

BULGARIA

Follow-up - Jurisprudence Action by Treaty Bodies

CAT, A/64/44 (2009)

VI. CONSIDERATION OF COMPLAINTS UNDER ARTICLE 22 OF THE CONVENTION

...

D. Follow-up activities

89. At its twenty-eighth session, in May 2002, the Committee against Torture revised its rules of procedure and established the function of a Rapporteur for follow-up of decisions on complaints submitted under article 22. At its 527th meeting, on 16 May 2002, the Committee decided that the Rapporteur shall engage, inter alia, in the following activities: monitoring compliance with the Committee's decisions by sending notes verbales to States parties enquiring about measures adopted pursuant to the Committee's decisions; recommending to the Committee appropriate action upon the receipt of responses from States parties, in situations of non response, and upon the receipt henceforth of all letters from complainants concerning non implementation of the Committee's decisions; meeting with representatives of the permanent missions of States parties to encourage compliance and to determine whether advisory services or technical assistance by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights would be appropriate or desirable; conducting with the approval of the Committee follow up visits to States parties; preparing periodic reports for the Committee on his/her activities.

90. During its thirty fourth session, the Committee, through its Special Rapporteur on follow up to decisions, decided that in cases in which it had found violations of the Convention, including decisions made by the Committee prior to the establishment of the follow up procedure, the States parties should be requested to provide information on all measures taken by them to implement the Committee's recommendations made in the decisions. ...

...

95. Represented below is a comprehensive report of replies received with regard to all 48 cases in which the Committee has found violations of the Convention to date and in 1 case in which although the Committee did not find a violation of the Convention it did make a recommendation.

Complaints in which the Committee has found violations of the Convention up to the forty-second session

...

State party

BULGARIA

Case

Keremedchiev, 257/2004

Nationality and country of removal if applicable	N/A
Views adopted on	11 November 2008
Issues and violations found	Cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, prompt and impartial investigation - articles 12 and 16, paragraph 1
Interim measures granted and State party response	N/A
Remedy recommended	An effective remedy to the complainant, including fair and adequate compensation for the suffering inflicted, in line with the Committee's general comment No. 2 (2007), as well as medical rehabilitation.
Due date for State party response	17 February 2009
Date of reply	None
State party response	None
Complainant's response	N/A
Committee's decision	Follow-up dialogue ongoing
...	

CAT, A/65/44 (2010)

...

CHAPTER VI. CONSIDERATION OF COMPLAINTS UNDER ARTICLE 22 OF THE CONVENTION

...

D. Follow-up activities

108. At its twenty-eighth session, in May 2002, the Committee against Torture revised its rules of procedure and established the function of a Rapporteur for follow-up of decisions on complaints submitted under article 22. At its 527th meeting, on 16 May 2002, the Committee decided that the Rapporteur shall engage, inter alia, in the following activities: monitoring compliance with the Committee's decisions by sending notes verbales to States parties enquiring about measures adopted pursuant to the Committee's decisions; recommending to the Committee appropriate action upon the receipt of responses from States parties, in situations of non-response, and upon the receipt henceforth of all letters from complainants concerning non-implementation of the Committee's decisions; meeting with representatives of the permanent missions of States parties to encourage compliance and to determine whether advisory services or technical assistance by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights would be appropriate or desirable; conducting with the approval of the Committee follow-up visits to States parties; preparing periodic reports for the Committee on his/her activities.

109. During its thirty-fourth session, the Committee, through its Rapporteur for follow-up of decisions on complaints, decided that in cases in which it had found violations of the Convention, including decisions made by the Committee prior to the establishment of the follow-up procedure, the States parties should be requested to provide information on all measures taken by them to implement the Committee's recommendations made in the decisions. To date, the following countries have not yet responded to these requests: Canada (with respect to *Tahir Hussain Khan*, No. 15/1994); Serbia¹ and Montenegro (with respect to *Dimitrov*, No. 171/2000,² *Danil Dimitrijevic*, No. 172/2000, *Nikolić, Slobodan and Ljiljana*, No. 174/2000, *Dragan Dimitrijevic*, No. 207/2002 and *Besim Osmani v. Republic of Serbia*, No. 261/2005); and Tunisia (with respect to *Ali Ben Salem*, No. 269/2005).

