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

THIRD SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 25923/15
A.R.
against Russia

The European Court of Human Rights (Third Section), sitting on 10 May 2016 as a Chamber composed of:

Luis López Guerra, *President,*
Helena Jäderblom,
Helen Keller,
Johannes Silvis,
Dmitry Dedov,
Branko Lubarda,
Georgios A. Serghides, *judges,*
and Stephen Phillips, *Section Registrar,*

Having regard to the above application lodged on 18 May 2015,

Having regard to the interim measure indicated to the respondent Government under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court,

Having regard to the decision to grant anonymity to the applicant under Rule 47 § 4 of the Rules of Court,

Having regard to the observations submitted by the respondent Government and the observations in reply submitted by the applicant,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

THE FACTS

1. The applicant, Mr A.R., is a Tajikistani national, who was born in 1976.

2. The applicant, who has been granted legal aid, is represented before the Court by Ms I. Sokolova, a lawyer practising in Ivanovo.

3. The Russian Government ("the Government") are represented by Mr G. Matyushkin, Representative of the Russian Federation at the European Court of Human Rights.

A. The circumstances of the case

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

1. Background information

4. According to the applicant, he joined the Democratic Party of Tajikistan in 1996. At that time it was, and apparently it remains, in opposition to the ruling regime. Following a murder attempt in 1997 against the Tajikistani President, some members and supporters of the party were reportedly arrested and tortured. Allegedly, the applicant was also arrested during that time. He submitted that he had been tortured by way of blows to his hands, back and head, causing loss of vision in his right eye. He had declined the offer to collaborate with the Secret Service on the party members and their activities. The party has now split into two factions: one is apparently loyal to the ruling regime, while the other is led by supporters of the former leader of the party, Mr Iskandarov (see *Iskandarov v. Russia*, no. 17185/05, 23 September 2010), who have been persecuted.

5. Fearing persecution, the applicant left for Kazakhstan. Allegedly, in 2000 the authorities were looking for him and arrested his brother. The applicant went back to Tajikistan between 2000 and 2004 (allegedly, remaining in hiding). In 2004 he obtained a new passport from the Tajik authorities (allegedly, through an acquaintance).

6. The applicant arrived in Russia in 2007. It appears that at the time Tajik nationals did not require a visa to enter Russia.

7. Since 2007 the applicant has been living in Russia in an unregistered relationship with Ms Z.

8. The applicant and Z. have two children together, born in 2008 and 2011. It appears that Z.'s first child, who was born in 1996 from her previous relationship, has been residing with Z. and the applicant. Z. and the children are Russian nationals.

9. In May 2011 the Migration Authority of the Ivanovo Region granted the applicant a temporary residence permit valid until May 2014.

2. The FSB's "warning" to the applicant and annulment of his temporary residence permit

10. In December 2011 Mr Ts. informed the Ivanovo office of the Federal Security Service ("the FSB") that the applicant had given him several publications about Hizb-ut-Tahrir, a prohibited organisation in Russia.

11. In November 2012 the Ivanovo regional prosecutor applied to the Oktyabrskiy District Court, Ivanovo ("the District Court"), asking it to classify those publications as "extremist". The court granted his request. The applicant was not party to the proceedings.

12. On 13 February 2013 the FSB interviewed the applicant, having informed him of his right not to testify against himself. According to the interview record, the applicant stated as follows: in 2002-03 he had studied Islam with his friend, reading together various writings, *inter alia*, calling for the creation of an Islamic Caliphate; in 2007 he learnt that the Tajikistani Security Service had arrested his friend and some of his relatives; fearing arrest himself, he had moved to Moscow where he obtained a work permit; there he met two Kyrgyz nationals who appeared to be supporters of Hizb-ut-Tahrir; a year later one of them provided the applicant with some publications, which he then gave to Ts.

13. According to the applicant, an FSB officer told him that the Tajik authorities "were looking for him".

14. The FSB wrote to the regional migration authority recommending that the applicant's residence permit be annulled.

15. On 27 February 2013 the authority annulled the residence permit on the basis of section 7 of the Foreigners Act (see paragraph 40 below). The applicant was informed that he could seek judicial review of the annulment decision or re-apply for a temporary residence permit in a year's time; that he was obliged to leave Russia within fifteen days; and that if he failed to leave the country he would be deported.

