COUNCIL OF EUROPE

CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

CPT/Inf (2015) 21

Report

to the Ukrainian Government on the visit to Ukraine carried out by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT)

from 9 to 16 September 2014

The Ukrainian Government has requested the publication of this report.

Strasbourg, 29 April 2015

CONTENTS

Copy of the letter transmitting the CPT's report

Ministry of Justice
13, Horodetskogo street
01001 Kyiv
Ukraine

Strasbourg, 27 March 2015

Dear Sir/Madam,

In pursuance of Article 10, paragraph 1, of the European Convention for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, I enclose herewith the report to the Ukrainian Government drawn up by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) following its visit to Ukraine from 9 to 16 September 2014. The report was adopted by the CPT at its 86th meeting, held from 3 to 6 March 2015.

The various recommendations, comments and requests for information formulated by the CPT are highlighted in bold type in the body of the report. As regards more particularly the CPT's recommendations, having regard to Article 10, paragraph 1, of the Convention, the Committee requests the Ukrainian authorities to provide within **three months** a response giving a full account of action taken to implement them. The CPT trusts that it will also be possible for the Ukrainian authorities to provide, in their response, reactions to the comments and requests for information formulated in this report.

As regards the request for information in paragraph 44, the CPT wishes to receive updated information on **15 October 2015** and **15 February 2016.**

The CPT would ask, in the event of the response being forwarded in Ukrainian, that it be accompanied by an English or French translation.

I am at your entire disposal if you have any questions concerning either the CPT's report or the future procedure.

Yours faithfully,

Mykola Gnatovskyy
President of the European Committee for
the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or
Degrading Treatment or Punishment

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The main objective of this ad hoc visit was to review the treatment of prisoners by staff at two correctional colonies in the Kharkiv area, namely Colonies Nos. 25 and 100. Further, as follow-up to the February 2014 visit, the delegation reviewed the action taken by prosecutors to investigate allegations of ill-treatment of detained persons by law enforcement officials during the "Maidan" events in Kyiv between November 2013 and February 2014. In this connection, particular attention was paid to specific cases which had been identified by the Committee during the February 2014 visit. Moreover, the delegation examined the situation of persons who had been detained by law enforcement officials in Kyiv and Kharkiv in the context of ongoing "anti-terrorism" operations.

Throughout the visit, the delegation received very good co-operation overall from the Ukrainian authorities. However, at Colony No. 25, attempts were made by staff to infringe upon the confidentiality of interviews of delegation members with prisoners.

The majority of persons detained in the context of "anti-terrorism" operations who were interviewed by the delegation stated that they had been treated correctly whilst in the hands of law enforcement officials. Further, the delegation received no allegations of ill-treatment by custodial staff at the detention facility of the State Security Service (SBU) in Kyiv and the pre-trial establishments (SIZOs) in Kyiv and Kharkiv. That said, some allegations were received of excessive use of force by SBU officers at the time of apprehension and/or of ill-treatment during subsequent questioning by SBU officers. In addition, a few allegations were heard of excessive use of force by soldiers at the time of apprehension.

As regards the investigations into allegations of ill-treatment by law enforcement officials during the "Maidan" events, consultation of relevant criminal investigation files revealed that, in all five cases examined by the delegation, investigators and prosecutors had carried out many essential investigative steps. However, a number of shortcomings were identified (e.g. lack of forensic medical examinations, delays in judges approving certain investigative actions). Further, it became apparent that investigations had reached a deadlock, since investigators had not identified any law enforcement official as a potential perpetrator. Overall, the investigations that had been carried out by investigative prosecutors did not seem to meet the requirements of effectiveness as defined by the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights and the relevant standards of the CPT. The Committee also reiterates its recommendation that steps be taken without any further delay to ensure that members of special forces and other uniformed police officers are always identifiable, through the wearing of a clearly visible identification number on the outside of their uniforms or on their helmet.

At Colonies Nos. 25 and 100, the delegation once again received a significant number of allegations of severe physical ill-treatment and/or torture of prisoners by prison officers (including senior members of staff). The delegation gained the distinct impression that, in both establishments, physical ill-treatment was used as a tool to maintain internal order. Further, the delegation was struck by the overall climate of fear in both establishments and the reluctance of prisoners to be interviewed. Many allegations were received that prisoners had been warned by staff not to say anything negative to the delegation. At Colony No. 100, allegations were also received that prisoners had been beaten up by prison officers after they had complained to a prosecutor or a representative of the Parliamentary Commissioner of Human Rights. Moreover, the CPT expressed concern about the frequency of allegations received in both colonies regarding corruption and exploitation of prisoners for economic reasons.

In its preliminary observations, the delegation called upon the Ukrainian authorities to carry out a prompt, independent, thorough and comprehensive inquiry from the central level into how Colonies Nos. 25 and 100 function (especially as regards the allegations of ill-treatment of prisoners) and to take appropriate measures to ensure that prisoners were not subjected to any retaliation for having spoken with the delegation.

By letters dated 11 and 23 February 2015, the Ukrainian authorities provided detailed information on the measures taken in response to the preliminary observations. In particular, inspections had been carried out of Colonies Nos. 25 and 100 by representatives of the General Prosecutor's Office (with the involvement of the Parliamentary Commissioner of Human Rights and various NGOs) as well as by a joint commission of the Ministry of Justice and the State Penitentiary Service (also with the involvement of several NGOs). The Directors of both colonies had been dismissed and criminal investigations had been initiated regarding two complaints of ill-treatment of prisoners by staff at Colony No. 100. Following a meeting with representatives of the CPT, the Minister of Justice issued a detailed set of instructions to the Directors of all prisons in the country regarding the measures to be taken to prevent ill-treatment and intimidation of prisoners and to improve the procedures for the investigation of allegations of ill-treatment. In addition, the Minister of Justice instructed the State Penitentiary Service to monitor the treatment of prisoners in Colonies Nos. 25 and 100 on a monthly basis (with the involvement of civil society organisations).

