



COUNCIL OF EUROPE CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Committee of Ministers
Comité des Ministres

Ministers' Deputies

Information documents

CM/Inf/DH(2006)32 29 June¹

Violations of the ECHR in the Chechen Republic: Russia's compliance with the European Court's judgments

Memorandum prepared by the Secretariat to assist the Committee of Ministers' supervision of the execution of the judgments in three cases against the Russian Federation
(Article 46 of the ECHR)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The present Memorandum has been prepared upon the Deputies' request to provide assistance in their examination of the action plan presented at the 960th meeting (March 2006) by the Russian authorities.

It is recalled at the outset that it has been generally acknowledged that these cases would appear to require important individual and general measures.

The Memorandum considers that individual measures so far adopted are positive in view of the procedural steps taken within the re-opened criminal investigations into the abuses impugned by the Court and invites the authorities to keep the Committee informed about further progress.

As regards the general measures taken or envisaged, the examination follows the general pattern for this type of cases. The question of general measures is thus examined from basically three perspectives and the Memorandum points out under each item outstanding questions and certain directions for further action with a view to ensuring the full implementation of the Court's judgments. The preliminary assessments so far could be summarised as follows:

- 1. Improving the legal and regulatory framework governing the activities of security forces: as information has been recently received and a number of clarifications have been requested, it has not yet been possible to make any detailed assessment of this issue.*
- 2. Awareness raising and training of members of the security forces: measures taken so far are welcomed, and certain directions for the development of these activities are proposed.*
- 3. Improvement of domestic remedies in case of abuses: the infrastructures lacking at the time of events are now in place; the information on the efficiency of criminal investigations does not yet permit any detailed conclusions; the existence of a draft law on compensation for the ineffectiveness of investigations is noted with interest but further measures to ensure the redress required by the Convention are expected.*

Proposals for the publication of this memorandum are being examined.

¹ This document has been classified restricted at the date of issue. It was declassified at the 976th (DH) meeting of the Ministers' Deputies (17-18 October 2006).

INTRODUCTION

Since October 2005 the Committee of Ministers has been supervising the execution of three judgments² of the European Court of Human Rights ("the Court") finding violations of the European Convention on Human Rights ("the ECHR") during military operations in Chechnya in 1999 and 2000. The violations may be summarized as follows:

- the killing without justification of the relatives of the applicants by military servicemen during a military operation in Grozny (violation of Article 2);
- the failure to prepare and execute military operations with the requisite care for the lives of the applicants' relatives who were killed during air strikes conducted by the Russian air forces in the countryside not far from the Chechen-Ingush administrative border (violations of Article 2 in two other cases);
- failure to carry out an effective criminal investigation into the circumstances surrounding the deaths of the applicants' relatives, as well as into the circumstances of the abovementioned military operations (procedural violations of Article 2 and violations of Article 13 in all the cases);
- failure to conduct a thorough and effective investigation into allegations of torture (violations of Article 3);
- the lack of any effective remedy as a result of the abovementioned absence of effective criminal investigation (violations of Article 13);
- unjustified destruction of one applicant's property as a result the abovementioned air strike by the military forces (violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1).

Following the Ministers Deputies' decision of 28-29 March 2006 (see Appendix II), the present Memorandum presents the measures reported by the Russian authorities in the action plan presented in response to the Court's judgments, the comments submitted by the applicants' lawyers and the Secretariat's preliminary assessment, including proposed avenues for further action to fully comply with the judgments.

I. INDIVIDUAL MEASURES

Issues raised in the Committee of Ministers

1. In accordance with the Committee of Ministers' well-established practice, the respondent State has a continuing obligation to conduct effective investigations inasmuch as procedural violations of Articles 2 or 3 have been found (see notably Interim Resolution ResDH(2005)20 in *McKerr and others v. the United Kingdom*). During the first examination of the present cases at the 940th meeting (11-12 October 2005), the Russian authorities were accordingly invited to provide information on the measures envisaged or being taken to remedy the shortcomings identified by the European Court's judgments in the investigations.
2. Applicants' submissions: Pursuant to former Rule 6 of the Committee's Rules for the application of Article 46§2³, the applicants provided the Secretariat, through their representatives, with detailed submissions regarding a number of individual measures to be adopted by the authorities, in particular, effective investigations into the events at the origin of the violations and the reopening of domestic criminal proceedings to ensure the prosecution of those responsible. The applicants' submissions were transmitted to the Russian authorities on 07/10/2005.