16. The applicant did not seek judicial review of the annulment decision. However, he appointed a lawyer and they both considered that given the imperative indication in section 7 of the Foreigners Act, there would be no prospect of success in claiming reinstatement of the residence permit on account of a risk of death or torture if the Tajik authorities became aware of the findings made by the Russian FSB in respect of the applicant. Instead, in December 2013 the applicant decided to attempt to regularise his stay in Russia by applying for refugee status (see paragraph 23 below). For this purpose, his lawyer obtained access to the case file concerning the residence permit. According to the lawyer, the file contained only the FSB's letter to the migration authority (see paragraph 14 above).

17. On 5 March 2014 the FSB issued the applicant with a "warning" (*предостережение*) against "unacceptable actions that create a basis for committing crimes falling within the FSB's competence" (see paragraph 44 below). The warning read as follows:

> "[The applicant] has expressed his intention to take part in the activities of the international terrorist organisation Hizb-ut-Tahrir, which has been classified as 'terrorist' by the Russian Supreme Court. The indicated actions create a basis for committing crimes under Article 205.5 of the Criminal Code".

18. Subsequently, the applicant denied membership of Hizb-ut-Tahrir or participation in its activities.

19. The applicant's lawyer challenged the "warning", indicating that the FSB's allegations in respect of the applicant were unsubstantiated; he had never been a member of the prohibited organisation; and none of his

previous actions or utterances had indicated an intention to take part in the activities of that organisation. The lawyer also challenged the "warning" as being an unsubstantiated and disproportionate interference with the applicant's private life, exposing him to a risk of removal to Tajikistan and of ill-treatment there on account of the Tajik authorities' awareness of the FSB's suspicion in respect of him.

20. On 20 May 2014 the District Court upheld the "warning" on judicial review. The court stated that Ts.'s and the applicant's own testimonies confirmed that the applicant had had contacts with people who were implicated in the activities of the prohibited organisation; as confirmed by Ts., the applicant had handed over to him publications that had an "extremist" content, as then confirmed by a court. The Russian legislation prohibited dissemination, possession and production of extremist material. In certain circumstances those actions constituted an offence; an extremist activity was also punishable in criminal law, civil law and otherwise. The "warning" had not violated any of the applicant's rights or freedoms.

21. The applicant appealed, arguing that nothing in his own statement to the FSB had disclosed an intention to take part in the "activities of the prohibited organisation" or elements of *corpus delicti* under Article 205.5 of the Russian Criminal Code; the impugned events dated back to December 2010 while the "warning" was meant to concern some continuing activity; the applicant had no knowledge of the "extremist" content of the publications, which was only subsequently established by a court in proceedings to which he had not been a party. The applicant concluded that in substance the proceedings against him and the resulting "warning" amounted to a finding of criminal guilt without either the benefit of a judicial procedure or the attending safeguards of criminal proceedings, including the presumption of innocence (Articles 49 and 118 of the Russian Constitution).

22. On 13 August 2014 the Ivanovo Regional Court dismissed the applicant's appeal. The appeal court discarded as "farfetched" the arguments under Articles 49 and 118 of the Constitution and endorsed in substance the reasoning of the District Court. On an unspecified date, the Regional Court rejected the applicant's subsequent appeal on points of law. It appears that in March 2015 the Supreme Court of Russia rejected the second appeal on points of law.

3. The applicant's efforts to regularise his stay in Russia

(a) Application for refugee status

23. After the annulment of his residence permit, in December 2013 the applicant applied to the regional migration authority seeking refugee status.

24. The applicant submitted that as an ordinary member of the Democratic Party of Tajikistan, he had attended meetings and complied

with the leaders' orders; after the attempted assassination of the Tajik President in 1997, he had been arrested and tortured (blows to his fingers with a gun handle and blows to his spine and head); he had left for Kyrgyzstan and had then returned to Tajikistan, where he had stayed in different towns until late 2006.

25. By decision of 14 March 2014 the regional migration authority dismissed the applicant's application for refugee status and ordered him to leave Russia within three days.