In the visit report, the CPT welcomes the measures taken thus far by the relevant Ukrainian authorities regarding the allegations of ill-treatment and/or intimidation of prisoners in Colonies Nos. 25 and 100. On the basis of all the information at its disposal, the CPT has reached the conclusion that a page is being turned and that decisive action is now being taken by the relevant authorities to combat the phenomena of ill-treatment and intimidation of prisoners in colonies. Consequently, the CPT has decided to close the procedure under Article 10, paragraph 2, of the Convention establishing the Committee, which had been set in motion in March 2013. The Committee also emphasises that it will continue to monitor closely the situation of prisoners in the the above-mentioned colonies (as well as in other prison establishments) and will not hesitate to re-open the procedure under Article 10, paragraph 2, at any moment, if it becomes apparent that the present process of improvement is not sustained and that the actions taken so far are not vigorously pursued at all levels.

During its visit to Colony No. 100, the delegation also reviewed the regime and security measures applied to prisoners sentenced to life imprisonment. From the information gathered during the visit, it transpired that most of the specific recommendations repeatedly made by the Committee after previous visits regarding the situation of life-sentenced prisoners had not been implemented. In particular, it remained the case that the prisoners concerned were usually locked up in their cells for 23 hours per day, were not allowed to have contact with life-sentenced prisoners from other cells, were systematically handcuffed during all movement outside their cells and were kept under constant video surveillance (CCTV) in their cells. The CPT calls upon the Ukrainian authorities to implement without further delay its long-standing recommendations in this regard.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Dates of the visit and composition of the delegation

1. In pursuance of Article 7 of the European Convention for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (hereinafter referred to as "the Convention"), a delegation of the CPT carried out a visit to Ukraine from 9 to 16 September 2014. The visit was one which appeared to the Committee "to be required in the circumstances" (see Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Convention).[1]

2. The visit was carried out by the following members of the CPT:

- Lətif HÜSEYNOV, President of the Committee (Head of Delegation)
- Marzena KSEL, 1st Vice-President of the CPT
- Davor STRINOVIĆ
- George TUGUSHI.

They were supported by Michael NEURAUTER, Head of Division in the CPT's Secretariat, and assisted by:

- Helle GULSETH, Investigative Prosecutor, Norwegian Bureau for the Investigation of Police Affairs, Oslo, Norway (expert)
- Denys DANYLENKO (interpreter)
- Vadim KASTELLI (interpreter)
- Larysa SYCH (interpreter).

[1] All reports on the CPT's previous visits to Ukraine and the related Government responses have been made public and are available on the CPT's website: http://www.cpt.coe.int/en/states/ukr.htm

B. Objectives of the visit and establishments visited

3. The main objective of the visit was to review the treatment of prisoners by staff at two correctional colonies in the Kharkiv area, namely Colonies Nos. 25 and 100. During previous visits, in particular to Colony No. 25, the CPT had heard many allegations of physical ill-treatment and/or torture of prisoners by prison officers.[2]

4. Another objective of the visit was to examine the situation of persons who had been detained in the context of ongoing "anti-terrorism" operations. For this purpose, the delegation interviewed a considerable number of such persons at the pre-trial establishments (SIZOs) in Kyiv and Kharkiv as well as at the detention facility of the State Security Service (SBU) in Kyiv.

5. The visit also provided an opportunity to review, as a follow-up to the February 2014 ad hoc visit, the action taken by prosecutors to investigate allegations of ill-treatment of detained persons by law enforcement officials during the "Maidan" events in Kyiv between November 2013 and February 2014. In this connection, particular attention was paid to specific cases which had been identified by the Committee during the February 2014 visit and which are described in the report on the latter visit (see paragraphs 24 to 32).

C. Consultations held by the delegation, co-operation encountered and post-visit dialogue

6. In the course of the visit, the delegation held consultations with Ms Inna YEMELIANOVA, First Deputy Minister of Justice, Mr Tigran AVAKYAN, Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs, Mr Volodymyr PALAGNIUK, Head of the State Penitentiary Service, and other senior officials of the Ministry of Justice.

Further, the delegation had meetings with Mr Vitaly YAREMA, Prosecutor General, and Mr Oleksii BAHANETS and Mr Vitalii KASKO, Deputy Prosecutors General, as well as with senior prosecutors of the Office of the Prosecutor General and investigative prosecutors of the Kyiv City Prosecutor's Office.

The delegation also met Ms Valeriya LUTKOVSKA, Parliamentary Commissioner for Human Rights in her capacity as National Preventive Mechanism (NPM), the Head of the Delegation of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) in Ukraine and representatives of various non-governmental organisations active in areas of concern to the CPT.

A list of the national authorities, other bodies and organisations with which the delegation held consultations is set out in the Appendix to this report.

---

[2] Colony No. 25 had previously been visited by the CPT in 2012 and Colony No. 100 in 2005.

7. Throughout the visit, the delegation received very good co-operation overall from the authorities at the central level, namely the Ministries of Justice and Internal Affairs and the Prosecutor General and senior prosecutors of the Office of the Prosecutor General. The delegation had fruitful consultations with all interlocutors and was promptly provided with all the necessary information it had requested.

The CPT also wishes to express its appreciation for the assistance provided before, during and after the visit by its liaison officer, Ms Luidmyla SUGAK, from the Ministry of Justice.

8. At local level, the delegation had ready and unlimited access to all the places visited (most of which had not been notified in advance), was able to speak in private with detained persons and was able to consult relevant documentation without delay.

That said, it is a matter of grave concern that, at Colony No. 25, attempts were made by staff to infringe upon the confidentiality of interviews of delegation members with prisoners. By way of example, a member of the delegation incidentally observed on the CCTV monitoring screen of security staff how a prison officer – in the presence of the Deputy Governor – was leaning his head against the door of a cell in which a prisoner was being interviewed by another delegation member. Such a practice not only constitutes an unacceptable failure of co-operation on the part of the management of the prison but also gives further credence to the many allegations of intimidation of prisoners by staff (see paragraph 36).

9. After the visit, the CPT pursued its dialogue with the Ukrainian authorities regarding the outcome of the September 2014 visit and the follow-up to previous visits. In particular, the issue of possible intimidation or retaliatory action against prisoners prior to, during and after CPT visits has been a recurrent issue since the very first visit of the Committee to Ukraine in 1998. Given the apparent failure of the Ukrainian authorities to take effective action to stamp out such practices in penitentiary establishments, the CPT had decided in March 2013 to set in motion the procedure under Article 10, paragraph 2, of the Convention.[3]

10. At the plenary meeting held from 3 to 7 November 2014, the delegation's main findings of the September 2014 visit were presented to the Committee as a whole, and members of the CPT also took note of the information provided by the Ukrainian authorities in their response to the report on the October 2013 visit.[4]

On the basis of that information, the CPT gained the distinct impression that the phenomena of ill-treatment and intimidation of prisoners by staff still persisted in the colonies visited and that the relevant authorities had failed to take effective measures to eradicate these phenomena, despite the specific recommendations made by the Committee after previous visits.