² The judgments delivered on 24 February 2005, become final on 06 July 2005 and examined for the first time at the 940th meeting of the Ministers' Deputies.

³ Replaced by Rule 9§1 of new Rules for the application of Article 46§2 adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 10 May 2006.

A. Information submitted by the authorities

(i) *Isayeva, Yusupova and Bazaeva and Issayeva* judgments

3. On 14 November 2005, pursuant Articles 214 and 413 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and considering Article 46 of the Convention, together with the Committee's Recommendation R(2000)2 of 19 January 2000 on the re-examination or re-opening of certain cases at domestic level, the Chief Military Prosecutor's office ordered the Military Prosecutor of the Unified Army Group to conduct new investigations under his close supervision.
4. On 12 January 2006, the time-limit for the investigations in the *Isayeva, Yusupova and Bazaeva* case was extended up to 29 months and up to 18 months in the *Issayeva* case, i.e. until 14 March 2006.
5. The Government further informed that a number of procedural steps had been taken by the Military Prosecutor, notably with a view to check the proportionality of the lethal force used during the military operation near the villages of Shaami-Yurt and Katyr-Yurt and to determine whether measures had been taken to ensure the safety of civilians. The following procedural actions are being carried out in the presence of the military officials who were planning and being in charge of operations in 1999-2000:
 - gathering of additional information from the territorial law-enforcement agencies in Chechnya and other regions of Russia and agencies of military command and bodies of local self-government;
 - conducting of operational tactical expert examinations on the basis of information received.

(ii) *Khashiev and Akayeva v. Russia* judgment

6. On 25 January 2006, the investigations on the *Khashiev and Akayeva v. Russia* case have also been reopened and assigned to the Prosecutor's office of the Starypromylovsky District of the City of Grozny (Chechen Republic), under the supervision of General Prosecutor's office.
7. According to the latest information received, 84 other persons affected by the events at issue were granted victim status in the present investigation.

B. Assessment of the measures taken and further information expected

8. In February 2006, the Committee welcomed the orders for new investigations to be conducted under supervision of the Chief Military Prosecutor or Prosecutor General. The competent authorities were encouraged to make rapid and visible progress in the conduct of the new investigations, thus remedying, to the extent possible, the shortcomings in the earlier investigations impugned by the judgments of the European Court (see decision adopted on 22 February 2006 in Appendix I).
9. Subsequently, the Deputies took note with interest of the information provided on the new ongoing investigations in these cases, in particular of the further procedural steps reported in the cases of *Isayeva, Yusupova and Bazaeva* and *Issayeva*. The Russian authorities have been encouraged to continue their efforts (See decision adopted on 12 April 2006, Appendix II).
10. **Information is therefore expected** on further progress achieved in the investigation of the circumstances and responsibilities in all three cases. More details would be helpful with regard to the procedural steps referred to in §5 above (e.g. operational tactical expert examinations). Clarifications would also be necessary as to whether the applicants have been granted 'victim status' in the newly opened investigations or otherwise kept informed of the progress made.
11. On a more general level, the progress and the results of these investigations may provide useful indications for the assessment of the effectiveness of the domestic investigative procedures set up by the new Code of Criminal Procedure in force since July 2002 and other subsequent rules (as opposed to the rules in force at the time of the events impugned by the Court) and could thus also be of assistance in the evaluation of general measures.

II. GENERAL MEASURES

Key areas of concern

12. It was stressed at the outset that these judgments of the Court would appear to require important general measures to prevent new, similar violations. In this respect, a reference was notably made to the extensive experience of other member states and of the Committee of Ministers in cases concerning violations of the Convention by members of security forces (see, in particular, Interim Resolutions DH(99)434, DH(2002)98 and ResDH(2005)43 concerning the action of the security forces in Turkey and Interim Resolution ResDH(2005)20 concerning the action of the security forces in Northern Ireland).
13. On the basis of the aforementioned experience, the following three key avenues for the adoption of general measures have been identified:
4. Improving the legal and regulatory framework governing the activities of security forces;
 5. Awareness raising and training of members of the security forces;
 6. Improvement of domestic remedies in case of abuses.
14. An action plan was thus requested from the authorities for the implementation of the present judgments (Secretariat's letter of 06/10/2000). The information provided so far by the Russian authorities, the Secretariat's assessment and the outstanding issues appear below.

