



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

FIRST SECTION

Application no. 14416/06
Sergey Vladimirovich IVANOV against Russia
and 5 other applications
(see list appended)

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The applicants are Russian nationals who claim to have been victims of ill-treatment by police officers at local departments of the Ministry of the Interior (*МВД РФ*) in 2002-2006 in different regions of Russia. The investigating authorities did not pursue criminal proceedings against police officers concerned. Those applicants, who were detained within the framework of criminal proceedings, were later convicted on the basis of *inter alia* statements allegedly given under duress as a result of the ill-treatment complained of.

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

1. Application no. 14416/06 lodged on 10 January 2006 by Mr Sergey Vladimirovich IVANOV who was born in 1966 and lived in Nizhniy Novgorod before his arrest. He is at present serving his sentence after conviction. He is represented before the Court by Mr D.V. Mosenkov.

A. Alleged ill-treatment by Nizhniy Novgorod Operational Search Bureau officers in June 2004

1. Alleged ill-treatment on 8 June 2004

On 8 June 2004 police officers of the Operational Search Bureau of the Main Directorate of the Ministry of the Interior of the Russian Federation in the Privolzhskiy Federal Circuit (*Оперативно-розыскное бюро ГУ МВД РФ по Приволжскому федеральному округу*) conducted a search at the applicant's home and arrested the applicant on suspicion of his participation in a robbery. Among documents seized was the applicant's disability certificate. At 9.40 a.m. he was brought to the Operational Search Bureau

premises in Nizhniy Novgorod. His request for access to an advocate was ignored. He was demanded to confess to the robbery. After his refusal, the police officers, in particular K., Pr. and S., subjected him to various forms of ill-treatment: they beat him up, strangled him, applied electric shocks via wires attached to his ears and did not let him breathe by covering his mouth and nose with a rag. They made him sit down on the floor in a cross-legged position, his hands cuffed behind his back, his feet tied with a rope which was connected to his neck and to the handcuffs. The police officers pulled the rope to contort the applicant into a painful position. He was put in the “envelope” position, which consisted of him being tied in the same way as above but lying on his stomach. Two police officers jumped on his back. They also put a bag on his head and secured it with a scotch tape at his neck. Tied in the same position, the applicant was rolled on the floor, had his genitals stepped on, received blows and kicks on his legs, back and kidneys. Then the police officers tied a rope to each of his legs and started pulling them apart. The applicant lost consciousness several times and was brought back to his senses by buckets of water. He heard his torturers telling each other not to leave traces on his body.

Following several hours of torture, the applicant wrote a confession as was dictated to him by his torturers. He was then taken to an unspecified IVS detention facility.

Complaint of ill-treatment to a judge of the Nizhegorodskiy District Court

On 9 June 2004 the Nizhegorodskiy District Court of Nizhniy Novgorod issued an order for the applicant to be remanded in custody. At the hearing the applicant who was represented by a lawyer complained to the judge that he had been tortured by the police officers and had signed a confession as a result. No reaction followed on the part of the judge.

According to statements by the applicant’s wife and son who were present at the court hearing, the applicant looked very distressed, had abrasions on his wrists and bruises on his head and did not recognise his family.

2. Alleged ill-treatment on 22, 24 and 28 June 2004. Complaints to the head of SIZO-1 and the prosecutor’s office.

After the court hearing on 9 June 2004 the applicant was placed in remand centre no. IZ 52/1 (SIZO-1).

On 22 and 24 June 2004 he was transported from the remand centre to the police where the torture continued by the same police officers with a view to extracting confessions to other robberies and to receive statements in respect of other suspects.

On 24 June 2004 the applicant sent letters from his remand centre to the prosecutor of the Nizhniy Novgorod region, the Prosecutor General’s Office and the Presidential Human Rights Commission complaining of his ill-treatment. He also lodged the complaint with the head of his remand centre.

On 28 June 2004 he was transported to the Operational Search Bureau where he was again beaten up and tortured by the same persons. On his return to SIZO-1 no injuries were recorded by officers on duty. On 29 June 2004 the applicant asked a doctor at the remand centre to record his injuries

inflicted on the previous day, notably chest contusions and abrasions. At 11.20 a.m. the doctor recorded circular abrasions on the lower third of both shins with a “wet” surface, inflicted on the day before the examination, and reported the incident to the head of the remand centre. On the same day the applicant himself lodged another written complaint with the head of the remand centre complaining of the new incident of ill-treatment and asking for medical examination. He stated that despite a severe pain in the chest area the staff of the remand centre medical unit had refused him medical examination. He asked the head of the remand centre to stop taking him to the Operational Search Bureau and instead to conduct investigative actions at the premises of SIZO-1 in his lawyer’s presence.

On 30 June 2004 the applicant sent the second complaint to the Nizhniy Novgorod regional prosecutor about the ill-treatment on 28 June 2004 stating that he could identify the police officers who had tortured him.

B. Alleged ill-treatment in colony UZ-62/14 in July-December 2004

On 14 July 2004 investigator S. from the Investigation Department of the Main Directorate of the Interior of the Nizhniy Novgorod region (*Следственная часть Главного следственного управления при ГУВД Нижегородской области*) in charge of the applicant’s case decided to transfer the applicant for further detention to strict regime correctional colony no. UZ-62/14 for the reason that the applicant, as a potential leader of a criminal group, had attempted to influence, by creating risk to their life and health, those of his co-accused who had started cooperating with the investigating authority by giving statements about the group’s criminal activities and who were being held in the same remand centre. By letter of 17 March 2006 the office of the Federal Service for Execution of Sentences in the Privolzhskiy Federal Circuit informed the applicant’s mother that the applicant’s transfer had had lawful basis in view, in particular, of the overcrowding of remand centre SIZO-1.

On 20 July 2004 the applicant was transported to the colony and immediately placed into a disciplinary cell where he spent eighteen days. During this time he was not allowed to take a walk outside, shower, shave, do his laundry or receive parcels from his family. He was beaten up unconscious, to make him confess to other armed robberies, by several convicted prisoners who acted on the instructions of the police officers and the administration of the colony. They used a rubber truncheon. At some point they hang the applicant upside down and beat him up in that position.

