through several video cameras installed on the streets in the vicinity of the House of Soviets.

1. The first applicant

At 10.30 a.m. on 20 March 2010 the first applicant's car was stopped and searched by the police. The police seized placards and leaflets from the car and brought the first applicant to the police station.

At about 4 p.m. on the same day the police drew up a report on an administrative offence under Article 20.2 § 1 of the Administrative Offences Code. The report stated that the first applicant had organised an unauthorised meeting against the regional authorities and had distributed leaflets calling for the regional government's resignation. The report also mentioned that the first applicant had been escorted to the police station.

The first applicant was released at 5.30 p.m. of the same day. He was not given a copy of the administrative offence report.

On 13 April 2010 the Justice of the Peace of the 3d Court Circuit of the Leningradskiy District of Kaliningrad discontinued the proceedings against the first applicant, finding no evidence of a breach of the established procedure for the conduct of public assemblies. The case file did not contain any evidence confirming that the first applicant had organised an unauthorised meeting or that he had distributed leaflets or waved placards. The Justice of the Peace also noted that the administrative offence report of 20 March 2010 had been procedurally defective. In particular, it had not been countersigned by the first applicant and the first applicant had not been served with a copy thereof.

On 11 May 2010 the Leningradskiy District Court of Kaliningrad quashed the decision of 13 April 2010 and remitted the case for a new examination before the same Justice of the Peace. It found that it was necessary to establish whether an unauthorised picket had taken place on 20 March 2010 and whether the first applicant had organised it. It was irrelevant whether the first applicant had taken part in the alleged picket himself. He had been charged with organising an unauthorised public assembly rather than with participating in it.

On 17 May 2010 the Justice of the Peace of the 3d Court Circuit held a new hearing.

One of the witnesses, a police officer, stated that at 1 p.m. on 20 March 2010 an unauthorised public assembly had taken place. The first applicant had not taken part in it because he had been arrested before its beginning. Given that his unlawful actions had been timely repressed by the police, he had been unable to distribute the placards and leaflets found in his car. Another police officer stated that he had stopped the first applicant's car because it had a small placard saying "Everyone goes to the market. What about you?" on its windscreen. The first applicant had not distributed any leaflets or placards to the passers-by.

A witness stated that at about 11.30 a.m. he had come to Zarayskaya Street and saw that the space between the Marriage Registration Office and the marketplace was empty. The third applicant testified that the organisers had been planning to get together at about noon to discuss where the picket should be held. The first applicant's task had been to make placards and leaflets and to deliver them to the participants.

On the same day the Justice of the Peace held as follows:

> "The statements by the defence witnesses do not prove that [the first applicant] did not take part in organising the meeting by notifying prospective participants, campaigning for participation and making and distributing related materials.
>
> On the basis of the materials in the case-file it has been established without doubt that [the first applicant's] task was to notify prospective participants of the public assembly and to campaign for participation with the aid of the placard stuck to the windscreen of his car. Moreover, it is [the first applicant] who made the placards seized from him on 20 March 2010 on which the members of the Kaliningrad regional government were depicted behind prison bars. Such placards insult and diminish the honour of the depicted persons...
>
> The procedural defects committed during the drawing of the administrative offence report ... of 20 March 20010 (the failure to serve a copy on [the first applicant], the failure to explain the procedural rights to [an attesting witness] and the lack of her signature on the administrative offence record) do not change the fact that [the first applicant's] actions amounted to an administrative offence under Article 20.2 § 1 of the Administrative Offences Code.
>
> The administrative offence report was drawn by a competent police officer who had no personal interest in the case and did not have any adverse feelings against the delinquent. He had therefore no reasons to distort the factual circumstances of the offence".

The Justice of the Peace found the first applicant guilty of an offence under Article 20.2 § 1 of the Administrative Offences Code and sentenced him to a fine of 1,000 Russian roubles (RUB, about 26 euros (EUR)).