---

[3] See paragraph 8 of the report on the 2012 visit (CPT/Inf (2013) 23) and paragraphs 9 to 13 of the report on the 2013 visit (CPT/Inf (2015) 3). Article 10, paragraph 2, reads as follows: "If the Party fails to co-operate or refuses to improve the situation in the light of the Committee's recommendations, the Committee may decide, after the Party has had an opportunity to make known its views, by a majority of two-thirds of its members to make a public statement on the matter".

[4] Document CPT/Inf (2015) 2.

In particular, the CPT had serious doubts about the effectiveness of the inquiries which had been carried out by prosecutors after the October 2013 visit. In their response to the report on the latter visit, the Ukrainian authorities indicated that "[a]ccording to the survey results none of the prisoners had told about the facts of harassment, violence and other ill-treatment, arbitrary use of force or special means" at Colony No. 25 and other penitentiary establishments visited by the Committee.

In this regard, the CPT wishes to stress once again that gaining a sufficient level of trust among prisoners remains a key issue for such inquiries to be effective and that prosecutors should take measures to counter the risk of intimidation of prisoners by staff or fellow inmates prior to and in the course of these inquiries. As already indicated in paragraph 11 of the report on the October 2013 visit, the use of anonymous questionnaires is of dubious value if nothing has been done to counter that risk.

11. In the light of the above, the CPT decided at the November 2014 plenary meeting to keep open the procedure under Article 10, paragraph 2, of the Convention and to extend the scope of the procedure to cover also the issue of ill-treatment, following the apparent failure of the relevant authorities to effectively combat the problem of ill-treatment by staff at Colonies Nos. 25 and 100. The Committee also decided to review the situation at the March plenary meeting, to be held from 3 to 6 March 2015, in the light of the Ukrainian authorities' response to the preliminary observations on the September 2014 visit.[5]

12. By letter dated 11 December 2014, the President of the CPT transmitted the delegation's preliminary observations, which had been communicated orally at the end of the visit, to the Ukrainian authorities and informed them of the above-mentioned considerations and decisions taken by the Committee.

13. In the preliminary observations, the delegation called upon the Ukrainian authorities to:

- carry out a prompt, independent, thorough and comprehensive inquiry from the central level into how Colonies Nos. 25 and 100 function. In this connection, particular attention should be paid to the allegations of ill-treatment of prisoners received by the delegation;

- take appropriate measures to ensure that prisoners in the two aforementioned Colonies are not subjected to any retaliation for having spoken with the delegation.

The delegation requested the Ukrainian authorities to provide within two months[6] a detailed account of the concrete measures taken in this connection.

---

[5] The preliminary observations were published on 13 January 2015 under an automatic publication procedure which had recently been introduced by the Ukrainian authorities. According to this procedure, all documents related to CPT visits shall be published automatically, unless the Ukrainian authorities submit within one month a request to postpone (for a period of up to six months) the publication of the document concerned.

[6] As of 11 December 2014, i.e. the date of transmission of the preliminary observations.

14. On 17 December 2014, the President of the CPT wrote another letter to the Ukrainian authorities expressing the Committee's concern about recent reports, according to which, during a general cell search operation at Berdychiv Colony No. 70 on 12 November 2014, many prisoners had allegedly been subjected to physical ill-treatment by prison officers. The alleged ill-treatment consisted mainly of kicks and punches to various parts of the body (including the head), reportedly resulting in a number of prisoners being injured. Following this incident, several of the alleged victims were transferred to various other prison establishments. On behalf of the Bureau of the CPT, the President urged the Ukrainian authorities to take the necessary steps to ensure that a prompt, independent, thorough and comprehensive injury be carried out into these allegations and requested them to provide by 23 February 2015 a detailed account of the concrete measures taken in this connection.

15. On 27 January 2015, the President of the CPT met for the first time the current Minister of Justice, Mr Pavlo PETRENKO, in Kyiv, in order to discuss issues of major concern related to the findings of the CPT's most recent visits to Ukraine and the above-mentioned incident. During that meeting, the Minister provided updated information on the action already taken by the relevant Ukrainian authorities to combat the phenomena of ill-treatment and intimidation in colonies. He also indicated that he and his Ministry were determined to vigorously pursue those actions in close co-operation with the CPT.

16. By letters dated 11 and 23 February 2015, the Ukrainian authorities provided detailed information on the measures taken in response to the delegation's preliminary observations and the letter dated 17 December 2014 from the CPT's President. This information is examined in paragraphs 42 to 44 of the present report.

17. Further, in their letter of 23 February 2015, the Ukrainian authorities informed the CPT that a monitoring visit had been carried out to Colony No. 70 on 14 November 2014 by representatives of the Office of the Parliamentary Commissioner for Human Rights. Further, on the basis of media reports on the above-mentioned incident, criminal proceedings were opened *ex officio* by the relevant inter-district prosecutor's office, and, on the following day, a fact-finding visit was carried out to Colony No. 70 by a representative of the Prosecutor General's Office. As a result of the aforementioned visit, the Prosecutor General decided that a comprehensive inspection of Colony No. 70 be carried out by 30 January 2015. In the context of this inspection, various deficiencies and instances of misconduct (including illegal instructions) were detected, and criminal proceedings had been initiated regarding the allegations of ill-treatment of prisoners by prison officers.[7] With immediate effect, the Director of Colony No. 70, as well as the Head and Deputy Head of the Regional Prison Administration responsible for Colony No. 70 had been dismissed, and disciplinary proceedings had been initiated against twelve members of staff of the establishment. All aforementioned criminal and disciplinary proceedings were still pending.

The CPT would like to be informed in due course of the outcome of these proceedings as well as of any action subsequently taken at the criminal/disciplinary level.

7 In the course of the inspections, visits were also carried out to the establishments in Kyiv and other regions to which a number of prisoners had been transferred after the above-mentioned incident at Colony No. 70.

18. The CPT welcomes the measures taken thus far by the relevant Ukrainian authorities regarding the allegations of ill-treatment and/or intimidation of prisoners in Colonies Nos. 25, 70 and 100. On the basis of all the information at its disposal, the CPT has reached the conclusion that a page is being turned and that decisive action is now being taken by the relevant authorities to combat the phenomena of ill-treatment and intimidation of prisoners in colonies.

