



General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/HRC/WG.6/1/CZE/3
6 March 2008

Original: ENGLISH

HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL
First session of the Working Group on the
Universal Periodic Review

SUMMARY PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR
HUMAN RIGHTS, IN ACCORDANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 15 C) OF
THE ANNEX TO HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL RESOLUTION 5/1*

Czech Republic

The present report is a summary of 6 stakeholders' submissions¹ to the universal periodic review. It follows the structure of the general guidelines adopted by the Human Rights Council. It does not contain any opinions, views or suggestions on the part of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), nor any judgement or determination in relation to specific claims. The information included herein has been systematically referenced in endnotes and, to the extent possible, the original texts have not been altered. Lack of information or focus on specific issues may be due to the absence of submissions by stakeholders regarding these particular issues. The full texts of all submissions received are available on the OHCHR website. The periodicity of the review for the first cycle being four years, the information reflected in this report mainly relates to events that occurred after 1 January 2004.

*The present document was not edited before being sent to the United Nations translation services.

I. BACKGROUND AND FRAMEWORK

A. Scope of international obligations

1. Amnesty International (AI) expressed concern about shortcomings in the ratification of international human rights instruments, especially following the pledges made by the Czech Republic before being elected as a member of the UN Human Rights Council. This refers in particular to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. AI recommended that the Czech Republic ratify the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, and the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families.²

B. Constitutional and legislative framework

2. According to a joint submission made by the Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions, the European Roma Rights Centre, the Peacework Development Fund and *Vzájemné Soužití* (Life Together) (COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT), the Czech Republic has not complied with its obligations to respect, protect and fulfil for all individuals within its territory and subject to its jurisdiction the rights recognized under international human rights law, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. The State is obligated to bring discrimination to an end by all appropriate means, including legislation, but the Czech legislature has yet to adopt a comprehensive anti-discrimination law, and most of the sectoral fields covered by the international human rights law ban on discrimination remain to date unprotected by any form of actionable domestic law ban on racial discrimination.³ Regrets on the non-enactment of the long-awaited anti-discrimination legislation were also expressed by the Council of Europe's Commissioner for Human Rights (CoE CHR).⁴ In more detail, Global Rights and ILGA-Europe (ILGA) pointed out that an Anti-discrimination Bill, which was intended to impose a broad prohibition on discrimination on grounds covered by European Union anti-discrimination legislation, was rejected by the Parliament in May 2006. ILGA added that a new proposal, approved by the Government on June 11th, 2007, is pending before Parliament. ILGA recommended that the State consider the adoption of this anti-discrimination bill with a view to leveling up and ensuring equal substantive and procedural protection against discrimination with regard to all prohibited grounds of discrimination.⁵

3. ILGA informed that while the Constitution prohibits discrimination on numerous grounds, and should be interpreted as including sexual orientation, the horizontal applicability of this provision is limited. It can be relied upon directly only where the discrimination concerns basic civil and political rights, and not for economic or social rights. Where it can be relied upon, it can be enforced against private as well as State actors, though only the State can be sued in the Constitutional Court. The constitutional prohibition of discrimination does not extend to social protection unless there is a legal right to the matter in respect of which discrimination is alleged and does not extend to education or health. According to ILGA, the limited scope of application of constitutional provisions protecting against discrimination, including on grounds of sexual orientation, constitutes a serious limitation to the implementation of Article 26 of the ICCPR which recognizes that "All persons are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to the equal protection of the law", as well as of Article 2 (2) of the ICESCR which stipulates that "the rights enunciated in the present Covenant will be exercised without discrimination of any kind [...]."

The current legislation in the Czech Republic does not guarantee to all persons equal and effective protection against discrimination, in particular in the enjoyment of economic and social rights.⁶

C. Institutional and human rights structure

4. The Czech Public Defender of Rights reported that, as stipulated by Act No. 349/1999 Coll. on the Public Defender of Rights, the Public Defender of Rights in the Czech Republic acts to protect the persons from conduct of offices and other institutions undertaking State administration, should such conduct be contrary to the law or even if not contravening the law then otherwise faulty, erroneous or incorrect.⁷

II. PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS ON THE GROUND

A. Implementation of international human rights obligations

1. Equality and non-discrimination

5. COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT informed that, in practice, Roma in the Czech Republic are regularly subjected to discrimination in almost all aspects of their lives. Moreover, in recent years and continuing to the present, there has been near total impunity for racial discrimination against Roma, as well as for those who would frustrate the Roma in their efforts to realize the right to equality; these concerns comprise both (i) the specific concern of failure to adopt adequate law banning racial and other forms of discrimination, as well as (ii) the fact that the State has tolerated and in some cases actively promoted the extreme, systemic exclusion of Roma.⁸ AI also reported that Roma continue to suffer discrimination at the hands of both public officials and private individuals and called on the Czech Republic to take appropriate and effective measures to fight discrimination and violence against Roma and ensure equal access to education, housing, healthcare and employment.⁹