After the disciplinary cell the applicant was moved to unit no. 12 and then to unit no. 14 where the convicted prisoners were held. The applicant was ordered to clean and do other work following the same regimen as the convicted prisoners. On multiple occasions he was visited by the police officers, in particular P. and Ch., who suggested that he make certain further confessions and beat him up after his refusal to do so. They summoned prisoners V. and S.P. who beat the applicant up in a solitary cell. Prisoner Z. threatened him with sexual violence.

Between 21 and 29 September 2004 the applicant saw a doctor at the colony who diagnosed him with a certain neurological disorder and ordered

in-patient treatment. It is unclear whether the applicant followed it. He was refused medical treatment for his injuries.

Two inmates, who had been kept in the same unit as the applicant, submitted to the Court in writing that at the time of his detention at the colony the applicant had had bruises and haematomas on his face and head and that he had not been able to move on his own after meetings with the police staff. They had also heard his screams when he had been beaten up by the prisoners. The applicant's wife and son who had visited him at the colony also testified that the applicant had had bruises and haematomas on his face and head, had had difficulty moving and speaking and had dragged his leg. The applicant told his wife and son that he had been beaten up and had been forced to sign a number of confessions.

After the applicant had confessed to several more crimes as a result of ill-treatment described above, on 1 December 2004, investigator S. in charge of his case ordered that he be moved back to SIZO-1 on the ground that the risk of him influencing his co-accused no longer existed.

C. Nizhniy Novgorod authorities' response to the applicant's complaint of ill-treatment

It appears that almost all applicant's complaints to various authorities were re-transmitted to the prosecutor's office of the Nizhniy Novgorod region, and by the latter often to the Nizhegorodskiy district prosecutor's office of the town of Nizhniy Novgorod.

His complaint to the Main Directorate of the Ministry of the Interior of the Russian Federation in the Privolzhskiy Federal Circuit (*ГУ МВД РФ по Приволжскому федеральному округу*) was answered by that authority on 2 March 2006 informing him that no violations had been detected in the police officers' actions.

1. Nizhegorodskiy district prosecutor's refusal to initiate criminal proceedings

(a) Alleged ill-treatment on 8, 22 and 24 June 2004

On 16 July 2004, after a pre-investigation inquiry under Article 144 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (CCrP) into the applicant's allegations of ill-treatment on 8, 22 and 24 June 2004 in the course of which investigator S. and unspecified police officers had given "explanations" denying the allegations, investigator B. at the Nizhegorodskiy district prosecutor's office of Nizhniy Novgorod (*прокуратура Нижнегородского района г. Н. Новгорода*) decided not to initiate criminal proceedings on the ground of the absence of a criminal event under Article 24 § 1 (1) of CCrP.

On 23 August 2004 the Nizhegorodskiy district prosecutor of Nizhniy Novgorod Mr A.P. issued an opinion that the decision of 16 July 2004 was lawful, well-founded and reasoned and that the pre-investigation inquiry had been full, comprehensive and objective. It reproduced the reasoning in the investigator's decision.

However, on 6 March 2006 a deputy prosecutor of Nizhegorodskiy district annulled the decision of 16 July 2004 as ill-founded in view of the failure to identify all police officers concerned.

(b) Alleged ill-treatment on 28 June 2004

On 2 August 2004, after a pre-investigation inquiry under Article 144 of the CCrP into the applicant's allegations of ill-treatment on 28 June 2004 which were denied by police officer Mr Ya. who had transported the applicant from SIZO-1 to the Operational Search Bureau and back together with other unspecified police officers and conducted investigative actions with the applicant on that day, investigator M. at the Nizhegorodskiy district prosecutor's office of Nizhniy Novgorod decided not to initiate criminal proceedings on the ground of the absence of *corpus delicti* under Article 286 of the Criminal Code (abuse of office) in the actions of police officer Ya., as provided by Article 24 § 1 (2) of CCrP.

On 6 March 2006 a deputy prosecutor of Nizhegorodskiy district annulled that decision as ill-founded in view of the failure to identify all police officers concerned.

On 13 March 2006 investigator M. at the Nizhegorodskiy district prosecutor's office took a decision identical to the previous one.

Following the annulment of the decision of 13 March 2006, on 5 April 2006 the applicant gave "explanations" to investigator M. in which he identified four police officers MM K., Ch., P. and Pr, stated that he could identify several others and confirmed that they had subjected him to ill-treatment in investigator S.'s presence. The investigator received "explanations" from three police officers. Mr K., head of the Operational Search Bureau unit no. 3, denied any ill-treatment, stated that P. and Ch. had meanwhile been relocated to the Unit for Fight against Organised Crime of the Republic of Mordoviya. Operative officers Pr. and Py. of the Operational Search Bureau unit no. 3 also denied any violence. Pr. stated that before the investigator's arrival on the day of the applicant's apprehension they had had a "talk" (*beceđa*) with the applicant.

On 10 April 2006 investigator M. issued a new decision not to institute criminal proceedings for want of *corpus delicti* in the actions of the police officers on the basis of the above "explanations". She noted that a request had been sent to the prosecutor's office of the Republic of Mordoviya to receive "explanations" from P. and Ch.

On the same day a deputy prosecutor of Nizhegorodskiy district annulled that decision as premature and ill-founded noting that it was necessary to establish an advocate who had defended the applicant in the course of the initial investigative actions.

A request for records of investigative actions had been sent to the Nizhniy Novgorod Regional Court. As no such documents had been received within the time-limit for pre-investigation inquiry – three days extendable up to ten days, on 19 April 2006 investigator M. decided not to institute criminal proceedings for reasons identical to those in her previous decision.

2. Sukhobezvodnoye prosecutor's refusal to initiate criminal proceedings

Alleged ill-treatment in colony

The applicant's allegations of ill-treatment in colony UZ-62/14 were subject to a pre-investigation inquiry under Article 144 of the CCrP by the prosecutor's office of Sukhobezvodnoye, Nizhniy Novgorod Region, as a result of which it issued decisions of 24 February and 14 March 2005 refusing prosecution, which were annulled on 4 April 2005 by a deputy prosecutor of Nizhniy Novgorod region, and then a decision of 8 April 2005 not to bring criminal proceedings for lack of a criminal event in accordance with Article 24 § 1 (1) of CCrP, based on "explanations" from the police officers, investigator S., the head of the medical unit of UZ-62/14 and some convicts allegedly involved in the applicant's ill-treatment.

The decision of 8 April 2005 was found lawful and well-founded by the Nizhniy Novgorod regional prosecutor's office and the Prosecutor General's Office of the Russian Federation.