Consequently, the CPT has decided to close the procedure under Article 10, paragraph 2, of the Convention, which had been set in motion in March 2013. However, it will continue to monitor closely the situation of prisoners in the three above-mentioned colonies (as well as in other prison establishments) and will not hesitate to re-open the procedure under Article 10, paragraph 2, at any moment, if it becomes apparent that the present process of improvement is not sustained and that the actions taken so far are not vigorously pursued at all levels.

II. FACTS FOUND DURING THE VISIT AND ACTION PROPOSED

A. Treatment of persons detained by law enforcement officials in the context of "anti-terrorism" operations

19. As already indicated, in Kyiv and Kharkiv, the delegation interviewed a considerable number of persons who had been detained by law enforcement officials in the context of ongoing "anti-terrorism" operations.

The majority of persons interviewed by the delegation stated that they had been treated correctly whilst in the hands of law enforcement officials. Further, the delegation received no allegations of ill-treatment by custodial staff at the SBU Detention Facility in Kyiv and the SIZOs in Kyiv and Kharkiv.

That said, some allegations were received of excessive use of force by SBU officers at the time of apprehension and/or of ill-treatment during subsequent questioning by SBU officers. In addition, a few allegations were heard of excessive use of force by soldiers at the time of apprehension. In a few cases, the persons concerned displayed visible injuries which were appeared to be consistent with the allegations made.

The CPT recommends that the Ukrainian authorities deliver a clear message to SBU officers and military staff that all forms of ill-treatment of persons deprived of their liberty are not acceptable and will be punished accordingly; they should also be reminded through instructions and suitable training that no more force than strictly necessary shall be used when effecting an apprehension and that, once apprehended persons have been brought under control, there can be no justification for striking them.

20. Further, a number of persons interviewed by the delegation claimed that they were hooded (with a bag) for many hours during transportation from the place of apprehension to Kyiv.

As a matter of principle, the CPT has strong objections to the blindfolding or hooding of detained persons. Even in cases where no physical ill-treatment occurs, to blindfold or hood a detain person – and in particular someone being transported from one place to another – is a form of oppressive conduct, the effect of which on the person concerned could, in the CPT's view, easily amount to psychological ill-treatment. **The Committee recommends that such practices cease and be expressly prohibited.**

21. The CPT recalls that the fundamental safeguards against ill-treatment (namely the right to have one's detention notified to a relative or another person and the rights of access to a lawyer and a doctor) should always be granted as from the very outset of the *de facto* deprivation of liberty.

From the interviews with detained persons it transpired that the implementation in practice of the above-mentioned safeguards did not pose major problems once the persons concerned had been transferred to an SBU establishment.

However, it is a matter of serious concern that the delegation received a number of consistent allegations from detained persons that they had been held *de facto* in incommunicado detention on the premises of a military establishment for several days (and, in a few cases, for more than ten days), prior to their transfer to the SBU detention facility.

The CPT recommends that the Ukrainian authorities take the necessary measures to put an end to such practices.

22. As far as the delegation could ascertain, all persons detained in the context of "anti-terrorism" operations who were met by the delegation had been subjected to medical screening upon admission to either SIZO or the SBU detention facility. According to the medical files, most of the persons concerned had not displayed any visible injuries upon arrival.

That said, in those cases where injuries had been recorded, the quality of the medical records left something to be desired. In particular, at the Kharkiv SIZO, the description of injuries was rather superficial. Further, at the SBU Detention Facility, custodial officers had allegedly been present during medical examinations.

23. Given the crucial importance of proper medical screening and documentation of injuries for the prevention of ill-treatment, **the CPT urges the Ukrainian authorities to take all the necessary measures – including through appropriate instructions and training – to ensure that the specific recommendations made by the Committee in the reports on the October 2013 periodic visit and the February 2014 ad hoc visit are effectively implemented at all SIZOs as well as in all police temporary detention isolators (ITTs) and the SBU Detention Facility in Kyiv.[8] In particular, action must be taken to ensure that:**

- **health-care professionals are as a rule not directly involved in the administrative procedure of handover of custody of detained persons by police officers to the establishment;**

- **persons found to display injuries upon admission are not questioned by anyone about the origin of those injuries during the above-mentioned handover procedure;**

- **any record made, and any photographs taken, of injuries during the handover-of-custody procedures are forwarded without delay to the establishment's health-care professionals;**

- **all persons admitted to the establishment are properly interviewed and thoroughly examined by qualified health-care staff as soon as possible, and no later than 24 hours after their admission; the same approach should be adopted each time a person returns to the establishment after having been taken back to the custody of another structure for investigative or other purposes;**

[8] See paragraphs 64 and 155 of the report on the 2013 visit (CPT/Inf (2014) 15) and paragraph 43 of the report on the February 2014 visit (CPT/Inf (2015) 3).

- **all medical examinations in law enforcement establishments, hospitals and SIZOs are conducted out of the hearing and – unless the health-care professional concerned expressly requests otherwise in a given case – out of the sight of staff not carrying out health-care duties;**

- **the record drawn up following the medical examination of a detained person in the establishment contains: (i) an account of statements made by the person in question which are relevant to the medical examination (including his/her description of his/her state of health and any allegations of ill-treatment), (ii) a full account of objective medical findings based on a thorough examination (supported by a "body chart" for marking traumatic injuries); (iii) the health-care professional's observations in the light of i) and ii), indicating the consistency between any statements made and the objective medical findings;**

- **detained persons and, upon their request, their lawyers are fully entitled to receive a copy of the medical records. When possible, photographs of injuries should be made and appended to the medical records.**

B. Investigations into allegations of ill-treatment by law enforcement officials during the "Maidan" events

24. As already indicated, the delegation reviewed the action taken by prosecutors to investigate allegations of ill-treatment of detained persons by law enforcement officials during the "Maidan" events in Kyiv between November 2013 and February 2014.

To this end, the delegation held extensive consultations with the Prosecutor General, two Deputy Prosecutors General and several investigative prosecutors and consulted a number of criminal investigation files. Particular attention was paid to specific cases which had been identified by the Committee during the February 2014 visit and which are referred to in the report on the latter visit as cases A, C, D, E and F.[9] These individual cases formed part of different collective investigation files which had been established according to the date on which the alleged ill-treatment had taken place, each of which comprised between 100 and 400 complaints of ill-treatment.