6. ILGA noted that, in 2006, the Czech Republic introduced the Registered Partnership Act for same-sex couples, but despite such positive legal developments, there are still instances of discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people and other human rights violations of this group in the country.¹⁰

7. According to ILGA, the Penal Code does presently not provide that homophobic hate may be considered as an aggravating circumstance in the case of an attack against life or physical integrity of the victim motivated by the victim's sexual orientation or gender identity, as the penal legislation establishes in the case of racially motivated crimes. The State does not provide consequently adequate protection against homophobic attacks. ILGA recommended including sexual orientation and gender identity in the list of aggravating circumstances in the draft Penal Code, which is currently being prepared, with a view of ensuring increased protection against violence and harassment for LGBT people.¹¹

8. ILGA also reported that there are significant problems in the area of the rights of same-sex partners as well as parental rights. While the Registered Partnership Act was adopted, the law was amended by a series of restricting and even discriminating articles.¹² ILGA further noted that, while since 2006 the Czech Republic allows same-sex couples to enter into formal relationships (registered partnerships), registered couples are disadvantaged compared to married couples when it comes to several basic rights such as joint property rights, tenancy rights, and are excluded from joint taxation and survivor pension rights. Similarly, according

to the Family Act, adoption is only open to married couples and excludes registered partners, as ILGA also reported.¹³

9. According to ILGA, transsexual individuals in the Czech Republic have significant problems with proving the “continuity” of their legal personhood, because of the system of national identification numbers.¹⁴

2. Right to life, liberty and security of the person

10. COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT reported that, in recent years, a number of acts have been undertaken in the Czech Republic by both private individuals and State actors who have threatened the lives of Roma.¹⁵ According to AI, incidents of violence against Roma are reported to have been perpetrated by youths with extreme racist views. The youths had previously been convicted for similar offences, but had received only light or suspended sentences.¹⁶ The CoE CHR added that there is increased recognition among police and prosecutors of the racial or ethnical motivations of certain criminal deeds and it is to be hoped that the relatively large number of police investigations in this area leads to additional prosecutions and to the imposition of sanctions which are proportionate to the gravity of this type of crime and sufficiently dissuasive for the future.¹⁷

11. AI raised concern about continuing reports of ill-treatment by law enforcement officials of members of marginalized groups, such as Roma and foreign nationals, including that some cases have not been adequately investigated. AI urged all incidents of ill-treatment by police authorities to be promptly investigated and that perpetrators are brought to justice in accordance with international standards for fair trial.¹⁸

12. In a resolution adopted on 15 March 2006, the Council of Europe’s Committee of Ministers invited the Czech Republic to pursue the efforts to combat all incidents of intolerance or hostile police attitudes towards Roma by developing more appropriate training and awareness-raising measures and ensuring more effective, impartial, independent monitoring of police activities.¹⁹

13. COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT noted that the Czech authorities continue to fail to provide Roma and human rights defenders with adequate protection against racially motivated violence perpetrated by members and sympathizers of nationalist-extremist movements and vigilante groups.²⁰

14. According also to COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT, the regular and systemic human rights abuses against Roma in the Czech Republic are aggravated by the fact that anti-Romani hate speech is a regular part of public discourse in the country. Anti-Romani statements are a standard and often unquestioned part of public life in the Czech Republic, and officials as high-ranking as the Prime Minister, the President, Senators (including members of the Senate’s Human Rights Committee), other members of the cabinet, and many local officials have either made anti-Romani statements or failed to counteract speeches denigrating the dignity of the Roma. This sets the tone for an environment in which internet chat rooms and other public fora are flooded with anti-Romani invective. Individuals are rarely, if ever, held accountable in cases in which anti-Romani statements are at issue.²¹

15. Regarding the issue of sterilization of women, the Public Defender of Rights reported that, through his inquiry, he reached the conclusion that in all the cases examined, shortcomings are identifiable in the legal quality of the sterilised persons’ consent. The inquiry by the Public Defender of Rights has gathered indicia that under the implementation of the

then State assimilation policy, Roma women were also persuaded to reduce the number of their children and thus approximate the majority population's contemporary perception of a model functioning family. Sterilisation was one of the methods offered and the availability of a relatively high social benefit acted as an incentive for the Roma women's deciding whether to undergo sterilisation. The Public Defender of Rights recommended to the Chamber of Deputies to adopt a legal regulation that will stipulate the provision of consent before the performing of sterilisation for health reasons or for other than health reasons within the legal regulation of informed consent.²²