26. In reply to a request from the applicant's lawyer, on 6 May 2014 the Moscow office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees ("the Moscow UNHCR office") issued an information document. Referring to some of the findings made in the 2013 United Nations report on Tajikistan and some other reports, the UNHCR office made the following comments:

> "In view of the numerous violations of human rights and fundamental principles of international law by the Tajik authorities, the widely used practice of torture and cruel treatment at the hands of law enforcement officers, in particular with the aim of extracting confessions in criminal cases ... the UNHCR considers that people who are suspected in relation to political activities of a religious nature run a real risk of persecution in the form of torture in Tajikistan ...
>
> Therefore, having regard to the international instruments ratified by Russia, in no circumstances should Mr R. be extradited, as he is seeking asylum on account of a risk of torture if returned to the country of nationality.
>
> We hope that this information will be taken into account during the examination of your client's case."

27. The applicant sought judicial review of the refusal to grant refugee status, contesting the reliance on the document of 14 January 2014 as the migration authority's only source of information about Tajikistan. He referred to the Court's findings in the *Iskandarov* judgment mentioned above and a number of other sources.

28. By a judgment of 8 May 2014 the District Court upheld the decision of 14 March 2014. The court stated, *inter alia*, that had the applicant had genuine reasons for seeking asylum, he would have made an application immediately after his arrival in Russia. The applicant appealed. On 21 July 2014 the Regional Court dismissed the applicant's appeal.

(b) Application for temporary asylum

29. Having been unsuccessful with his application for refugee status (see paragraph 25 above), in April 2014 the applicant applied to the regional migration authority for so-called "temporary asylum" (see paragraph 43 below).

30. On 10 July 2014 the authority dismissed the application. On 3 October 2014 the Federal Migration Authority upheld the lower authority's decision.

31. The applicant sought judicial review of the refusal of temporary asylum. He argued that the migration authority had not assessed whether the FSB's warning on suspicion that he might commit a criminal offence of an extremist nature substantiated his argument that he was at risk of ill-treatment at the hands of the Tajik authorities, who were aware of the FSB's warning.

32. On 11 December 2014 the District Court upheld the decision to refuse temporary asylum. On 25 February 2015 the Ivanovo Regional Court dismissed an appeal lodged by the applicant. On 29 June 2015 the same court dismissed a subsequent appeal on points of law lodged by the applicant. The applicant lodged a second appeal on points of law before the Supreme Court of Russia, which dismissed that appeal on 14 September 2015.

4. Other relevant proceedings and circumstances

33. The applicant unsuccessfully sought an extension of his permission to stay in the country pending appeals against the decision to refuse him temporary asylum. On 8 September 2014 the District Court upheld the decision. On 17 November 2014 the Regional Court upheld the judgment on appeal. It appears that a subsequent appeal on points of law lodged by the applicant was dismissed in April 2015.

34. Allegedly, the applicant has been subjected to covert supervision by law-enforcement officials wearing plain clothes; questions about him were raised with his neighbours; and his relatives in Tajikistan were questioned and their homes searched. Since February 2015, the applicant has not left his home, fearing abduction with a view to forcibly transferring him to Tajikistan.

35. In May 2015 the applicant's lawyer asked the migration authority about their intention to expel the applicant. No reply has been received.

36. It appears that the applicant has applied to the UNHCR office for help with resettlement. That request is pending.

37. According to the applicant, on an unspecified date in 2015, officers from the Tajik Security Service arrested his brother; he was subsequently released but was required to assist the authorities in obtaining the applicant's return to the country.

38. It appears that the applicant is currently considered as a foreigner "temporarily present in Russia", which, according to him, gives him an opportunity to move within the region but not to work.

B. Relevant domestic law and international documents

1. Grounds for a foreigner's stay in Russia

(a) Visa, temporary residence and residence permits

39. The Foreigners Act (Federal Law no. 115-FZ of 25 July 2002) provides that a foreigner can be temporarily present on Russian territory for a period specified in a visa or, for foreign nationals not required to obtain a visa, for ninety days unless otherwise provided for by the Act (section 5).