On 20 August 2010 the Leningradskiy District Court upheld the decision on appeal, finding that it had been lawful, well-reasoned and justified.

The first applicant lodged a civil claim against the Kaliningrad Town Administration and the police for compensation of non-pecuniary damage. He complained that the refusal to approve the location of the picket had been unlawful. He further complained that his arrest and seven-hour detention at the police station had been also unlawful.

On 25 February 2011 the Tsentralnyy District Court of Kaliningrad found that the refusal to approve the location of the picket had been lawful and justified. The holding of a picket on Zarayskaya Street simultaneously with the weekly market and solemn registration of marriages in the nearby Marriage Registration Office would block pedestrian traffic, create

inconveniences for the market visitors and cause security problems. Moreover, the aims of the above public events were incompatible with each other. They could not therefore be held simultaneously because it would be contrary to the interests of the population. The organisers had been proposed alternative locations and time for the picket. The court held that the proposal to change the location or time of the picket had not made it devoid of its purpose and had been compatible with its social and political meaning. The court further found that the applicant had not been subjected to administrative arrest within the meaning of Russian law. No administrative arrest record had therefore been drawn up. The applicant had been escorted to the police station for the purpose of drawing up a report on an administrative offence. He had been subsequently found guilty of that offence by the the Justice of the Peace of the 3d Court Circuit. The police had therefore acted lawfully.

On 18 May 2011 the Kaliningrad Regional Court upheld the judgment on appeal, finding that it had been lawful, sufficiently reasoned and justified.

2. The second applicant

At about 9 p.m. on 18 March 2010 the second applicant was arrested by the police because he was in possession of leaflets calling for participation in the picket of 20 March 2010. He was brought to the police station.

On 19 March 2010 the police drew up an administrative arrest report indicating that the second applicant had been arrested at 1.10 a.m. of that day in the vicinity of the police station for uttering obscenities.

The second applicant was released on 3.45 p.m. on 19 March 2010.

On 20 March 2010 the police found the second applicant guilty of uttering obscenities in public places, an offence under Article 20.1 § 1 of the Administrative Offences Code.

On 19 November 2010 the Moskovskiy District Court of Kaliningrad quashed the decision of 20 March 2010 for procedural defects. It discontinued the administrative offence proceedings against the second applicant as being time-barred.

The second applicant lodged a civil claim against the Kaliningrad Town Administration and the police. He complained that the refusal to approve the location of the picket had been unlawful. He further complained about unlawful arrest and seventeen-hour detention at the police station. He claimed RUB 300,000 in respect of non-pecuniary damage.

On 29 March 2011 the Tsentralniy District Court of Kaliningrad rejected the second applicant's claim against the Kaliningrad Town Administration. It found that the refusal to approve the location of the picket had been lawful and justified. The holding of a picket on Zarayskaya Street simultaneously with the weekly market and solemn registration of marriages in the nearby Marriage Registration Office would block pedestrian traffic, create inconveniences for the market visitors and cause security problems. Moreover, the aims of the above public events were incompatible with each other. They could not therefore be held simultaneously because it would be contrary to the interests of the population. The organisers had been proposed alternative locations and time for the picket. The court held that the proposal to change the location or time of the picket had not made it devoid of its purpose and had been compatible with its social and political meaning.

The court further allowed in part the second applicant's claims against the police, finding that his arrest had been unlawful. It examined the police station register from which it transpired that the second applicant had been brought to the police station at about 9 p.m. on 18 March 2010 after being arrested for being in possession of leaflets calling for participation in an unauthorised picket. The leaflets had been seized and at 11.40 p.m. the second applicant had been released without being charged with any administrative offence. At 1.10 a.m. on 19 March 2010 he had been rearrested near the police station for uttering obscenities and had been again released at 3.45 p.m. The court noted that the second applicant contested the information contained in the police station register and insisted that he had been continuously detained from 10.50 p.m. on 18 March to 3.45 p.m. on 19 March 2010. The court found that the police had not convincingly refuted the second applicant's allegation. It therefore found it established that the second applicant had been continuously detained at the police station for seventeen hours. Given that the administrative offence proceedings against the second applicant had been discontinued, he was entitled to compensation for unlawful arrest. The amount of compensation claimed by him was however excessive. The court awarded the second applicant RUB 20,000 (about EUR 500) in respect of non-pecuniary damage, plus RUB 3,000 for cost and expenses.