110. Action taken by the States parties in the following cases complied fully with the Committee's decisions and no further action will be taken under the follow-up procedure: *Halimi-Nedibi Quani v. Austria* (No. 8/1991); *M.A.K. v. Germany* (No. 214/2002);³ *Hajrizi Dzemajl et al. v. Serbia and Montenegro* (No. 161/2000), *the Netherlands* (with respect to *A.J.*, No. 91/1997); *Mutombo v. Switzerland* (No. 13/1993); *Alan v. Switzerland* (No. 21/1995); *Aemei v. Switzerland* (No. 34/1995); *V.L. v. Switzerland* (No. 262/2005); *El Rgeig v. Switzerland* (No. 280/2005); *Tapia Paez v. Sweden* (No. 39/1996); *Kisoki v. Sweden* (No. 41/1996); *Tala v. Sweden* (No. 43/1996); *Avedes Hamayak Korban v. Sweden* (No. 88/1997); *Ali Falakflaki v.*

Sweden (No. 89/1997); *Orhan Ayas v. Sweden* (No. 97/1997); *Halil Haydin v. Sweden* (No. 101/1997); *A.S. v. Sweden* (No. 149/1999); *Chedli Ben Ahmed Karoui v. Sweden* (No. 185/2001); *Dar v. Norway*⁴ (No. 249/2004); *Tharina v. Sweden* (No. 266/2003); *C.T. and K.M. v. Sweden* (No. 279/2005); and *Jean-Patrick Iya v. Switzerland* (No. 299/2006).

111. In the following cases, the Committee considered that for various reasons no further action should be taken under the follow-up procedure: *Elmi v. Australia* (No. 120/1998); *Arana v. France* (No. 63/1997); and *Ltaief v. Tunisia* (No. 189/2001). In one case, the Committee deplored the State party's failure to abide by its obligations under article 3 having deported the complainant, despite the Committee's finding that there were substantial grounds for believing that he would be in danger of being tortured: *Dadar v. Canada* (No. 258/2004). In one case, given the author's voluntary return to his country of origin, the Committee decided not to consider the case any further under the follow-up procedure: *Falcon Rios v. Canada* (No. 133/1999).

112. In the following cases, either further information is awaited from the States parties or the complainants and/or the dialogue with the State party is ongoing: *Dadar v. Canada* (No. 258/2004); *Brada v. France* (No. 195/2003); *Guengueng et al. v. Senegal* (No. 181/2001); *Ristic v. Serbia and Montenegro* (No. 113/1998); *Blanco Abad v. Spain* (No. 59/1996); *Urta Guridi v. Spain* (No. 212/2002); *Agiza v. Sweden* (No. 233/2003); *Thabti v. Tunisia* (No. 187/2001); *Abdelli v. Tunisia* (No. 188/2001); *M'Barek v. Tunisia* (No. 60/1996); *Saadia Ali v. Tunisia* (No. 291/2006); *Chipana v. Venezuela* (No. 110/1998); *Pelit v. Azerbaijan* (No. 281/2005); *Bachan Singh Sogi v. Canada* (No. 297/2006); *Tebourski v. France* (No. 300/2006); and *Besim Osmani v. Republic of Serbia* (No. 261/2005).

113. During the forty-third and forty-fourth sessions, the Rapporteur for follow-up of decisions on complaints presented new follow-up information that had been received since the last annual report with respect to the following cases: *Guengueng et al. v. Senegal* (No. 181/2001); *Agiza v. Sweden* (No. 233/2003); *Bachan Singh Sogi v. Canada* (No. 297/2006); *Falcon Rios v. Canada* (No. 133/1999); *Blanco Abad v. Spain* (No. 59/1996); *Urta Guridi v. Spain* (No. 212/2002); *M'Barek v. Tunisia* (No. 60/1996); *Saadia Ali v. Tunisia* (No. 291/2006).

114. Represented below is a comprehensive report of replies received with regard to all 49 cases in which the Committee has found violations of the Convention to date and in 1 case in which although the Committee did not find a violation of the Convention it did make a recommendation.

¹ On 11 June 2008, following requests by the Committee to Serbia and Montenegro to confirm which State would be following up on Decisions adopted by the Committee and registered against the State party "Serbia and Montenegro", the Secretariat received a response from Montenegro only which stated that all the cases were within the remit of the Republic of Serbia.

² In December 2009, the Secretariat learned verbally from the State party that this case had been subsequently reopened but nothing has been received in writing to this effect.

³ Although no violation was found in this case, the Committee welcomed the State party's readiness to monitor the complainant's situation and subsequently provided satisfactory information in this regard (see chart below).

⁴ The State had already remedied the breach prior to consideration of the case.

Complaints in which the Committee has found violations of the Convention up to the forty-fourth session

...

State party	Bulgaria
Case	<i>Keremedchiev, 257/2004</i>
Nationality and country of removal if applicable	N/A
Views adopted on	11 November 2008
Issues and violations found	Cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, prompt and impartial investigation - articles 12 and 16, paragraph 1
Interim measures granted and State party response	N/A
Remedy recommended	An effective remedy to the complainant, including fair and adequate compensation for the suffering inflicted, in line with the Committee's general comment No. 2 (2007), as well as medical rehabilitation.
Due date for State party response	17 February 2009
Date of reply	None
State party response	None
Complainant's	N/A

response

**Committee's
decision**

Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

...