40. Section 7 of the Foreigners Act requires that a temporary residence permit be annulled if the foreigner (i) has expressed himself in favour of a radical change in the constitutional regime of the Russian Federation or, by way of other actions, poses a threat to the security of the Russian Federation or its citizens; (ii) has made financial contributions or planned terrorist or extremist acts, has provided assistance to others in the commission of such acts, or has supported terrorist (extremist) activities by way of other actions.

41. After the annulment of a temporary residence permit or a residence permit, the foreigner concerned must leave Russia within fifteen days; failure to do so will lead to deportation (section 31 of the Act).

42. A decision to deport should be taken by a chief officer of the local migration authority (paragraph 6 of the Instruction issued by order no. 240 of 12 October 2009 by the Federal Migration Authority).

(b) Temporary asylum

43. Section 12 of the Refugees Act provides that temporary asylum may be granted where (i) the foreigner has grounds for acquiring refugee status but only requests a possibility to remain in Russia for some time; or (ii) the foreigner has no grounds for acquiring refugee status but should not be expelled from Russia for "humanitarian reasons". Having received temporary asylum, the person may not be returned against his will to the country of nationality or the country of habitual residence.

2. Federal Security Service

44. Sections 13 and 13.1 of the Federal Security Service Act (Federal Law no. 40-FZ of 3 April 1995) provides that, in the absence of grounds for instituting criminal proceedings, the FSB has competence to issue and inform the person concerned of an "official warning" (*официальное предостережение*) about unacceptable actions that create conditions for the commission of certain crimes. Such a "warning" is classified as a measure of prevention (*мера профилактики*) that may be implemented for the purpose of preventing the commission of such criminal offences.

COMPLAINTS

45. The applicant alleged that the FSB's "warning" in respect of him in the context of the annulment of his residence permit and the rejection of the other grounds for his stay in Russia had created a situation in which he was inevitably exposed to removal to Tajikistan, where he ran the risk of treatment in breach of Article 3 of the Convention. Furthermore, the circumstances of the case entailed or could entail a violation of Article 8 of the Convention. Lastly, the applicant also argued that he had no effective remedies in the circumstances of the case.

THE LAW

46. The applicant raised complaints under Articles 3, 8 and 13 of the Convention, which read as follows:

Article 3

"No one shall be subjected to torture or to inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment."

Article 8

"1. Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence.

2. There shall be no interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right except such as is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic well-being of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others."

Article 13

"Everyone whose rights and freedoms as set forth in [the] Convention are violated shall have an effective remedy before a national authority notwithstanding that the violation has been committed by persons acting in an official capacity."

A. The parties' submissions

1. The Government

47. The Government submitted that no extradition, deportation or administrative removal proceedings had yet been initiated in respect of the applicant in Russia. Thus, he was not at risk of an immediate forced transfer to Tajikistan. In the event that a decision on his deportation or administrative removal was eventually taken, he would be able to challenge such a decision before the Russian courts. There was nothing to prevent the applicant from voluntarily leaving Russia for other countries of his choice

before a decision on his removal from the country was taken, if he believed that his complaints would not be properly examined in Russia.

48. According to the information available to the Government, the applicant had not been and was not being criminally prosecuted in Tajikistan; no requests for his extradition had been received by the Russian authorities from the Tajik authorities. Therefore, the applicant could not claim to be a victim of the alleged violation of Article 3 of the Convention on account of his forced transfer to Tajikistan.

49. Arguably, the decision of the regional migration authority of 27 February 2013 to annul the applicant's temporary residence permit could be viewed as creating a risk of the applicant's forced transfer to Tajikistan. However, even proceeding on such an assumption, the applicant had still failed to challenge that decision.

2. The applicant

50. The applicant argued that there was no evidence of his involvement in the activities of a prohibited organisation. He had not been afforded an opportunity to participate in the proceedings in which the publications that he had allegedly given to Mr Ts. had been classified as extremist. The courts reviewing the FSB's "warning" had relied on the above-mentioned classification as an established fact.

51. The applicant also argued that judicial review of the decision to annul his residence permit was not a remedy to be exhausted in the circumstances of his case. The grounds for annulment in section 7 of the Foreigners Act were phrased in such a wide way that mere unsubstantiated suspicion on the part of the Federal Security Service was sufficient to validate annulment by the migration authority. That authority and the reviewing courts had found it unnecessary to require the production of any additional documents corroborating the suspicions against the applicant. The courts would not give adequate consideration to his arguments pertaining to a risk of ill-treatment or to his family life.