25. At the outset, the CPT wishes to stress that, in all the cases examined by the delegation, investigators and prosecutors had carried out many essential investigative steps regarding potential cases of ill-treatment by law enforcement officials during the "Maidan" events (such as interviewing all the above-mentioned alleged victims concerned as well as various witnesses, including law enforcement officials, commissioning of forensic medical examinations, analysis of extensive video footage, onsite reconstruction of the sequence of events, etc.).

That said, from the examination of relevant parts of the collective investigation files, it transpired that the criminal investigations into the above-mentioned individual cases were hampered by various factors, which, according to investigative prosecutors met by the delegation, were also present in many other similar cases.

---

[9] See paragraphs 12 and 15 of CPT/Inf (2015) 3.

26. Firstly, although forensic examinations had been ordered by the relevant prosecutor, no such examination had been carried out by the time of the CPT's visit (i.e. several months later) in any of the five cases examined by the delegation. According to investigative prosecutors met by the delegation, the forensic experts had refused to conduct examinations without having received all the medical documents concerning the victims or because the medical treatment of the alleged victims was still ongoing.

In the CPT's view, there can be no justification for delaying the carrying-out of a forensic medical examination of persons who display visible injuries. **The Committee reiterates its recommendation that the Ukrainian authorities take the necessary steps to ensure that, whenever allegations of ill-treatment or other information which is indicative of ill-treatment are notified to the Prosecution Service, the detained person concerned is promptly physically examined by a forensic doctor.**

27. Another problem lies in the fact that investigations had been slowed down because of considerable delays in judges approving certain investigative actions (such as searches or the recovery of information concerning the use of mobile phones). Despite the fact that judges are under a legal obligation to take a decision on such requests "immediately", it was apparently not uncommon for decisions to be rendered only after several weeks or even months.

The CPT recommends that the Ukrainian authorities take the necessary steps, through appropriate channels, in order that requests for investigative actions are processed by judges expeditiously.

28. More generally, it became apparent that, in all the cases examined by the delegation, investigations had reached a deadlock, since investigators had not identified any law enforcement official as a potential perpetrator. According to the delegation's interlocutors, the same problem existed in hundreds of similar cases.

As already highlighted in the report on the February 2014 visit, it is a matter of particular concern that most of the "Berkut" and Interior Troops officers were wearing balaclavas or helmets during their interventions and that none of them had individual identification numbers on their uniform or helmet.

In this regard, the CPT acknowledges that, following recent legislative changes, police officers are no longer allowed to wear balaclavas during public order operations. Notwithstanding that, **the Committee reiterates its recommendation that steps be taken without any further delay to ensure that members of special forces and other uniformed police officers are always identifiable, through the wearing of a clearly visible identification number on the outside of their uniforms or on their helmet.**

29. The situation was further complicated by the fact that prosecutors could apparently obtain hardly any official deployment plan to help them establish which law enforcement official was present at a particular location at a given time during the events.

In this regard, the delegation was provided access to extracts from an inquiry report which had been finalised by the Internal Security Department of the Ministry of Internal Affairs on 24 April 2014 concerning the handling by law enforcement agencies of the whole of the "Maidan" events, which formed part of the above-mentioned investigation files. According to the latter report, no comprehensive operational plans had been prepared by the relevant services, the actual deployment of officers often differed from the initial plans, no officers had been assigned to co-ordinate and oversee law enforcement operations on the spot and it was not possible to identify officers involved in these operations (as they were wearing helmets/balaclavas).

30. Further, the delegation was informed that several of the highest-ranking law enforcement officials responsible for the operations had in the meantime left the country and that around two-thirds of all (former) "Berkut" and Interior Troops officers were currently involved in the ongoing "anti-terrorism" operations in south-eastern Ukraine and could thus not be questioned. The delegation was also told that prosecutors had not been able to obtain access to various internal documents of the Ministry of Internal Affairs concerning the above-mentioned operations because they had been classified as "secret". According to some interlocutors, there were indications that relevant internal documents (such as the personal files of many law enforcement officials) had been destroyed.

31. More generally, the delegation observed that it was not uncommon for several investigations into the same event to be carried out in parallel within different investigative units. For instance, cases concerning the use of firearms were investigated exclusively by the Office of the Prosecutor General itself, while cases concerning beatings and other forms of physical ill-treatment which had allegedly occurred at the same time were being investigated by the Investigation Department of the Kyiv City Prosecutor's Office. Moreover, in cases in which the ill-treatment had allegedly been inflicted by private individuals (so-called "Titushky"[10]) at the instigation of law enforcement officials, investigations were being carried out by the police.

In the light of the information gathered during the visit, there seemed to be little co-operation and exchange of information between these investigative units, which could lead to necessary information not being presented to the relevant unit and not being taken into account in relevant investigations. It is also a matter of concern that there was no central system in place which would enable investigative prosecutors to find out which investigative unit was investigating a certain individual. As a result, whenever investigators needed specific information about a particular person, formal requests had to be sent to various institutions. According to the delegation's interlocutors, it could take weeks or even months to receive responses to such requests.

32. To sum up, the CPT gained the distinct impression that the investigations that had been carried out by investigative prosecutors in the five individual cases it had examined during the visit, did not meet the requirements of effectiveness as defined by the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights and the relevant standards of the Committee[11].

The CPT wishes to receive detailed information on any additional investigative steps taken by prosecutors since the September 2014 visit regarding the alleged ill-treatment of the persons referred to in paragraph 24 by law enforcement officials during the "Maidan" events.

---

10 For further details, see paragraph 11 of the report on the February 2014 visit (CPT/Inf (2015) 3).

11 See paragraphs 32 to 35 of the CPT's 14th General Report (CPT/Inf (2004) 28).

33. As indicated in the report on the February 2014 visit, an International Advisory Panel[12] (IAP) was established in April 2014 at the initiative of the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, Thorbjørn Jagland, with the mandate to oversee that the investigations into the violent incidents which took place from 30 November 2013 to 21 February 2014 meet all the requirements of the European Convention on Human Rights and the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights. In this connection, particular attention is paid to violent acts committed by any person during three periods of the Maidan demonstrations, namely the night of 30 November/1 December 2013; 1 December 2013; and 18-21 February 2014.