On 8 June 2011 the Kaliningrad Regional Court upheld the judgment on appeal. It noted that under Article 27.5 of the Administrative Offences Code the duration of the administrative arrest could not normally exceed three hours. The second applicant had been however unlawfully detained for seventeen hours. There had been no justification for such long detention.

3. The third applicant

At about noon and a half on 20 March 2010 the third applicant was arrested near the House of Soviets on Shevchenko Street and brought to a police station where he remained until 5.15 p.m.

On the same day the police drew up a report on an administrative offence under Article 20.2 § 1 of the Administrative Offences Code. The report stated that the third applicant had been arrested at 10.30 a.m. while organising an unauthorised meeting against the authorities.

The case-file was then sent for trial before the Justice of the Peace of the 3d Court Circuit of the Leningradskiy District of Kaliningrad.

During the hearing the arresting police officer stated that on 20 March 2010 he had seen the third applicant near the House of Soviets. He had been standing in a group of ten people, talking and actively gesticulating. He had not used any loud speaking equipment. The police officer had invited the third applicant to follow him to his car and had brought him to the police station.

Several police officers stated that they had witnessed a large gathering of people in front of the House of Soviets from noon to 2 p.m. on 12 March 2010. The people had chanted "Putin, resign!" and "[The Governor of the Kaliningrad region], resign!" and waved placards depicting regional officials behind prison bars. The vendors of the weekly market held in the vicinity had complained to them about disturbances caused by the meeting and had asked the police to intervene.

Other police officers described the third applicant's questioning at the police station and how the administrative offence report had been drawn up. One of them stated that he had personally written the entire text of the administrative offence report. The differences in handwriting were explained by his personal peculiarities.

The third applicant stated that he had not taken part in the meeting of 20 March 2010 and had not been involved in organising it. The meeting had been advertised by a group of opposition parties who had then decided to cancel it. Many people had however spontaneously come to the meeting despite its cancellation. He had not been in any way responsible for that. His intention had been to organise a picket which, however, had not been approved by the authorities. He had been arrested while he had been on the way to the Town Administration in order to discuss the situation with the responsible officials and try to convince them to agree to the picket. He further stated that the information contained at the administrative offence report had been incorrect. In particular, he had been arrested at noon and a half rather than at 10.30 a.m. At 10.30 a.m. he had been at home and had arrived on Shevchenko Street at about noon. Moreover, the administrative offence report mentioned attesting witnesses who had not been present at the questioning. He argued that the time of the arrest and the witnesses' names had been added after he had countersigned the report.

Several defence witnesses stated that they had telephoned or visited the third applicant at home between 10 a.m. and noon on 20 March 2010.

On 13 April 2010 the Justice of the Peace of the 3d Court Circuit found the third applicant guilty as charged. The Justice of the Peace held as follows:

> "The copies of the administrative arrest report submitted by [the third applicant] and his counsel and which do not indicate the date on which the report was drawn up, the time of the commission of the administrative offence and the names of the attesting witnesses have no legal value for the present case. These photocopies are not certified, contain less information than the original and do not bear any authentic official stamp, seal or signature. It is therefore impossible to establish whether the copies were made [at the police station] immediately after the administrative offence report had been drawn up or at some other place or time. Nor is it possible to establish whether the copies were made by a police officer or some other person.
>
> Other factual circumstances referred to by [the third applicant] during the hearing were not confirmed either. The Justice of the Peace is not convinced by the witnesses called by [the third applicant] because they are interested in a favorable outcome for him. By contrast, there is no proof that the police officers have any personal interest in tampering with evidence of commission by [the third applicant] of an administrative offence.
>
> The offender's guilt is confirmed by the following documents: the report on an administrative offence and submissions by the police officers. The Justice of the Peace has no reason to doubt the documents or the submissions made by the police officers because they are coherent, do not contradict each other, are consistent with each other and supplement each other. The administrative offence report was made by a competent police officer who had no personal interest in the outcome of the case and had no adverse feelings against the offender. He had therefore no reasons to distort the factual circumstances of the administrative offence.
>
> Having studied the materials in the case file, heard [the third applicant], his counsel and the witnesses and analysed the evidence in its entirety ..., the court finds it established that an administrative offence under Article 20.2 § 2 [of the

Administrative Offences Code] was committed and that [the third applicant] was guilty of committing it."

The Justice of the Peace sentenced the third applicant to a fine of RUB 1,000.

The applicant appealed. He repeated his submissions before the Justice of the Peace. He reiterated, in particular, that at 10.30 a.m. on 20 March 2010 he had been at home. He had submitted his telephone bills showing that calls had been made to and from his home telephone number at that time. He further submitted that he had not taken part in the meeting of 20 March 2010 and had not been involved in organising it.

On 19 July 2010 the Leningradskiy District Court of Kaliningrad upheld the conviction on appeal, finding that it had been lawful. As regards the telephone bills, the court noted that it could not be considered convincing evidence of the third applicant's presence at home on 10.30 a.m. It only showed that calls had been made to and from his home telephone number, but did not show by whom or with which purpose.

B. Relevant domestic law

1. Procedure for the conduct of public assemblies

(a) The procedure in force at the material time

The Federal Law on Assemblies, Meetings, Demonstrations, Marches and Pickets, no. FZ-54 of 19 June 2004 ("the Public Assemblies Act"), provides for several types of public assembly. In particular:

— a meeting: that is, a mass assembly of citizens at a certain location with the aim of publicly expressing an opinion on topical, mainly social or political issues;

— a picket: that is, a form of public expression of opinion that does not involve movement or the use of loudspeaker equipment, where one or more citizens with placards, banners and other means of visual expression assemble near the target object of the picket (section 2 paragraphs 2 - 6).

A public assembly may be held in any convenient location, provided that it does not create a risk of building collapse or any other risks to the safety of the participants. The access of participants to certain locations may be banned or restricted in the circumstances specified by federal laws (section 8 paragraph 1).

Assemblies in the following locations are prohibited:

1) in the vicinity of dangerous production facilities or other facilities subject to special technical safety regulations;

2) on flyovers, main railway lines or railroad rights-of-way, oil, gas or petroleum pipelines, or high-voltage electricity lines;

3) in the vicinity of the residences of the President of the Russian Federation, court buildings or detention facilities;

4) in a frontier zone, unless permission is given by the competent border authorities (section 8 paragraph 2).

The procedure for holding assemblies in the vicinity of historic or cultural monuments is determined by the regional executive authorities with due regard to the particular features of such sites and the requirements of this Act (section 8 paragraph 3).

A notification of a public assembly is a document by which the competent authority is informed, in accordance with the procedure established by this Act, that an assembly will be held, so that the competent authority may take measures to ensure safety and public order during the assembly (section 2 paragraph 7).

No earlier than fifteen days and no later than ten days before the intended public assembly, its organisers must notify the competent regional or municipal authorities of the date, time, location or itinerary and purposes of the assembly, its type, the expected number of participants, and the names of the organisers. A notification in respect of a picket involving several persons must be submitted no later than three days before the intended picket or, if the end of the time-limit falls on a Sunday or a public holiday, no later than four days before the intended picket. No notification is required for gatherings or pickets involving one person (section 7 paragraphs 1 and 3).