3. NGOs' intervention

In February 2006, in addition to the applicant's own complaints, his situation was communicated to the Prosecutor General of the Russian Federation by non-governmental organisations "Za prava cheloveka" and "Komitet za grazhdanske prava" which demanded investigation into the applicant's ill-treatment.

In the same month "Committee against Torture", a non-governmental organisation based in Nizhniy Novgorod, conducted an inquiry into the applicant's complaints. Two persons, who were serving their sentences in colony UZ-62/14 at the time of the applicant's detention there, gave statements which confirmed the applicant's allegations of ill-treatment by the police officers who visited him and by other convicts. The applicant's son's and wife's statements also confirmed the applicant's account of events in 2004.

D. Criminal proceedings against the applicant

As transpires from the trial records, the applicant claimed that his pre-trial self-incriminating statements should not be admitted in evidence as they had been obtained as a result of ill-treatment by the police officers and prisoners acting on their instructions. At his request the trial court heard two witnesses, notably one of his inmates in the correctional colony and his son who testified to seeing traces of ill-treatment on the applicant. The court rejected the applicant's requests to declare his self-incriminating statements inadmissible evidence.

By verdict of a jury of the Nizhniy Novgorod Regional Court the applicant was found guilty of several armed robberies as a member of a criminal group and theft. Six other accused were found guilty in the case. In a judgment of 8 June 2006 the applicant was sentenced to nineteen years' imprisonment.

On 22 February 2007 the Supreme Court of Russia examined the applicant's case on appeal. The appeal court rejected as ill-founded the complaint of inadmissibility of evidence obtained under duress, referring to the results of the authorities' pre-investigation inquiry into the alleged ill-treatment and the trial court's findings. The Supreme Court reduced the applicant's term of imprisonment to sixteen years and upheld the remainder of the judgment on appeal.

COMPLAINTS

1. The applicant complains under Article 3 of the Convention of ill-treatment by the police officers and convicts who acted on the instructions of the police officers and the administration of the correctional colony.

2. He complains under Article 6 that the trial court convicted him on the basis of his confessions at the preliminary investigation obtained under torture.

3. He also complains under Article 4 of the Convention that, being detained at the correctional colony as a criminal suspect, he was forced to carry out the same work as convicted prisoners.

2. Application no. 40192/06 lodged on 24 June 2006 by Mr Mikhail Fedorovich NIKOLAYEV who was born in 1960 and lives in Krasnyy Yar, Staropoltavskiy district of Volgograd region.

A. Alleged ill-treatment by Staropoltavskiy district police officers (Volgograd region)

On 5 August 2002 the applicant had a quarrel with his brother who called the police. Four police officers from the Staropoltavskiy district police department Sh., S., D. and Z. apprehended the applicant. They allegedly threw him into the boot of their VAZ-2105 car where he travelled about 80 kilometres to the Staraya Poltavka police station. While trying to get out or to receive access to air he damaged the boot. On the way to the police station on several occasions he was taken out of the car and beaten up. He was once again beaten up at the police station and placed into a cell for administrative offenders where he spent the night being left without any medical aid, experiencing pain from the injuries inflicted on him.

The following morning he was brought before a judge of the Staropoltavskiy District Court who found him guilty of petty hooliganism and sentenced him to two days' administrative arrest. After the hearing police officers called the ambulance. The applicant was hospitalised to the Staropoltavskaya district hospital and diagnosed with a broken rib, soft tissue bruises and abrasions on the left part of his chest and traumatic left side otitis. On 8 August 2005 he was released from hospital and continued out-patient treatment at the place of his residence. Following examination by a neurosurgeon and X-ray examination the applicant was diagnosed with skull cup fracture which required his urgent hospitalisation. According to medical forensic report no. 2786 of 23 October 2002, on 5 August 2002 the applicant received closed craniocerebral injury – brain contusion with a left temporal bone fracture, classified as a grave damage to health, and a fracture of the eighth rib on the left side, classified as a damage to health of medium severity. From 24 October to 11 November 2002 he underwent in-patient treatment at the Volgograd regional hospital where he was diagnosed with a left temporal bone fracture, two-sided otitis and hearing loss.

B. Volgograd region authorities' response to the applicant's complaint of police ill-treatment

Following the applicant's complaint about his ill-treatment by the police, on 7 September 2002 the prosecutor's office of the Staropoltavskiy District, Volgograd Region, opened a criminal case and recognized him as victim.

On 15 January 2003 the criminal proceedings were terminated in a part concerning police officers Z. and D. for lack of *corpus delicti* in their actions. On 4 March 2003 the criminal proceedings against police officers S. and Sh. were also terminated on the same ground. The proceedings were re-opened and terminated again.

On 17 November 2011 the Court requested the Government to submit a number of documents relating to the investigation into the applicant's alleged ill-treatment by police. According to information submitted by the

Government, on 21 December 2011 the Volgograd regional prosecutor's office re-opened the proceedings in view of the defects of investigation.

On 30 April 2012 the Pallasovskiy investigation department of the Volgograd Regional Investigation Committee informed the applicant that on that day the proceedings had again been terminated on the same ground as before.

COMPLAINTS

The applicant complains about the ill-treatment he suffered in the hands of police and the authorities' failure to bring the criminal case to trial. He relied on Articles 3 and 5 of the Convention.

3. Application no. 49869/06 lodged on 28 September 2006 by Dmitriy Viktorovich GOLUBYATNIKOV who was born in 1979, represented by Ms O.A. Golubyatnikova (“first applicant”).

4. Application no. 44822/06 lodged on 28 September 2006 by Sergey Anatolyevich ZHUCHKOV who was born in 1978, represented by Ms L.V. Kolesnikova (“second applicant”).

Both applicants lived in Tikhoretsk, Krasnodar region, before their arrest. They are at present serving their sentences in Stavropol region after conviction.

A. Alleged ill-treatment by Tikhoretsk district police officers (Krasnodar region)

1. Opening of criminal proceedings into the death of S.

On 3 January 2005 criminal proceedings were initiated into the death of a young woman found with head injuries in the yard of a block of flats in Tikhoretsk. The investigation was conducted by investigator Sh. and, from 23 January 2005, senior investigator O. of the Tikhoretsk interdistrict prosecutor’s office. Operative activities were conducted by the criminal investigation unit of the Tikhoretsk town and district police department (*ОУП УВД города Тихорецка и Тихорецкого района*), in particular by senior officer K., officers R. and Ch. Those officers established that B. could have been involved in the crime. On 20 January 2005 they established his whereabouts and arrested him. B.’s statements gave grounds to suspect the first applicant’s complicity in the crime.