A. Legal and regulatory framework governing the activities of security forces

15. The importance of ensuring that the action of security forces be surrounded by an appropriate legal and regulatory framework has systematically been emphasized by the Committee of Ministers in similar cases and the measures taken by the respondent states in this area carefully considered (see in addition to the above-mentioned cases, *Makaratzis v. Greece*, judgment of 20 December 2004, Annotated Agenda of 966th meeting (6-7 June 2006), CM/Del/OJ/DH(2006)966 Volume I).
16. The judgments here at issue pointed out "the Government's failure to invoke the provisions of any domestic legislation governing the use of force by the army or security forces in situations such as the present one" (*Isaeyva*, § 199 of the judgment; *Issaeyva, Yusupova and Bazaeyeva*, § 198 of the judgment). In the Court's proceedings the Government only referred to an expert report of the Combined Armed Services Military Academy, which relied on six legal acts, without providing the Court with their titles (*Isaeyva*, § 96 of the judgment).

1. Information submitted by the authorities

17. According to the information provided, the actions of the security forces are governed by the following laws:
- New Law "On Counterterrorism" of 6 March 2006 (replacing the old law on Suppression of Terrorism of 25 July 1998 in force at the time of the vents);
 - Law on the Interior Forces of the Ministry of the Interior of 6 February 1997 as recently amended;
 - Law on the Federal Security Service of 3 April 1995;
 - Law on the Status of Military Servicemen of 27 May 1998.

2. Assessment of the Secretariat and further information expected

18. This information clarifies the questions which remained outstanding in the Court's judgments concerning legal framework for the action of the security forces. However, the content of these provisions including the recent changes introduced therein and their capacity to prevent new similar violations of the Convention by the security forces remain to be assessed. It is thus proposed to revert to these complex issues subsequently, after their detailed examination.

19. It is also noted that the expert's report provided by the Government to the Court relied on six legal acts (see §°16 above), whereas only 4 have been received. A clarification in this respect would thus be useful.
20. In the meantime, information would be appreciated about the present regulatory (by-law) framework of the army in the context of similar security operations, including instructions governing the use of lethal force in conflict areas, and on any further measures taken or planned with a view to ensuring full respect for the Convention requirements in the course of the security operations.
21. In this context, more details would be useful about the planned revision of the manual on international humanitarian law for the armed forces (see §°28 below).

B. Awareness raising and training

1. Information submitted by the authorities

a) Publication and dissemination

22. The three judgments (in Russian translation) have been transmitted to the General Prosecutor's Office, Supreme Court, Ministry of Defense, Ministry of the Interior, Federal Security Service, Ministry of Justice.
23. The Ministry of Defense posted the judgments on its official website to make them available to the staff of the Armed Forces.
24. The judgments have also been disseminated to all other Prosecutor's offices and Military Prosecutors, including the Prosecutor of the Chechen Republic and the Military Prosecutor of the Joint Group of forces in the North Caucasian region together with a letter encouraging them to use these judgments in their oversight activities and legal training. These authorities have also been encouraged to subscribe to "The Bulletin of the European Court of Human Rights" and to the "Russia's Justice" in order to remain informed of the European Court's case-law.
25. The judgments will also be published in "The Bulletin of the European Court of Human Rights," a journal regularly disseminated to Russian courts.

b) Training in the Army

26. Issues related to the activities of the European Court of Human Rights, to the laws of the Russian Federation and to international humanitarian law have been introduced as a part of the servicemen's law-related education.
27. Directive N°D-6 of 1999 of the Minister of Defense had already established mandatory legal minimums for all categories of servicemen and civilian staff, including *inter alia* study of issues related to observance of human rights and freedoms. Systematic briefings, seminars, lectures or round-tables are organized on a weekly or quarterly, mandatory or optional, basis with a view to provide all categories of servicemen and civilian staff of the Armed Forces with a legal knowledge to be applied to their day-to-day activities.
28. Video films on law, including those on compliance with the norms of international humanitarian law, textbooks, guidance for servicemen and other materials have been published as methodological support for the aforementioned courses. A revised Manual on international humanitarian law for the Armed Forces is under way.
29. Finally, a partnership program between the Ministry of Defense and the delegation of the International Committee of the Red Cross concerning the awareness of the rules of international humanitarian law is approved annually.

c) Training of judges and prosecutors

30. A specific item dedicated to the activities of the European Court of Human Rights has been introduced in the degree course within the Russian Academy of Justice and the Institute of Continuing Legal Education for senior officials of the General Prosecutor's office.