Upon receipt of the notification of a public assembly the competent regional or municipal authorities may provide the organisers of the assembly, within three days of receiving the notification (or, in case of a picket involving several persons, if the notification is submitted less than five days before the intended picket, on the day of receipt of such notification), with reasoned suggestions for changing the location and/or time of the assembly, or for amending the purposes, type or other arrangements if they are incompatible with the requirements of this Act (section 12 paragraph 1).

No later than three days before the intended date of the assembly the organisers of a public assembly must inform the authorities in writing whether or not they accept the authorities' suggestions for changing the location and/or time of the assembly (section 5 paragraph 4 (2)).

The organisers of a public assembly are entitled to hold meetings, demonstrations, marches or pickets at the location and time indicated in the notification or agreed upon after consultation with the competent regional or municipal authorities (section 5 paragraph 3 (1)). They have no right to hold an assembly if the notification was submitted outside the time-limits established by this Act, or if the new location and time of the assembly have not been agreed upon following a reasoned suggestion for their change by the competent regional or municipal authorities (section 5 paragraph 5).

(b) Case-law of the Constitutional Court concerning the procedure for the conduct of public assemblies

On 2 April 2009 the Constitutional Court examined an application by Mr Lashmankin and Others, who submitted, in particular, that section 5 paragraph 5 of the Public Assemblies Act, which prohibited holding an assembly if its location and time had not been approved by the competent regional or municipal authorities, was incompatible with Article 31 of the Constitution.

The Constitutional Court found that both the Constitution and the European Convention on Human Rights provided for restrictions on freedom of assembly in certain cases. Section 5 paragraph 5 of the Public Assemblies Act did not give the executive the power to ban an assembly. It only permitted the executive to make reasoned suggestions as to the location

or time of the assembly. It required the executive to give compelling reasons for their suggestions. Such reasons might include the need to preserve the normal, uninterrupted functioning of vital public utility or transport services, to protect public order or the safety of citizens (both the participants in the assembly and any other persons present at the location during the assembly) or other similar reasons. It was impossible, however, to make an exhaustive list of permissible reasons, as this would have the effect of unjustifiably restricting the executive's discretion.

The Constitutional Court further held that the authorities' refusal to agree to an assembly could not be justified by logistical or other similar reasons. The fact that an assembly might cause inconvenience was not sufficient to justify the suggestion to change the location or time. The authorities had to show in a compelling way that public order considerations made it impossible to hold the assembly. The term "agreed upon" contained in section 5 paragraph 5 of the Public Assemblies Act meant that in such circumstances the authorities had an obligation to suggest for discussion with the organisers of the assembly a location and time compatible with the assembly's purposes and its social and political meaning. In particular, it should be taken into account that for an assembly to fulfil its purposes some feedback (including via the media) between the participants in an assembly and the targets of its message was necessary. The organisers, in their turn, were also required to make an effort to reach an agreement with the executive.

If it proved impossible to reach an agreement, the organisers were entitled to defend their rights and interests in court. The courts were required to examine their complaints as quickly as possible, and in any event before the intended assembly, otherwise the judicial proceedings would be deprived of any meaning.

The Constitutional Court concluded that the provisions challenged by the complainants were clear and compatible with the Constitution.

2. Liability for breaches committed in the course of public assemblies and other relevant administrative offences

At the material time a breach of the established procedure for the conduct of public assemblies was punishable by a fine of 1,000 to 2,000 Russian roubles (RUB) for the organisers of the assembly, and from RUB 500 to 1,000 for the participants (Article 20.2 §§ 1 and 2 of the Administrative Offences Code).

A disorderly act, that is a breach of public order in the form of an open disregard for the public accompanied by uttering obscenities in public places, offensive behavior towards others or destroying or damaging other people's property, shall be punishable by a fine equivalent to between five and ten months' minimum wages or by up to fifteen days' administrative detention (Article 20.1 § 1 of the Administrative Offences Code).