At the end of the IAP's mission, a final report will be prepared by the Chair of the Panel and presented to the Secretary General and the Ukrainian authorities at the end of March 2015.[13]

C. Treatment of prisoners at Colonies Nos. 25 and 100

34. The delegation visited two correctional colonies in the Kharkiv area, namely Colonies Nos. 25 and 100, in order to review the treatment of prisoners. During previous visits, in particular to Colony No. 25, the CPT had heard many allegations of physical ill-treatment and/or torture of prisoners by prison officers.

35. The CPT is very concerned about the frequency and seriousness of the allegations of ill-treatment by staff received and the climate of fear and intimidation of prisoners observed by the delegation in Colonies Nos. 25 and 100.

In both establishments, and especially at Colony No. 25, the delegation once again received a significant number of allegations of severe physical ill-treatment and/or torture of prisoners by prison officers (for instance, very extensive beatings; rape with truncheons; use of straitjackets and squeezing of the abdomen with a rope noose to the point that prisoners were defecating; continuous exposure to high-pressure jets of water from a fire hose). In addition, several prisoners interviewed by the delegation claimed that they were subjected to a form of positional asphyxia by being forced to lie face-down on the floor while one officer was sitting on their back and others were pulling the arms and legs upwards. It is also alarming that, in some cases, the physical ill-treatment was allegedly inflicted by senior members of staff.

The delegation gained the distinct impression that the two establishments were managed through a system of intimidation and violence and that physical ill-treatment (sometimes of such a severe nature that it could be considered to amount to torture) was used as a tool to maintain internal order. There was a widespread perception among prisoners that any disobedient behaviour would be immediately sanctioned with severe corporal punishment.

---

[12] The IAP is composed of three members: Sir Nicolas Bratza, former President of the European Court of Human Rights (Chairperson), Mr Volodymyr Butkevych, former Judge of the European Court of Human Rights, and Mr Oleg Anpilogov, member of the Kharkiv Regional Council. In September 2014, it was decided to extend the IAP's mandate, in order to cover also the violent events which took place in Odessa on 2 May 2014.

[13] For further information on the IAP's activities, see http://www.coe.int/en/web/portal/international-advisory-panel

36. Further, in both establishments, the delegation was struck by the overall climate of fear and the reluctance of prisoners to be interviewed. As regards, more specifically, Colony No. 25, the CPT must stress that it has thus far never visited a prison in Europe where so many prisoners refused to talk to delegation members and appeared to be virtually scared to death, and this when conditions of detention were generally of a high standard.[14] Those prisoners who eventually dared to speak with members of the delegation agreed to do so only with great reluctance.

What is even worse, many allegations were received that, in both colonies, prisoners had been warned by staff not to say anything negative to the delegation. Apparently, a number of prisoners were also approached by staff after having talked to members of the delegation. Not surprisingly, several of them refused to talk to delegation members again on the second day of the visit to the establishment.

As already indicated in paragraph 8, at Colony No. 25, a member of the delegation incidentally observed on the CCTV monitoring screen of security staff how a prison officer – in the presence of the Deputy Governor – was leaning his head against the door of a cell in which a prisoner was being interviewed by another delegation member. Undoubtedly, such practices give further credence to the many allegations of intimidation of prisoners by staff.

37. Moreover, at Colony No. 100, one prisoner interviewed by the delegation claimed that he had been beaten up by prison officers after having complained to a prosecutor from the Office of the Prosecutor General. Similar allegations were received from prisoners who had spoken to members of staff of the NPM who had recently visited the establishment.

38. Further, the CPT has serious misgivings about the fact that prisoners continued to be employed as "duty prisoners" in dormitories. The prisoners concerned were usually dressed in black clothes and were responsible for the maintenance of internal order. The delegation received allegations that, among other things, "duty prisoners" conducted searches in dormitories and acted as "informants" for staff (e.g. on the contents of prisoners' telephone conversations). In this regard, **the Committee wishes to stress once again that the practice of delegating authority to inmates with a designated role to assist them to keep control over the inmate population is an unacceptable abdication of the responsibility for order and security – which invariably falls within the ambit of penitentiary staff – and also exposes weaker prisoners to the risk of abuse by their fellow inmates.**[15]

39. There is one more point which gives rise for concern, namely the frequency of allegations received in both colonies regarding corruption and exploitation of prisoners for economic reasons. Many prisoners claimed that they were often not receiving the salaries they were entitled to for their work in one of the establishment's industrial workshops. In addition, a number of prisoners complained that they were pressured by the management to work overtime and that often without any additional remuneration.

---

[14] Material conditions were indeed very good throughout the establishment (which also comprised a zoo with all kinds of exotic animals), and prisoners were offered work (see, however, paragraph 39).

[15] See also paragraphs 24 and 25 of the report on the 2012 visit (CPT/Inf (2013) 23).

40. The CPT's experience in Ukraine has shown that decisive action taken by the relevant authorities and changes in the management of the establishments concerned can bring about significant improvements.[16] For instance, during previous visits to certain other colonies (such as Colonies Nos. 81 and 89), numerous allegations of physical ill-treatment and/or torture had been received, while only a limited number of allegations of ill-treatment were received during follow-up visits to the same establishments a few years later.

Given that the situation has not improved at all in Colonies Nos. 25 and 100 since the previous visits to the establishments (in 2012 to Colony No. 25 and in 2005 to Colony No. 100), the CPT cannot but conclude that there is a major management problem in both establishments.

41. As indicated in paragraph 13, in its preliminary observations, the delegation called upon the Ukrainian authorities to carry out a prompt, independent, thorough and comprehensive inquiry from the central level into how Colonies Nos. 25 and 100 function. In this connection, particular attention should be paid to the allegations of ill-treatment of prisoners received by the delegation.

Further, the delegation urged the Ukrainian authorities to take appropriate measures to ensure that prisoners in the two aforementioned Colonies were not subjected to any retaliation for having spoken with the delegation.

42. By letter dated 11 February 2015, the Ukrainian authorities provided the following information:

- In 2014, Colony No. 25 was visited 18 times by a public prosecutor (including once by a representative of the General Prosecutor's Office) and Colony No. 100 was visited 173 times (including six visits by a representative of the General Prosecutor's Office).

- In autumn 2014, inspections were carried out to both colonies by representatives of the General Prosecutor's Office (with the involvement of representatives of the Parliamentary Commissioner of Human Rights and various NGOs and several specialists (such as psychologists)).