2. The first applicant’s arrest and alleged ill-treatment

On 21 January 2005 at 7.20 p.m. operative officers K. and R. arrested the first applicant at his girlfriend’s home in the presence of witnesses O.V., A.V. and O.B. and took him to the Tikhoretsk police department (*УВД города Тихорецка и Тихорецкого района*).

Officers K., R. and Ch. suggested that the first applicant should confess to the crime and, in reply to his refusal, subjected him to various forms of ill-treatment including beatings and suffocation. They used a gas mask and a rubber truncheon. The applicant lost consciousness. He did not confess to the murder.

At 9 p.m. they took him to the temporary detention facility (IVS) at the Tikhoretsk police department. The IVS officer on duty refused to admit the applicant, who had injuries on his body and complained of a pain in the left part of his chest. An ambulance was called.

After 10.30 p.m. the ambulance doctor T. diagnosed the applicant with ribs’ fracture, multiple contusions and traumatic shock. He recorded multiple haematomas on the applicant’s back and chest and asthenia, and noted the applicant’s complaints about pain in the chest and stomach. The doctor stated that the applicant had been beaten up and assessed his condition as grave. He administered first aid to him. Then the applicant accompanied by police guards was taken to hospital for X-ray examination.

At 11.30 p.m. at the Tikhoretsk Central Town Hospital the applicant underwent X-ray examination and was examined by a traumatologist and surgeon who diagnosed him with the fracture of the sixth rib on the left side. The hospital staff gave the X-ray pictures to the police convoy officers. The X-ray pictures were never found afterwards.

It was established later by a commission of medical forensic experts that the applicant had a fracture of the seventh and eighth ribs on the left side and a traumatic shock (report no. 152/2010 of 5 May 2010).

3. The second applicant's arrest and alleged ill-treatment

On 26 January 2005 at 7.45 a.m. the same operative officers from the criminal investigation unit of the Tikhoretsk town and district police department arrested the second applicant at his place of work in his colleagues' presence, took him to the Tikhoretsk police department and allegedly subjected him to various forms of ill-treatment, including beatings by a truncheon, suffocation with the use of a gas mask and threats, in order to force him to give statements incriminating himself, the first applicant, and B. in the murder of S.. During the night he was left in the Tikhoretsk police department's premises shackled to a radiator. The ill-treatment continued on the next morning.

At 1 p.m. on 27 January 2005 the second applicant wrote his confession statements under the operative officers' instructions, on the basis of statements by V. allegedly extracted from the latter under duress earlier on the same day. V.'s and the second applicant's statements formed part of records of their "voluntary surrender with a confession of guilt" (*явки с повинной*).

At 2.40 p.m. the second applicant was formally detained as a suspect.

Both the second applicant and V. confirmed their confession statements during their questioning as suspects and during the crime reconstruction on 1 February 2005, both times in the presence of lawyers on duty called by investigator O. who allegedly threatened the applicant with one more night with the operative officers in case he would not confirm his confession. The applicant's mother was present during the crime reconstruction and saw him with a bruise on his face and limping. The crime reconstruction was filmed and shown on the local TV channel. The second applicant's injuries were visible on those video records.

On 2 February 2005 the second applicant was taken by police officer K. and two other policemen to his grandparents. In the police officers' presence the applicant asked his grandparents to give him 20,000 roubles, allegedly in order to repay a gambling debt to a cellmate. When left alone with his grandmother he explained that he had been beaten up by the police officers, that he had confessed to a crime because otherwise they would have killed him, and that he needed money in order to evade prosecution. His grandmother saw that he had a bruise on his face and that he was limping. Subsequently criminal proceedings were brought against officer K. who acknowledged that he had taken the second applicant to his grandparents unlawfully. The police officers returned the money to the applicant's grandparents. On 31 December 2005 the criminal proceedings were terminated for want of *corpus delicti* in the actions of K.

On 3 February 2005 lawyer D. retained by the applicant's mother met with the applicant and suggested that he should lodge a complaint about the police ill-treatment and request a medical examination. The applicant refused, being afraid of retaliation from the police officers. Later on the same day he and V. informed investigator O. about their wish to withdraw their confession statements explaining that they had given them as a result of ill-treatment by the operative officers.

4. The applicants' trial

On 27 May 2005 an indictment was approved and the case against the applicants, B. and V. was forwarded to the Tikhoretsk Town Court for trial.

On 2 August 2005 the Town Court declared the records of "surrender with a confession of guilt" by the second applicant and V. of 27 January 2005 inadmissible evidence. It referred to Article 75 § 2 (1) of the CCrP (inadmissibility of suspect's statements given in the absence of a lawyer and withdrawn at trial) without stating its reasons. It dismissed requests by the second applicant and V. also to exclude from evidence their similar statements given as suspects and during the crime reconstruction. B.'s request for an order that his statements as a suspect and accused be excluded from evidence, also on the ground that they had been given under duress by the operative officers, was likewise rejected. Those statements were among evidence on which the applicants' conviction was based according to the Tikhoretsk Town Court's judgment of 5 August 2005 finding the applicants guilty of infliction of grave harm to S.'s health which led to her death, under Article 111 § 4 of the Criminal Code, and sentencing the first applicant to twelve years' and the second applicant to nine years' imprisonment. B. and V. were also convicted under the same provision of the Criminal Code and sentenced to various terms of imprisonment.

The Town Court dismissed the applicants' and the other two defendants' complaint that they had been subjected to unlawful investigative methods including ill-treatment, having found it unproved on the basis of pre-investigation inquiries by the prosecutor's office and a decision by the Krasnodar regional prosecutor's office refusing to bring criminal proceedings into those allegations.

On 29 March 2006 the Krasnodar Regional Court upheld the Town Court's judgment. It reiterated the conclusion that the applicants' allegations of police ill-treatment were ill-founded.