2. Assessment of the measures taken and further information expected

31. ***The publication of the judgments and their wide dissemination*** is a welcome development. According to the established practice, the authorities are invited to provide the Secretariat with copies and/or references of the abovementioned publications, notably with the new draft of the revised Manuel on international humanitarian law, and with the circulars letters by which the judgments were disseminated to various authorities.
32. The practice of circular letters is very important and the dissemination of judgments should systematically be accompanied by detailed comments/instructions issued by higher hierarchical authorities (e.g. Chief Military Command, Supreme Court, General Prosecutor's Office, etc.) to explain to all subordinates the obligations flowing from the judgments and their effects on the day-to-day practice. Such measures will also contribute to create a better regulatory framework (see §§°15-21).
33. The dissemination of the judgments to courts with an explanatory note from the Supreme Court, remains to be confirmed.
34. ***As regards professional training***, the Committee of Ministers has welcomed the measures taken by the Russian authorities and encouraged them to continue their efforts to mainstream the human rights and international humanitarian law issues into the initial and in-service training of members of security forces, judges and prosecutors. Additional details would be helpful as regards the scope and nature of the courses delivered, the time allocated to them and evaluation of their practical effectiveness.
35. Information on specific measures taken within the Air Force would be of particular importance, given the latter involvement in the incidents impugned by the Court's judgments.
36. The mainstreaming of the Convention into professional training of the army, judges and prosecutors is a continuous process and the authorities are invited to keep the Committee informed of further steps taken in this respect. In the process of adopting additional measures, they are invited to follow the **Committee's Recommendation Rec(2004)4 of 12 May 2004 on the ECHR and professional training**.
37. ***As regards additional (ad hoc) awareness raising activities organised in the wake of the Court's judgments***, the authorities are invited to provide the list of various activities (seminars, conferences, etc) where the issues raised by the judgments have been or will be addressed. It will be in particular important to receive confirmation that various authorities concerned, such as the Ministry of Defense, the Ministry of Justice, the General Prosecutor's Office and the Federal Courts' service, have included the relevant topic in their awareness-raising activities. Information on any general programs in this respect would be appreciated.

C. Effective remedies in case of abuses

1. Information submitted by the authorities

a) Effectiveness of criminal investigation

38. Since the facts of the present cases a number of changes have taken place which will contribute to the prevention of new similar violations:
- the General Prosecutor created on 08/02/2000 the Prosecutor's Office of the Chechen Republic and on 09/09/2002 the Military Prosecutor's Office of the Joint Group of forces in the North Caucasian region. The local department of the Ministry of the Interior created in December 1999 was transformed in 2002 into the Ministry of the Interior of the Chechen Republic;

- according to the Ruling n°15 of the Prosecutor of the Chechen Republic of 30/11/2002, interagency investigative groups were created with a view to investigate grave crimes;
- an interagency working group has been created in June 2005, headed by the Deputy Prosecutor of the Chechen Republic and including the heads of law enforcement bodies and of the security forces, to coordinate their action in those cases;
- the United Register of kidnapped or disappeared persons has been also created and is regularly compared with the lists of detained or convicted persons;
- a program providing for a set of measures in order to prevent kidnappings and to ensure the effective investigation into the disappearances adopted in 2004 was corrected in January 2005 by the prosecutor's office of the Republic in cooperation with the Ministry of Interior of the Republic, the local FSB department and the Prosecutor's Office;
- the new Code of Criminal Procedure entered into force on 01/07/2002, with new rules of investigation.

b) Sanctions against officials responsible for abuses

39. According to the statistics provided by the General Prosecutor's Office, since 1999, first counter terrorist's operations in the North Caucasian Region, the Military Prosecutor's Office had opened 245 criminal cases in relation to crimes allegedly committed by servicemen, out of which
- 98 cases concerning 127 servicemen have been transferred to military courts for trial;
 - 62 cases have been discontinued for different reasons, notably an amnesty act, for want of *corpus delicti* or following the death of the accused);
 - 85 cases are still under investigation.

So far no statistics regarding possible convictions has been provided.

40. Military courts have tried criminal cases against 117 servicemen, including 28 officers.

d) Compensation of victims

41. The Russian authorities are considering the setting up of a specific procedure to allow victims to get compensation for ineffective investigation.