- An anonymous questionnaire was prepared by an international NGO and Kharkiv Regional Supervisory Commission and circulated to some 900 prisoners.

- From 2 to 5 December 2014, an audit was carried out at Colony No. 25 (with the participation of the Head of the Public Council at the State Penitentiary Service). In July 2014, the Prosecutor's Office of Kharkiv region had initiated criminal proceedings regarding complaints of physical and psychological ill-treatment by ten prisoners at Colony No. 100; all were closed in December 2014.

- On 27 January 2015, criminal investigations were initiated regarding two complaints of ill-treatment of prisoners by staff at Colony No. 100 (following a visit by a NGO); the investigations were still pending.

- The Directors of Colonies Nos. 25 and 100 had been dismissed, and new directors were appointed by Order of the State Penitentiary Service dated 28 January 2015.

---

[16] See paragraph 111 of the report on the 2013 visit (CPT/Inf (2014) 15) and paragraph 12 of the report on the 2012 visit (CPT/Inf (2013) 23).

- On 28 January 2015, a Directive was issued to all prison directors reminding them of their obligation to report instances of ill-treatment and other illegal actions (with a list of recommendations by national and international experts; for instance, acts of intimidation and reprisal should be regarded as disciplinary offences).

- On 30 January 2015, the Minister of Justice issued an instruction (No. 6-48/1) to the State Penitentiary Service and relevant services of the Ministry to visit Colonies Nos. 25 and 100, in order to follow-up the issues raised by the CPT in the letter dated 11 December 2014 and, subsequently, to monitor the treatment of prisoners in both colonies on a monthly basis with the involvement of civil society organisations.

- On 2 and 3 February 2015, a joint commission of the Ministry of Justice and the State Penitentiary Service carried out visits to check the activities of both colonies as well as of the regional prison administration. In these visits, six representatives of NGOs and human rights organisations were involved. In the context of the visits, various parts of the colony (including accommodation areas, medical units, disciplinary units, intensive control areas, workshops) were inspected, and an anonymous survey of prisoners was conducted. Explicit complaints about torture and ill-treatment were not received. Reportedly, several prisoners indicated that the attitude of staff had improved during the previous four months.

- In February 2015, the Minister of Justice would deliver a message to all prison directors through a video conference that ill-treatment, reprisals and intimidation of prisoners are inadmissible.

- Additional training was organised for staff in both colonies on respect of human rights of prisoners.

43. Further, by letter of 23 February 2015, the Ukrainian authorities informed the CPT that, on 12 February 2015, the Minister of Justice had issued Order No. 178/5 which contains a detailed set of instructions to the Directors of all prisons in the country regarding the measures to be taken to prevent ill-treatment and intimidation of prisoners and to improve the procedures for the investigation of allegations of ill-treatment. The Order *inter alia* stipulates that:

- it is necessary to take urgent steps to ensure that prisoners could quickly report on cases of ill-treatment, not being afraid of official or unofficial punishment through sanctions or misuse of powers. Persons who complain about ill-treatment or other signs of improper treatment should not be subjected to intimidation or abuse for what they have done;
- the principle that prisoners should be able to file complaints of ill-treatment without fear of retribution could mean that if necessary, in special cases, such prisoners shall have the right to request a transfer to another institution;
- intimidation or the imposition of penalties for communication with the monitoring agencies should be classified as a separate disciplinary violation;
- tools for correspondence should be available to prisoners and envelopes for complaints that allow communication with the relevant authorities without censorship (in particular, with the Prosecution service and the Ombudsman) should be available in several locations in the prison, and their presence should not depend on a specific request;
- meetings between prisoners and members of the monitoring services must take place in conditions that ensure the confidentiality of discussions. Prison staff should not make any attempt to find out the contents of interviews with prisoners;

- prison staff should be obliged to report cases of ill-treatment even if the prisoner has not filed a complaint;
- the professional independence of doctors must be enhanced and the trust of prisoners in doctors must be restored;
- any attempt by prison staff to infringe medical confidentiality shall result in disciplinary punishment.

44. The CPT welcomes all the above-mentioned developments and **urges the Ukrainian authorities to pursue their efforts to combat the phenomena of ill-treatment and intimidation in Colonies Nos. 25 and 100, as well as in other prison establishments in the country.**

Further, **the Committee would like to receive detailed information on the implementation of the announced measures referred to in paragraph 42, as well as information on the outcome of the criminal and disciplinary proceedings which have been initiated against the management and members of staff of Colonies Nos. 25 and 100.**

D. Situation of life-sentenced prisoners at Colony No. 100

45. During its visit to Colony No. 100, the delegation also reviewed the regime and security measures applied to prisoners sentenced to life imprisonment. At the time of the visit, a total of 68 such prisoners were being held there in a separate unit (usually in double or four-bed cells).

46. The CPT welcomes the fact that, following recent legislative changes,[17] life-sentenced prisoners now benefit from the same visit entitlements as ordinary sentenced prisoners, namely one short-term visit per month and one long-term visit once every three months. It is also noteworthy that life-sentenced prisoners were offered remunerated work (sewing garment bags) in their cells.

47. That said, from the information gathered during the visit, it transpired that most of the specific recommendations repeatedly made by the Committee after previous visits to the country regarding the situation of life-sentenced prisoners had not been implemented. In particular, it remained the case that the prisoners concerned were:

- usually locked up in their cells for 23 hours per day;
- not allowed to have contact with life-sentenced prisoners from other cells, let alone with other sentenced prisoners;
- systematically handcuffed during all movement outside their cells;
- kept under constant video surveillance (CCTV) in their cells.

[17] See also the judgment of the European Court of Human Rights in *Trosin v.Ukraine* (no. 39758/05, 23 February 2012).

48. The management of the colony affirmed to the delegation that a decision had been taken about one year before to no longer use service dogs for escorting life-sentenced prisoners inside the prison.