B. Krasnodar authorities' response to the applicants' complaint of police ill-treatment

1. Prosecutor's office investigators' refusal to bring criminal proceedings

First complaints about the second applicant's ill-treatment were lodged by his mother on 8 February 2005 and by his lawyer D. on 15 February and 17 March 2005 with the Tikhoretsk interdistrict prosecutor's office, which received them on 9 and 16 February and 18 March 2005 accordingly, as confirmed by the Tikhoretsk post office. The applicant's mother also

complained to the Krasnodar regional prosecutor on 7 February 2005. The applicant himself complained about his ill-treatment to the Tikhoretsk interdistrict prosecutor and the investigator on 17 March 2005.

They did not receive any response.

The first applicant's mother also complained of her son's ill-treatment.

On 18 April 2005 investigator O. replied to the applicants' collective complaint dated 25 March 2005. He stated that when questioned as suspects and accused in the presence of their lawyers the applicants had not claimed that they had been ill-treated by police officers, and that the applicants "had given their statements voluntarily".

During three years from March 2005 to March 2008 the applicants represented by their mothers unsuccessfully requested that criminal proceedings be opened into their ill-treatment.

The first decision to refuse prosecution was taken on 2 June 2005 by the Krasnodar regional prosecutor's office which concluded, on the basis of statements by operative officers R. and K. and investigator O., that there was no *corpus delicti* in the actions of investigator O. (Article 24 § 1 (2) of the CCrP).

The Tikhoretsk prosecutor's office based its decision of 23 July 2005 not to initiate criminal proceedings on the absence of a criminal event (Article 24 § 1 (1) of the CCrP).

Subsequently decisions refusing to initiate criminal proceedings were annulled by higher prosecutors or courts and new similar decisions taken again. Thus, for example, on 27 December 2007 the Tikhoretsk Town Court examined the applicants' appeal against a decision refusing prosecution taken on 21 December 2007 by the Tikhoretsk division of the Investigation Committee at the Krasnodar regional prosecutor's office. The Town Court stated that, despite its previous decision of 15 October 2007 in which it found a refusal of prosecution of 21 June 2007 unlawful and ill-founded, yet another refusal of prosecution followed, identical to the previous one, which disregarded the courts' findings. Decisions refusing prosecution cited, *inter alia*, the second applicant's grandmother's statements to the effect that on 2 February 2005 she had seen the applicant with a bruise on his face and limping which gave her the ground to believe that he had been beaten up by the police officers.

2. Institution and the course of criminal proceedings into the first applicant's ill-treatment

On 5 March 2008 the Tikhoretsk division of the Investigation Committee at the Krasnodar regional prosecutor's office instituted criminal proceedings into the first applicant's alleged ill-treatment under Article 112 of the Criminal Code.

Subsequently the criminal proceedings were suspended or terminated, for example on the ground that the prosecution was time-barred, and then resumed again following annulment of those decisions by the same investigating authority. The first applicant was not always informed of those developments.

Following the applicant's complaints about the investigating authority's inactivity the Tikhoretsk Town Court acknowledged repeatedly that the investigating committee at the prosecutor's office had failed to proceed with

the investigation as required by law (i.e. decisions of 30 May, 1 July, 21 August and 26 September 2008).

On 22 November 2010 the Tikhoretsk interdistrict prosecutor decided that the Tikhoretsk police department was a proper authority to conduct further investigation in the case concerning the alleged misconduct of its own officers.

On 26 November 2010 an investigator of the Tikhoretsk police department suspended the proceedings for a failure to identify those responsible (Article 208 § 1 (1) of the CCrP). Exact time, place and a person responsible for infliction of grave bodily harm on the first applicant were not established.

The proceedings were resumed and suspended again and are still pending.

C. Other information

On 7 December 2006 the Tikhoretsk newspaper *Provintsiya Yug* (*Провинция Юг*) reported on cases of S. detained by police in administrative proceedings and B. who both died after a fall from a window of the Tikhoretsk police department on different dates in November 2006.

COMPLAINTS

1. The applicants complain under Article 3 of the Convention that they were subjected to ill-treatment by the Tikhoretsk police department operative officers and that the State failed to conduct effective investigation and punish them. The second applicant also complains that the alleged ill-treatment took place during the period when those police officers arbitrarily deprived him of his liberty, from his actual apprehension at 7.45 a.m. on 26 January 2005 until his formal detention as a suspect at 2.40 p.m. on 27 January 2005, in the absence of any reasons to suspect him of the involvement in the attack on S., in particular, in the absence of any statements by the first applicant and B. about the second applicant's involvement in the crime.

2. The applicants complained under Article 6 of the Convention that their trial was marred by procedural irregularities and was unfair; in particular, their conviction was based on the second applicant's and their co-defendants' coerced statements.

3. The first applicant also complained that he had been detained in the temporary detention facility at the Tikhoretsk police department during the period until 28 May 2005 exceeding ten days provided for by law; that his detention on remand in 2005 was not justified by any valid reason; and that it took the appeal court six months to examine his case. He relied on Articles 5, 6 and 13 of the Convention.

5. Application no. 2674/07 lodged on 18 December 2006 by Sergey Yevgenyevich RYABOV who was born in 1980 and lived in Tuchkovo, Ruza district of Moscow region, before his arrest. He is at present serving his sentence in Bezhetsk, Tver region, after conviction. He is represented before the Court by Mr M.T. Rachkovskiy, a lawyer with the International Protection Centre in Moscow.

A. The applicant's alleged ill-treatment by Ruza district police officers (Moscow region)

On 11 July 2005 the town prosecutor's office of Ruza, Moscow Region, opened a criminal case on account of a murder of a police officer from the Moscow region Ruza district police department (*ОВД Рузского района Московской области*). On the same day at 4.05 a.m. the applicant was apprehended as a suspect in the above crime and taken to a temporary detention facility IVS located on the premises of the Ruza district police department. According to the records of his apprehension, his wife was informed of his apprehension. During the apprehension and while in the IVS the applicant was beaten up by policemen who kicked, punched and hit the handcuffed applicant with a rubber truncheon, allegedly to extort from him a confession to the above crime.

The applicant's lawyer R. was denied access to the applicant. At 10.35 p.m. the lawyer informed the prosecutor's office of the Moscow Region by telegram about the applicant's ill-treatment and refusal to let him see the applicant. The Ruza town prosecutor Mr I. personally denied the lawyer access to the applicant. In another telegram sent on 12 July 2005 at 11.49 a.m. to the Moscow regional prosecutor's office the applicant's lawyer complained that prosecutor I. had denied him access to the applicant, repeated that the applicant was being maltreated and requested his medical examination. On the same day the applicant addressed the prosecutor of the Moscow Region with a complaint in which he stated that had put up no resistance to the police during his apprehension, and yet he had been beaten up.