2. Assessment of the measures taken and further information expected

42. According to the Court's well established case-law in cases of this kind, the notion of effective remedy entails, in addition to the payment of compensation where appropriate, a thorough and effective investigation capable of leading to the identification and punishment of those responsible for the deprivation of life and infliction of treatment contrary of Article 3, including effective access for the complainant to the investigative procedure (see § 237 in *Isayeva, Yusupova and Bazaeva*, § 183 in *Khashiyev and Akayeva* and § 227 in *Isayeva* judgments).
43. ***The measures reported by the authorities*** (see § 38 above) may no doubt contribute to the establishment of effective remedies in the Chechen Republic, inasmuch as they provide the necessary infrastructure which was deficient at the time of events impugned by the Court.
44. ***The existence of procedures allowing a thorough and effective investigation*** into alleged abuses is one of the core requirements highlighted by the present judgments. It remains to be assessed to what extent the current procedures as amended by the new Code of Criminal Procedure and their implementation conform to the detailed requirements of the Convention, which were violated in the present cases. These requirements notably relate to:
- the nature and scope of investigation required,
 - the necessary investigative steps to be taken,
 - speediness and transparency of investigation,
 - access of victims to the investigative procedure, etc.

45. The following questions arise at the outset with regard to the existing procedures, as amended by the new Code of Criminal Procedure and subsequent by-laws:
- What bodies are responsible for the investigations of abuses committed by members of security forces and what are the guarantees of the investigative authorities' independence and impartiality from the hierarchical, institutional and practical point of view?
 - What are the investigation powers and means of the General Prosecutors and of the Military Prosecutors vis-à-vis the police, the Armed Forces and the other enforcement bodies involved?
 - What legal remedies/sanctions (e.g. civil, administrative or criminal) are currently available in Russian law against state's officials, in particular police, investigative bodies or prosecution, who omit to give a prompt and adequate response to allegations of serious crime?
 - What are the victims' rights throughout the investigation; in particular do they have whole or partial access to the investigation file and at what stage of the investigation? What means and remedies are available to the victims under domestic law to challenge before courts prosecutors' refusals to prosecute?
 - How do the new Code of Criminal Procedure and other rules in force ensure promptness of criminal investigation?
 - What statutory limitation apply in cases of different abuses (including homicide, kidnapping, destruction of property, etc)?
46. Clarifications on the above points would be helpful for initial assessment of the adequacy of the existing procedures. In the second time, the authorities may wish to demonstrate, possibly through recent specific examples (as also indicated in §°10), that the investigations brought against members of the security forces effectively now meet all aforementioned Convention's requirements.
47. **The statistics of criminal cases brought against officials** before courts constitute a useful indicator of the effectiveness of criminal sanctions against abuses. Up-dates and details in this respect would be appreciated, especially as regards the results of the criminal trials referred to in §§°39-40 above (e.g. number of convictions for abuses per year, facts and legal grounds at their basis, indication of whether the sentence imposed has been or is being effectively served, etc). Specific examples of relevant court decisions would be helpful. Information regarding the applicability of the principle of command responsibility would be useful (i.e. on the scope of responsibility of those simply obeying orders and the scope of responsibility of those giving orders leading to serious human rights' abuses).
48. **As regards the issue of compensation** for ineffective investigation, more information on the draft law mentioned in §°41 above, its scope and the time-frame for its adoption are awaited. This planned law may be a welcome first step towards an effective domestic mechanism for compensation of victims.
49. As a following step, the authorities are invited to consider setting up a special procedure allowing direct compensation by the State for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damages resulting from anti-terrorist activities in the Chechen Republic. In this respect, the authorities may wish to consider the experience of Turkey, which was confronted to similar problems in the context of anti-terrorist fight in the south-east of the country (development of the administrative court's case-law on the state strict liability for damages caused in the context of the fight against terrorism and in addition the Law on Compensation of the Losses Resulting from Terrorism and from the Measures Taken against Terrorism allowing an extra-judicial additional compensation, see for details Interim Resolution ResDH(2005)43).
50. While encouraging the authorities rapidly to engage in or to complete the aforementioned reforms, they are invited to consider possible interim measures. In particular, the development of domestic court practice could be encouraged. Indeed, some domestic decisions delivered by courts in recent years in the regions concerned suggest that compensation of victims is possible under current provisions both for ineffective investigation and for substantial damage resulting from homicides caused by the security forces.