However, a number of prisoners interviewed by the delegation claimed that the use of service dogs had stopped only shortly before the CPT's visit. **The CPT would like to receive confirmation that a definitive end has been put to the use of service dogs to escort prisoners within the prison perimeter at Colony No. 100, as well as in other penitentiary establishments in the country.**

49. Once again, the delegation observed that, whenever a cell door was opened by a prison officer, all life-sentenced prisoners in the cell were obliged to instantly line up and recite one after the other the article(s) of the Criminal Code under which they had been convicted. **Immediate steps should be taken to stop this anachronistic practice at Colony No. 100 and, where appropriate, in other penitentiary establishments.**

50. The CPT wishes to stress once again that, as a matter of principle, the imposition of a particular, more restrictive regime should lie with the *prison authorities* and always be based on an *individual* risk assessment, and not be the automatic result of the type of sentence imposed. In this regard, the Committee recalled that:

- life-sentenced prisoners – as indeed all prisoners – are sent to prison as a punishment and not to receive punishment;

- life-sentenced prisoners are not necessarily more dangerous than other prisoners;

- life-imprisonment can have a number of desocialising effects upon prisoners. In addition to becoming institutionalised, the prisoners concerned may experience a range of psychological problems;

- the provision of a regime of purposeful activities (including group association) and constructive staff/inmate relations will reinforce "dynamic security"[18] within the prison.

51. The above-mentioned precepts are embodied in the European Prison Rules and the Committee of Ministers' Recommendation Rec (2003) 23 on the management by prison administrations of life sentence and other long-term prisoners.

52. As regards the systematic 24-hour video surveillance of prisoners, the CPT already acknowledged in previous reports that the installation of CCTV cameras may be an important additional means to ensure security in common detention areas (corridors, sports rooms, etc.), special cells (e.g. special observation cells, disciplinary cells) and exercise yards.

---

[18] "That is the development by staff of positive relationships with prisoners based on firmness and fairness, in combination with an understanding of their personal situation and any risk posed by individual prisoners" (Paragraph 18.a of Recommendation Rec (2003) 23 on the management by prison administrations of life sentence and other long-term prisoners).

However, given the extreme intrusion into the privacy of prisoners when such cameras are installed in their own cells, in particular when the inmates remain there for prolonged periods, the Committee reiterates its serious misgivings about the routine installation of CCTV cameras in cells and considers that the resources devoted to such schemes can more usefully be deployed by having staff interact with the prisoners concerned.[19]

53. **The CPT calls upon the Ukrainian authorities to take the necessary measures without further delay at Colony No. 100 as well as in other penitentiary establishments to ensure that:**

- **life-sentenced prisoners are as a rule allowed to have contact with life-sentenced prisoners from other cells (including during outdoor exercise);**

- **all life-sentenced prisoners are offered a range of purposeful out-of-cell activities (such as work, education, sports, recreational activities);**

- **an immediate end be put to the practice of routinely handcuffing life-sentenced prisoners within the prison perimeter. Handcuffing of such prisoners outside their cells should be an exceptional measure, always based on an individual risk assessment and should be reviewed on a regular and frequent basis;**

- **life-sentenced prisoners are as a rule allowed to receive short-term visits in open conditions (i.e. table visits).**

Further, **the CPT reiterates its recommendation that the Ukrainian authorities review the use of video surveillance inside cells in penitentiary establishments and adopt detailed regulations, in the light of the above remarks.**

Finally, **the Committee urges the Ukrainian authorities to reconsider their position vis-à-vis life-sentenced prisoners and to amend the relevant legislation accordingly, in order to integrate life-sentenced prisoners into the general prison population as soon as possible following their conviction (taking into account the above-mentioned European standards).**

---

[19] See also Paragraph 18.b. of Recommendation Rec (2003) 23, which makes it clear that technical means cannot be a substitute for dynamic security.

APPENDIX

List of the national authorities, other bodies and organisations with which the CPT's delegation held consultations

Ministry of Justice

Inna YEMELIANOVA	First Deputy Minister of Justice
Tamara ANDRIIEVA	Director, Directorate for the Implementation of the Agreement with the European Union, Legal Expertise of International Agreements and International Co-operation
Svitlana MARTYNENKO	Deputy Director, Directorate for Interaction with Public Authority
Luidmyla SUGAK	Head of Division for Co-operation with International Organisations, Directorate for the Implementation of the Agreement with the European Union, Legal Expertise of International Agreements and International Co-operation

State Penitentiary Service

Volodymyr PALAGNIUK	Head of the State Penitentiary Service
Mykola ILTIAI	Director, Directorate of Protection, Supervision and Security, State Penitentiary Service

Ministry of Internal Affairs

Mr Tigran AVAKYAN	Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs

Prosecution Service

General Prosecutor's Office

Vitalii YAREMA	Prosecutor General of Ukraine
Oleksii BAHANETS	Deputy Prosecutor General
Vitalii KASKO	Deputy Prosecutor General
Valentyn NEDILKO	First Deputy Head of the Main Department for Supervision over Law Observance in Execution of Judgments in Criminal Proceedings and Other Coercive Measures

Vasyl KOZHUHAR	Deputy Head of Main Department for Supervision over Law Observance in Execution of Judgments in Criminal Proceedings and Other Coercive Measures Head of Department for Supervision over Law Observance in Application of Coercive Measures
Oleh KARPENKO	Deputy Head of Main Department for Supervision over Law Observance in Execution of Judgments in Criminal Proceedings and Other Coercive Measures
Ihor SHCHERBYNA	Deputy Head of Main Investigation Department
Pavlo NEMCHYNOV	Deputy Head of Department for Investigation of Particularly Important Cases
Oleksandr PRYKHODKO	Deputy Head of Department for Supervision over Law Observance by Internal Affairs Bodies
Ihor ROHATIUK	Deputy Head of International Cooperation Department Head of International Co-operation Division
Vasyl TARTUS	Head of Third Supervisory Division, Department for Supervisory Activities in Criminal Proceedings of Investigators of the Prosecution Authorities, Main Investigation Department
Anatolii MALETSKYI	Senior Prosecutor, First Division for Supervision over Law Observance in Pre-Trial Investigation and State Prosecution
Andrii TELIZHENKO	Head of Division for Official Events and Protocol Secretariat of Prosecutor General of Ukraine
Tetiana USTYCH	Prosecutor, International Co-operation Division

Kyiv City Prosecutor's Office

Andrije O. LYUBOVYCH	Head of Investigative Department

Office of the Parliamentary Commissioner for Human Rights (National Preventive Mechanism)

Valeriya LUTKOVSKA	Parliamentary Commissioner for Human Rights

International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)

Michel MASSON	Head of the ICRC Delegation in Ukraine

Non-governmental organisations

Amnesty International – Ukraine
Association of Ukrainian Human rights Monitors on Law Enforcement
Centre for Civil Liberties
EuroMaidon SOS
Ukrainian Helsinki Human Rights Union