On the same day, the applicant informed the Ruza Town Court, which was examining the investigating authority's request for the applicant's remand in custody, that he had been beaten up by the policemen and demonstrated the traces of the beatings. After the hearing the escorting guards took the applicant to the first floor of the courthouse and beat him up.

On 12 July 2005 the investigator in the criminal case ordered a forensic medical expert examination of the applicant to clarify certain circumstances of the criminal case against him.

On 13 July 2005 the applicant's lawyer was allowed to see the applicant. The lawyer filed a request with the prosecutor's office of Ruza for immediate transfer of the applicant to a remand centre in Mozhaysk, Moscow Region, on the ground that the applicant was ill-treated by the police at his current place of detention and that the implicated policemen could interfere with the investigation of the incident. He sent a similar complaint to the regional prosecutor's office on the following day.

On an unspecified date the applicant was transferred to the remand centre IZ-50/4 in Mozhaysk, Moscow Region.

On 14 July 2005 an expert examined the applicant in the presence of his counsel. The applicant stated that he had been beaten up by the police during the apprehension and at the remand centre, adding that he had not fallen down during the apprehension. He specified that at the remand centre he had received approximately twelve blows by the truncheon and several punches across his back and a leg. The expert recorded multiple bruises and abrasions on the back, shoulders, chest, stomach, legs and face of the applicant. He elaborated that the bruises on the chest and back could have been inflicted by an elongated object and confirmed that the injuries could have been received in the circumstances and at the time indicated by the applicant.

B. The Ruza town authorities' response to the applicant's complaint of police ill-treatment

On 21 July 2005 the prosecutor's office of Ruza refused to open a criminal case on account of the applicant's complaint. The decision contains an account of the events by the applicant who admitted that he had committed the murder, that he had been put and forcibly retained on the floor during the apprehension and that he had been beaten up as a reprisal for the policeman's murder. The officers who had taken part in the apprehension stated that they had put the applicant on the floor and, while placing handcuffs on him, had pressed their knees against his back to keep him still. The officers, who had been on duty when the applicant had been brought to the remand centre, denied any malpractice. The investigator considered the medical report of 14 July 2005 and did not rule out the possibility that some of the injuries could have been inflicted on the applicant as the result of resistance on his part during the apprehension. He also concluded that the actions of unidentified police officers who had beaten the applicant at the remand centre fell into the category of crimes that was subject to private prosecution.

Two policemen who had been on duty at the remand centre when the applicant had been beaten up were reprimanded for lack of diligence by the relevant decisions of 29 July and 22 August 2005.

The decision of 21 July 2005 was annulled by the town prosecutor and remitted for additional pre-investigation inquiry. A new decision taken on 23 August 2005 was identical to the previous one, except for the conclusion that the applicant had not proved that he had been beaten up at the remand centre. This decision was sent to the applicant's counsel on 30 June 2006. On 9 October 2006 the Ruza Town Court declared the decision of 23 August 2005 ill-founded and unlawful on the ground that, even if the case concerned private prosecution, it had been the prosecutor's duty to identify the culprits.

C. Criminal proceedings against the applicant

1. The trial

The applicant's criminal case arrived at the Moscow Regional Court on 27 January 2006 and was set down for trial by jury.

At the preliminary hearing of 9 February 2006 judge P. scheduled the hearing of the case. She also dismissed the counsel's request to strike out as obtained under duress the applicant's "explanations" made during the preliminary investigation on the ground that the "explanations" could not be regarded as criminal evidence.

On 28 February 2006 the jury panel was formed with the participation of judge R. who presided over the case henceforth. At one of the hearings on the merits of the case the court rejected the applicant's counsel's request to read out the medical report of 14 July 2005 on the ground that the contents of the report were not part of the factual circumstances which were to be determined by the jury.

At the hearing of 14 March 2006 the court rejected the counsel's objection to the reading out of the interrogation records of the applicant as a suspect. The objection was based on the allegation that the physical force applied to the applicant beforehand and participation of an *ex officio* lawyer, a former employee of the prosecutor's office who had not acted in the applicant's interests, made the records inadmissible evidence. In support of its decision the court referred, among others, to the refusal to open a criminal case on account of the alleged ill-treatment of 23 August 2005 which stood unchallenged at the time.

By verdict of the jury of the Moscow Regional Court of 11 April 2006 the applicant was found guilty of infliction of bodily harm, aggravated murder of a police officer, misappropriation and damage of property and other crimes. He was sentenced to eighteen years' imprisonment and ordered to pay civil damages to the victims.

On 13 July 2006 the Supreme Court of Russia upheld the judgment on appeal. As to the composition of the trial court, the appeal court found that selection of the jury had taken place in line with the normative provisions and that replacement of the judge had not been unlawful as long as it had taken place before examination of the evidence. As to inadmissibility of evidence allegedly obtained under duress or with participation of a bad-faith lawyer, the appeal court noted that the applicant had himself admitted that force had been used to restrain him during the apprehension and as a reprisal but not with a view to extracting confessions. The applicant also had not objected to the participation of the *ex officio* lawyer during the questioning. Addressing the complaints of various procedural irregularities concerning the jury's question paper, the judge's summing-up speech and her retreat into the retiring room with the question paper, and incompleteness of the trial records, the appeal court also did not find any breach of the relevant procedural rules.

2. Attempt to re-open the proceedings

On 12 October 2007, at the applicant's counsel's request the Ruza prosecutor's office re-opened the criminal case on account of newly

discovered circumstances, namely certain information in the murdered policeman's medical records. However, the proceedings were terminated on 25 October 2007, and by a final decision of 18 February 2008 the Supreme Court upheld that decision.

COMPLAINTS

The applicant complains under Article 3 of the Convention of ill-treatment by the police with a view to extracting confessions. He also complains under the same provision and under Article 13 of the lack of an effective investigation of his pertinent complaints.

He complains under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention that information about the candidate jurors was insufficient and that each candidate juror was not subject to separate discussion; that a preliminary hearing and the trial were held by different judges; that the court read out before the jury his statements given under duress after his arrest, having rejected his request to declare them inadmissible evidence, and refused to examine the medical report concerning his injuries received as a result of police ill-treatment; that the list of questions to the jury was not sufficiently clear; that the presiding judge failed to explain to the jurors in the summing-up speech the provisions of the criminal law regulating innocent infliction of harm; that the presiding judge retreated into the retiring room with the jury's verdict before its announcement and that the trial records did not mention this event.