The two examples below are highly illustrative in this respect:

- First instance court decision of 8 September 2004, upheld by the Karachaevo-Cherkessya Supreme Court on 19 October 2004: the applicant was awarded **compensation for non-pecuniary damage (10 000 RUR) caused by unlawful failings of the investigation conducted by the Prosecutor's office** into the circumstances of the abduction of the applicant's minor son; The first instance court's decision explicitly refers to Russian authorities' failure to meet their obligations under the ECHR, as set out in *Aksoy and Aydin v. Turkey* judgments of the Court;
- The Nazran Town Court's decision of 26 February 2003, upheld by the Ingushetia Supreme Court on 4 April 2003: the applicant was **granted compensation for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damages (675,000 RUR) caused by the killing of the applicant's relatives in the area under control by the Federal forces**, although the responsible units were not identified in the criminal proceedings.

51. It is particularly encouraging that the first of the aforementioned judgments directly and explicitly implement the Convention requirements and the European Court's case-law, as prescribed by the Plenum of Supreme Court in its Ruling of 10 October 2003. While these court decisions may appear for the time being isolated instances, the development of court practice in this direction should be encouraged and the Supreme Court may wish to consider taking appropriate measures to that effect. Further similar examples from domestic court practice would be appreciated.
52. On a general level, it is recalled that the Committee of Ministers' Recommendation Rec(2004)6 contains a number of elements relevant to the progress of domestic remedies which may provide guidance as to the reform which is carried out.

Appendix I***Ministers' Deputies***
Decisions**CM/Del/Dec(2006)955 FINAL** 22 February 2006

955th (DH) meeting, 7-8 February 2006

Decisions adopted (EXTRACT)

(Formal date of adoption: 22 February 2006)

The Deputies,

1. welcomed the decision taken by the Chief military prosecutor's office, pursuant Article 46 of the Convention, ordering the military prosecutor of the Unified Army Group to conduct new investigations on the cases of Isayeva, Yusupova and Bazaeva against the Russian Federation and Issayeva against the Russian Federation and the fact that the investigations on the Khashiev and Akayeva v. Russia case have also been reopened;
2. noted that the aforementioned investigations have been put under the supervision of the Chief Military Prosecutor's Office and General Prosecutor's office, respectively;
3. encouraged the competent authorities to make rapid and visible progress in their conduct of the new investigations, thus remedying, to the extent possible, the shortcomings in the earlier ones impugned by the judgments of the European Court;
4. decided to resume consideration of these cases at their 960th meeting (28-29 March 2006) (DH), to assess progress in implementation of both individual and general measures required by the judgments of the European Court:

- 3 cases against the Russian Federation

H46-807	57950/00	Isayeva, judgment of 24/02/2005, final on 06/07/2005
H46-808	57947/00+	Isayeva, Yusupova and Bazayeva, judgment of 24/02/2005, final on 06/07/2005
H46-809	57942/00+	Khashiyev and Akayeva, judgment of 24/02/2005, final on 06/07/2005, rectified on 01/09/2005

Appendix II

Ministers' Deputies Decisions

CM/Del/Dec(2006)960 FINAL 12 April 2006

960th (DH) meeting, 28-29 March 2006

Decisions adopted (EXTRACT)

(Formal date of adoption: 12 April 2006)

The Deputies,

1. took note with interest of the information provided on the new ongoing investigations in these cases, in particular of the further procedural steps reported in the cases of Isayeva, Yusupova and Bazaeva against the Russian Federation and Issayeva against the Russian Federation;
2. noted with satisfaction the information that the Russian authorities have begun to implement general measures to prevent new similar violations, in particular by:
 - widely disseminating the judgments of the European Court to all competent authorities concerned and taking comprehensive educational measures at all levels including within the Army,
 - taking stock of the efficiency of criminal prosecution of abuses by military personnel in the Chechen Republic,
 - starting legislative procedures to ensure compensation for ineffective investigations into the facts of violations of human rights committed in the course of counter-terrorist operations;
3. encouraged the Russian authorities to continue their efforts with regard to both the individual and the general measures required by the judgments;
4. decided to resume consideration of these cases at their 966th meeting (6-7 June 2006), to assess progress in implementation of both individual and general measures required by the judgments of the European Court on the basis of a memorandum to be prepared by the Secretariat.

- 3 cases against the Russian Federation

H46-749	57942/00+	Khashiyev and Akayeva, judgment of 24/02/2005, final on 06/07/2005, rectified on 01/09/2005
H46-747	57950/00	Isayeva, judgment of 24/02/2005, final on 06/07/2005
H46-748	57947/00+	Isayeva, Yusupova and Bazayeva, judgment of 24/02/2005, final on 06/07/2005