52. The applicant submitted that following the annulment of his residence permit and the dismissal of the plausible grounds for remaining in Russia, his removal would inevitably ensue unless he left the country voluntarily. The applicant also argued that he had raised his arguments concerning a risk of ill-treatment before the courts on judicial review against the decision to refuse him refugee status and temporary asylum. Those applications and the ensuing judicial proceedings were central to his situation. There was no prospect of success by re-arguing the same issues and he would not obtain adequate redress in eventual proceedings requiring his effective removal. In particular, he argued that a presumption of fact established by a prior court decision would apply on judicial review of a deportation order.

53. The applicant argued that the Russian authorities should have provided a legal basis for his stay in the country or completed a procedure for his removal. For the applicant, the approach consisting in the annulment of legal grounds for staying in the country was just another disguised way of ensuring the removal of people whose presence was not acceptable to the Russian authorities. They would then argue, as in the present case, that no adverse decision, such as an extradition or expulsion order, had been taken and that the authorities of the home country had no particular interest in the people concerned.

54. The applicant contested that the absence of any specific removal decision excluded any risk of ill-treatment. The Court had previously found that people suspected of or otherwise linked to the activities of prohibited organisations such as Hizb-ut-Tahrir ran a risk of ill-treatment in Tajikistan and in some other countries.

55. Lastly, the applicant submitted that it would be difficult for him to leave Russia for another country, given that his family was residing in Russia. The father of his wife's first child also resided in Russia and it would be unfair to impinge upon that person's and the family's interests. The applicant's departure alone would rupture his family life. In any event, it was unlikely that any State would accommodate his entire family on a permanent basis. He had no information as to which State would be safe for them. He had applied to the Moscow UNHCR office requesting help with resettlement but was still awaiting a reply.

B. The Court's assessment

1. Articles 3 and 13 of the Convention

56. The Court has taken note of the Government's argument that it was open to the applicant to seek judicial review of the decision to annul his temporary residence permit. However, the Court finds it unnecessary to deal with this argument since the complaints are, in any event, inadmissible for the following reason.

57. First of all, the Court has not been provided with any information as to whether any removal decision has been taken in respect of the applicant. The Court is aware that the decision annulling the applicant's residence permit contained a clear and specific requirement that he leave Russia or otherwise be deported; the refusal of his application for refugee status also required him to leave Russia (see paragraphs 15 and 25 above). Nevertheless, the Court considers that the above does not necessarily entail that the applicant's removal is inevitable and impending in the circumstances of the case. Under Russian law a specific decision requiring a foreigner's removal from the country must be taken before a foreigner can be removed, for instance, an extradition order, a decision imposing the

penalty of administrative removal for an administrative offence or a decision declaring his presence in Russia undesirable and ordering his deportation (see, by way of comparison, *A.L. (X.W.) v. Russia*, no. 44095/14, § 65, 29 October 2015), and any such removal order can, as the Government note, be challenged. In the absence of any such decision, as a rule, it cannot be said that the applicant is a "victim" of a potential violation under Article 3 of the Convention, as in the present case, on account on a risk of ill-treatment in Tajikistan. The Court reiterates in this connection that the word "victim" in Article 34 of the Convention denotes a person directly affected – or at risk of being directly affected – by the act or omission at issue (see *F.G. v. Sweden* [GC], no. 43611/11, § 76, 23 March 2016).

58. Second, as regards the applicant's argument concerning an "extradition in disguise", indeed, in previous cases the Court dealt with situations where extradition requests were made by another State and rejected by the Russian Prosecutor General's Office but the applicants were still removed from Russia by way of another legal procedure (see, for instance, *Muminov v. Russia*, no. 42502/06, §§ 15-17 and 102-03, 11 December 2008) or even in defiance of the legal procedures under Russian law and the indication made by the Court under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court (see *Kasymakhunov v. Russia*, no. 29604/12, 14 November 2013, and *Mamazhonov v. Russia*, no. 17239/13, 23 October 2014). In fact, several such applications concerned the applicants' removal to Tajikistan (see *Iskandarov*, cited above, 23 September 2010; *Abdulkhakov v. Russia*, no. 14743/11, 2 October 2012; *Savriddin Dzhurayev v. Russia*, no. 71386/10, ECHR 2013 (extracts); *Nizomkhon Dzhurayev v. Russia*, no. 31890/11, 3 October 2013; and *Latipov v. Russia*, no. 77658/11, 12 December 2013).