Finally, the applicant complains of the lack of proper reasoning in the decision of the Ruza prosecutor's office to terminate the re-opened criminal proceedings against him and the Supreme Court's decision of 18 February 2008.

6. Application no. 32546/08 lodged on 24 April 2008 by Aleksandr Ivanovich MORGUNOV who was born in 1969 and lives in Orenburg. He is represented before the Court by Mr Ye.V. Bogryakov, a lawyer practising in the Orenburg region.

A. Alleged ill-treatment by officers from the Orenburg Regional Department for the Fight against Organised Crime

On 30 August 2006 the applicant was apprehended by officers of the Orenburg Regional Department for the Fight against Organised Crime (“UBOP”), on suspicion of robbery.

On 18 September 2006 at unspecified time he was transported from remand centre SIZO-56/1 to the Orenburg UBOP where five or six policemen beat him up to extract from him a confession of committing crimes. Afterwards they put a plastic bag over his head and took him to the basement of the building where the beatings continued.

The medical report of the same date drawn up by the medical staff of SIZO-56/1 recorded hematomas on the left frontal bone and the right shin, hyperaemia of the right side of the forehead, both buttocks and the right side of the lumbar area.

B. Orenburg authorities’ response to the applicant’s complaint of police ill-treatment

On 27 September 2006 the applicant requested the prosecutor’s office of the Promyshlenniy District of Orenburg to open criminal proceedings against the implicated policemen. On 6 October 2006 the prosecutor’s office dismissed his request for absence of a criminal event. This decision cites the findings of the medical report of 18 September 2006 and an account of the events given by one of the policemen. The latter stated that during the interview the applicant had leapt up from the chair and had hit his face on the corner of the chair; he had then thrown a fit, rolling on the floor and screaming. According to some information received by operative officers earlier, the applicant was inclined to escape and suicide. The policemen had allegedly drafted a report about the incident.

A forensic medical examination commissioned in the framework of the investigation into the applicant’s complaint confirmed that the injuries found on the applicant could have been inflicted in the circumstances indicated by the interviewed policeman.

After reversal of the above decision by the supervising prosecutor, on 27 October 2006 the district prosecutor’s office again refused to open criminal proceedings. In addition to the evidence cited in the above decision, the new decision also relied on the findings of the forensic expert examination.

The applicant’s lawyer challenged the decision of 27 October 2006 in court, pointing out, inter alia, that the investigator had failed to ask the expert whether the injuries could have been inflicted in the circumstances indicated by the applicant, to reconcile the applicant’s and the policemen’s statements, to obtain the reports drafted by the policemen after the alleged

incident and to establish why the implicated policemen had not attempted to prevent or put an end to the applicant's self-harm.

On 19 September 2007 the Promyshlenniy District Court of Orenburg rejected the complaint finding that the decision to refuse institution of criminal proceedings had been well-grounded. On 25 October 2007 that decision was upheld on appeal by the Orenburg Regional Court which stated, in particular, that the applicant's argument about the police officers' responsibility for their failure to put an end to the applicant's self-harm had no basis in domestic criminal law.

COMPLAINTS

The applicant complains under Article 3 of the Convention of ill-treatment in police custody. He also complains under Articles 3 and 13 of the Convention of the lack of an effective investigation into his relevant complaint.

QUESTIONS

1. Was the applicant subjected to torture, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment by the police officers (*application no. 14416/06*: and on the police officers' instructions by the convicted prisoners), in breach of Article 3 of the Convention?

In answering that question the Government are requested to address, *inter alia*, the following points concerning the circumstances surrounding the applicant's alleged ill-treatment:

(a) Once in the hands of the police:

(i) Was the applicant informed of his rights? If so, when, and what rights was he informed about?

(ii) Was he given the possibility of informing his family about his apprehension and, if so, when?

(iii) Was he given access to a lawyer and, if so, when? Was that a lawyer on duty invited by a police officer or an investigator, or a lawyer of the applicant's choice? If given initially a State-appointed lawyer, when did the applicant receive access to a lawyer of his choice?

(iv) Was he given access to a doctor and, if so, when? Was his medical examination, if any, conducted out of the hearing and out of sight of police officers?

(b) What activities, where, when and by whom were conducted with the applicant's participation during the period between the moment of his actual apprehension and until the moment when he was first brought before the judge who ordered his remand in custody (*application no. 40192/06*: who examined his administrative case)? The Government are required to provide a detailed hour-by-hour report on what happened during that period and to account for the time spent by the applicant in the hands of police.

Where was the applicant held during that period? What was his procedural status? What confessions and/or statements (*явка с повинной; показания*) did he give during that period? Was he given access to a lawyer before and during each such activity, and, if so, was that a lawyer on duty invited by a police officer or an investigator, or a lawyer of the applicant's choice?

The Government are required to provide relevant procedural and other documents in support of their answers, including where applicable the decision on bringing the criminal proceedings within the framework of which the applicant was apprehended; records of the applicant's apprehension as a suspect or an administrative offender; the investigator's request for remand in custody; records of investigative activities including interrogations as a suspect and accused, surrender with a confession of guilt (*явка с повинной*), if any; records of the applicant's entering and leaving the police station from the Register of persons brought to a police station

(Книга учета лиц, доставленных в дежурную часть органа внутренних дел), of his admission to detention facilities (ИВС и СИЗО, камеры для административно задержанных), any documents attesting to his state of health and injuries during the period concerned, etc.

Application no. 32546/08: Information requested under (b) above should relate to 18 September 2006, the date of the applicant's alleged ill-treatment; as regards information under (a) above, only information under (iv) is required in relation to that date.

2. All applications except for applications nos. 2674/07 and 32546/08: Was the applicant deprived of his liberty in breach of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention? In particular, did the deprivation of liberty during the period from the moment of his actual apprehension until the moment of his formal apprehension as a suspect (application no. 40192/06: from the moment of his actual apprehension until the court hearing in his administrative case) fall within one of the paragraphs of this provision? Was the applicant informed promptly of the reasons for his arrest and of any charge against him, as required by Article 5 § 2 of the Convention? What was the reason and ground for taking him to the police station? Did the authorities have a reasonable suspicion of the applicant having committed the offence (of which he was later convicted) before taking him to the police station?