3. Administrative arrest

A police officer may escort an individual to the police station by force for the purpose of drawing up a report on an administrative offence if it is impossible to do so at the place where the offence was detected. The

individual must be released as soon as possible. The police officer must draw up a report stating that the individual was taken to the police station, or mention the fact in the report on the administrative offence. The individual concerned must be given a copy of that report (Article 27.2 §§ 1 (1), 2 and 3 of the Administrative Offences Code).

In exceptional cases a police officer may arrest an individual for a short period if this is necessary for the prompt and proper examination of the administrative case and to secure the enforcement of any penalty imposed (Article 27.3 § 1 of the Code). The duration of such administrative arrest must not normally exceed three hours. Administrative arrest for a longer period, not exceeding forty-eight hours, is permissible only for persons subject to administrative proceedings concerning an offence punishable by administrative detention or offences involving unlawful crossing of the Russian border. This term starts to run from the moment when the person has been escorted to the police station in accordance with Article 27.2 of the Code (Article 27.5 of the Code). The arresting officer must draw up an "administrative arrest report" (Article 27.4 of the Code).

COMPLAINTS

1. The first and second applicants complain under Article 5 of the Convention that their arrest and detention were unlawful. The second applicant complain, in particular, that the compensation he received for the unlawful detention was insufficient.

2. The applicants complain under Articles 10 and 11 of the Convention that the authorities' refusal to allow the picket was unlawful and unjustified. They further complain, under Article 13 of the Convention, that they did not have at their disposal any effective remedy in respect of the above complaints.

QUESTIONS TO THE PARTIES

1. As regards the first applicant, was he deprived of his liberty in breach of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention? In particular, was the deprivation of liberty applied to him for any of the purposes set out in paragraphs (a)-(e) of Article 5 § 1? Was the purpose of drawing up a report on the administrative arrest covered by Article 5 § 1 (c)? Was it possible to draw up such report without "escorting" the applicant to the police station? Did the need to draw up a report on the administrative arrest justify the applicant's detention for seven hours? Was a procedure prescribed by law complied with? Was an "escorting report" drawn up? Was the applicant given a copy or the "escorting report" or of the report on an administrative offence mentioning the fact of "escorting" to the police station?

2. As regards the second applicant, was he deprived of his liberty in breach of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention? In particular, was he arrested in accordance with a procedure prescribed by law? Was the statutory maximum duration of an administrative arrest exceeded in his case? Given that the second applicant received compensation for the unlawful administrative detention, may he still claim to be a "victim" of the alleged breach of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention? In particular, was the amount of compensation substantially lower than what the Court generally awards in comparable cases (see *Scordino v. Italy (no. 1)* [GC], no. 36813/97, §§ 182-192 and 202 - 215, ECHR 2006-V)?

3. Did the authorities' suggestion to change the location or time of the picket of 20 March 2010, the applicants' arrest and the administrative proceedings against them interfere with their rights under Articles 10 and/or 11 of the Convention? Was that interference lawful? Did it pursue a legitimate aim? Were the reasons advanced by the authorities for the change of the location and time "relevant and sufficient"? Were the applicants' arrest and the administrative proceedings against them "necessary in a democratic society" within the meaning of Articles 10 § 2 and 11 § 2 of the Convention?

4. Did the applicants have at their disposal an effective domestic remedy for their complaints under Articles 10 and 11, as required by Article 13 of the Convention? In particular, did they have at their disposal a procedure that would allow them to obtain an enforceable decision prior to the date of the planned assembly?

APPENDIX

Commented [A1]: Page: 12
DO NOT DELETE

No	Application No	Lodged on	Applicant Date of birth Place of residence Nationality
1.	6737/11	03/12/2010	**Vadim Vasilyevich KHAYRULLIN** 27/01/1972 Kaliningrad Russian
2.	74971/11	01/11/2011	**Aleksandr Vladimirovich KOSTYRIN** 24/12/1944 Kaliningrad Russian
3.	64746/13	10/11/2010	**Yevgeniy Nikolayevich LABUDIN** 09/03/1962 Kalinigrad Russian