59. However, in the present case, the Court has not been presented with any evidence that the Tajik authorities have undertaken any actions seeking the applicant's return to Tajikistan (for instance, an extradition request or an order to trace him), or that the Russian authorities have informed the Tajik authorities of their suspicions in respect of the applicant. The Court has no reason to doubt the sincerity and completeness of the Government's submissions on this aspect of the case and the respondent State's compliance with their obligations under Article 38 of the Convention (see, among others, *Tahsin Acar v. Turkey* [GC], no. 26307/95, §§ 253-54, ECHR 2004-III). Therefore, the Court cannot but conclude that there are insufficient elements to conclude or to assume that the Tajik authorities have or are likely to have an "adverse interest" in the applicant, and that the applicant is running a risk of or is being subjected to an "extradition in disguise".

60. The above considerations, taken together, have led the Court to the conclusion that the applicant's complaint under Article 3 of the Convention

is currently devoid of substantiation. Accordingly, at present this part of the application is manifestly ill-founded and must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 §§ 3 (a) and 4 of the Convention.

61. In view of the above conclusion, the applicant had no "arguable claim" to be the victim of a violation of Article 3 of the Convention (see *Boyle and Rice v. the United Kingdom*, judgment of 27 April 1988, Series A no. 131, § 52, and *Nzapali v. the Netherlands* (dec.), no. 6107/07, § 36, 17 November 2015). Accordingly, at present, the complaint under Article 13 of the Convention in conjunction with its Article 3 is also manifestly ill-founded and must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 §§ 3 (a) and 4 of the Convention.

2. Articles 8 and 13 of the Convention

62. The applicant also argued that the circumstances of the case disclosed or could disclose a violation of Article 8 of the Convention.

63. The Court considers that in the absence of a removal order the applicant's arguments concerning future adverse effects on his "family life" arising from his removal from Russia were and remain speculative. Accordingly, at present this part of the application is manifestly ill-founded and must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 §§ 3 (a) and 4 of the Convention.

64. As regards the applicant's arguments relating to the immediate effects that the impugned decisions or omissions on the part of the Russian authorities (the "warning", the annulment of the residence permit and the refusals of refugee status and temporary asylum) may have already produced, the Court observes that the applicants' observations do not contain any specific arguments in this respect, beyond and separately from the submissions relating to Article 3 of the Convention. In particular, the Court has not been afforded an adequate opportunity to consider whether the respondent State has incurred but failed to discharge any positive obligation on account of the applicant's presence in the country after the revocation of the residence permit (see, by way of comparison, *Jeunesse v. the Netherlands* [GC], no. 12738/10, § 100 *et seq.,* 3 October 2014). It appears that the national authorities tolerated the applicant's continued presence in the country during his various administrative and judicial proceedings after the annulment of the residence permit and then also in compliance with the Court's indication under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court. Accordingly, this part of the application, as presented to the Court, is manifestly ill-founded and must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 §§ 3 (a) and 4 of the Convention.

65. In view of the above conclusions, the applicant had no "arguable claim" to be the victim of the alleged violations of Article 8 of the Convention. Accordingly, at present, the complaint under Article 13 of the Convention in conjunction with its Article 8 is manifestly ill-founded and

must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 §§ 3 (a) and 4 of the Convention.

3. Rule 39 of the Rules of Court

66. In view of the above, the Court's indication Rule 39 of the Rules of Court is no longer applicable.

67. It remains open to the applicant to institute new proceedings before the Court under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court and Article 34 of the Convention, in compliance with the admissibility criteria, if new circumstances arise, for instance, on account of a removal order being issued by the Russian authorities.

For these reasons, the Court, unanimously,

Declares the application inadmissible.

Done in English and notified in writing on 2 June 2016.

Stephen Phillips
Registrar

Luis López Guerra
President