3. All applications except for application no. 32546/08: Did the judge, who ordered that the applicant be remanded in custody (application no. 40192/06: the judge who examined the applicant's administrative case; application no. 14416/06: and extended his remand in custody during June-December 2004), react to the applicant's submissions about his ill-treatment and/or his visible injuries (please submit the court decisions and court hearing records)? What were the judge's powers in such a situation?

4. Having regard to the procedural protection from torture, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment (see paragraph 131 of *Labita v. Italy* [GC], no. 26772/95, ECHR 2000-IV), did the State conduct an investigation in compliance with Article 3 of the Convention (see, among many others, *Mikheyev v. Russia*, no. 77617/01, §§ 108-110 and 121, 26 January 2006)?

In particular:

(a) Was the investigating authority which examined the applicant's complaint of police ill-treatment impartial and independent from the investigating authority which conducted investigation in the criminal case (application no. 40192/06: administrative case) against the applicant?

(b) Were the police officers, which assisted the investigating authority and carried out operational activities in the course of the pre-investigation inquiry or investigation into the applicant's complaint, impartial and independent from the police officers who allegedly subjected the applicant to ill-treatment?

(c) Was the investigating authority which examined the applicant's complaint of police ill-treatment impartial and independent from the police officers who allegedly subjected the applicant to ill-treatment? Did those police officers' department conduct operative and other supporting activities in cases investigated by the investigating authority in question?

(d) All applications except for application no. 40192/06: Does the pre-investigation inquiry under Articles 144-145 of the Code of Criminal Procedure of the Russian Federation provide for procedural guarantees and investigative methods capable of establishing the facts of the case and leading to the identification and punishment of those responsible, where there is an arguable claim of ill-treatment under Article 3 of the Convention? Did the domestic authorities' refusal to bring criminal proceedings and, hence, to conduct a preliminary investigation according to Part VIII, Articles 150-226 of the Code of Criminal Procedure breach the State's obligation to conduct an investigation in compliance with Article 3?

The Government are invited to submit copies of the materials of the pre-investigation inquiries under Articles 144-145 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and, where applicable, the investigation after opening criminal proceedings including the investigating authorities' decisions on the applicant's complaints of police ill-treatment, as well as courts' decisions on the applicant's complaints against the investigating authority's decisions, medical certificates and medical experts' reports concerning the applicant's injuries and other relevant documents.

5. Applications nos. 14416/06, 49869/06, 44822/06 and 2674/07: Did the applicant have a fair hearing in the determination of the criminal charges against him, in accordance with Article 6 § 1 of the Convention, in view of the applicant's conviction being based on the evidence which was allegedly obtained as a result of the police ill-treatment? Did the applicant request at the trial that such evidence should be declared inadmissible evidence? If so, what was the ground for such request and how was it decided by the domestic courts (please submit the relevant decisions, extracts of the court records and/or any other relevant documents)?

Other information to be requested:

Application no. 14416/06:

1. What disability did the applicant have at the moment of his arrest? Did the police officers seize the applicant's disability certificate during the search at his home (please submit the search records)? Were the police officers who allegedly tortured the applicant aware of his disability?

2. By whom of the police officers, for what purposes, when and for how long was the applicant taken from SIZO-1 on the days of his alleged ill-treatment in June 2004 (please submit extracts from the SIZO register concerning the applicant's transportation, records of investigative activities, etc.)?

3. By whom of the police officers, for what purposes, when and for how long was the applicant visited in the correctional colony in July-December 2004?

4. Did the applicant seek medical assistance during his detention at the correctional colony? If he was seen by any medical staff, on what date(s) did it happen and what was the result of the applicant's examination? Was the applicant prescribed any treatment and did he follow it?

Document to be requested: the Nizhniy Novgorod Regional Court's ruling mentioned on page 16 of the RF Supreme Court's appeal decision in the applicant's case.

Application no. 40192/06:

Were other persons detained in the cell together with the applicant? If so, were they questioned in relation to the applicant's complaint of police ill-treatment? Was he provided with any medical aid before the court hearing? When was he examined by the ambulance doctor?

Specific documents to be requested: the decision of the Pallasovskiyy investigation department of the Volgograd Regional Investigation Committee of 30 April 2012 to terminate the criminal proceedings; forensic medical examination report no. 2786 of 23 October 2002 and forensic situational examination report of 13 February 2003; the court's judgment and court records of the hearing in the administrative case against the applicant; documents concerning the applicant's examination by the ambulance doctor and at the hospital.

Application no. 44822/06:

Specific documents to be requested: the decisions to open and to terminate the criminal proceedings against police officer K., who took the applicant to his grandparents on 2 February 2005, and other documents concerning that investigation; the video records of the crime reconstruction with Mr S.A. Zhuchkov's participation on 1 February 2005 which form part of the materials of the criminal case and the video records of the crime reconstruction which were shown on the local TV channel.

Application no. 32546/08:

Specific documents to be requested: the report on the incident involving the applicant allegedly prepared by the policemen on 18 September 2006; the medical report of 18 September 2006; the applicant's forensic medical examination report; the decision to annul the refusal to open criminal proceedings of 6 October 2006; records of the applicant's transportation from SIZO-56/1 to and from the Orenburg UBOP on 18 September 2006 including information about the time and the police officers involved; and records of investigative activities on 18 September 2006.

APPENDIX

No.	Application no.	Lodged on	Applicant name date of birth	Represented by
1.	14416/06	17/02/2006	Sergey Vladimirovich IVANOV 20/01/1966	D.V. Mosenkov
2.	40192/06	12/09/2006	Mikhail Fedorovich NIKOLAYEV 30/03/1960	
3.	49869/06	28/09/2006	Dmitriy Viktorovich GOLUBYATNIKOV 21/02/1979	O.A. Golubyatnikova
4.	44822/06	28/09/2006	Sergey Anatolyevich ZHUCHKOV 29/11/1978	L.V. Kolesnikova
5.	2674/07	18/12/2006	Sergey Yevgenyevich RYABOV 30/01/1980	M.T. Rachkovskiy, CENTRE OF ASSISTANCE TO INTERNATIONAL PROTECTION
6.	32546/08	24/04/2008	Aleksandr Ivanovich MORGUNOV 1969	Ye.V. Bogryakov, lawyer