16. On the same issue, COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT added that civil complaints for damages have been initiated by a number of victims concerned. The submitting organizations are aware of two cases in which monetary damages have been awarded to victims by courts, and another case in which a court ordered a written apology by the hospital concerned. According to COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT, criminal charges have been filed by the Public Defender of Rights in a series of cases in which criminal law may have been infringed, but Czech prosecutors have dismissed all such complaints to date. For COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT, there is a need for Czech lawmakers to adopt a comprehensive administrative remedy – based on practice in other countries, where there has been comprehensive acknowledgement of such practices and remedy made available.²³ The submitting organizations added that Czech lawmakers have not yet indicated any willingness to provide such a mechanism. In this regard, AI urged the Czech Republic to take concrete action to stop the practice of forced sterilization of women and to enact relevant legislation providing for adequate compensation.²⁴

17. In addition, according to COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT, silence on the part of high-ranking public officials on these matters has meant that, to date, the victims are regarded by the vast majority of the Czech public as persons who are purported to have invited, profited from, or deserved the treatment to which they have been subjected. Some of the victims of coercive sterilization are Czech citizens or permanent residents who have been coercively sterilized in Slovakia (coercive sterilization having been carried out by both Czech and Slovak doctors, both during the Czechoslovak period, as well as after it). Czech officials have been repeatedly urged to raise these matters with their Slovak counterparts, in order to provide justice for persons harmed in Slovakia, who are currently under Czech jurisdiction. Thus far, there are no apparent efforts by Czech officials to act on these matters, as informed COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT.²⁵

18. The Public Defender of Rights reported that the number of complaints with respect to prison conditions has been rising for a long time, in particular regarding requests for transfer to another prison, bullying by fellow prisoners and Prison Service officers, failure to provide a suitable diet, lack of work for inmates, employment and remuneration issues, and insufficient educational and therapeutic work with inmates.²⁶

19. With respect to the issue of ill-treatment, the European Committee on the Prevention of Torture (CPT), in its report to the Czech Government on the visit carried out in 2006, expressed concern about allegations of physical ill-treatment inflicted directly on prisoners by prison staff in Section D of Valdice Prison. The delegation also heard a number of allegations concerning prison officers mocking prisoners during medical consultations in Mirov Prison and Section E of Valdice Prison. The CPT recommended that the Czech authorities deliver the clear message to prison officers that all forms of ill-treatment are not acceptable and will be the subject of severe sanctions.²⁷ The State provided a response to these recommendations.²⁸

20. The CPT further reported that inter-prisoner intimidation/violence was a significant phenomenon in Sections D and E of Valdice prison and additional such allegations were made concerning certain other establishments. In the case of Valdice Prison, the delegation was able to document several cases of prisoners who had been physically and sexually abused by other prisoners. Prison staff in Section D explained to the delegation that certain vulnerable prisoners often had to be moved from one dormitory to another as they did not get on with other prisoners. It would appear that a number of such prisoners in Sections D and E were being routinely raped and sexually abused, when they were moved to a new dormitory or cell. Moreover, the delegation was concerned that vulnerable prisoners who had clearly suffered physical abuse and rape while in Section D were, subsequently, transferred to Section E because they were perceived as being “difficult” prisoners. Furthermore, it appeared that these prisoners were often accommodated in the same cell as persons who were known to have perpetrated acts of violence and/or rape on other prisoners. An examination of the records and interviews with prisoners (both alleged perpetrators and victims) confirmed these findings. The CPT called upon the authorities to conduct a thorough review of the treatment of vulnerable prisoners within Section E of Valdice Prison.²⁹ The State provided a response to these recommendations.³⁰

21. AI expressed concern about existing legislation on the use of so-called “cage beds”. These devices are used to restrain patients in psychiatric hospitals and residents in social care homes for people with mental disabilities. AI considers that the use of “cage beds” and the denial of appropriate rehabilitation and care to children with disabilities may amount to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment. According to AI, the Czech Ministry of Social Affairs has acknowledged that “cage beds” are used, and stated that domestic legislation does not explicitly forbid this form of restraint. Additionally, the Ministry has mentioned budgetary constraints on hiring qualified staff as a reason for this shortcoming. In the absence of legislation governing the use of seclusion and other harmful restraints, there is concern that even if “cage beds” were eliminated, isolation and increased psychiatric medication would be used instead. The authorities have yet to introduce much-needed reform of the mental health care system, including setting up of community-based alternatives to residential care in psychiatric and social care institutions. In this regard, AI stated that in May 2005, the Czech Parliament adopted an amendment to the law on social care on the use of restraint in all social care institutions, including “cage beds”. Although regularization of restraint use is cited as the objective of the law, in fact it legalized the use of restraints. Moreover, the amendment does not provide for supervision or time limits on the restraint order, or any complaint mechanisms for victims. AI called on the Czech Republic to ensure that appropriate legislation is adopted to reform the mental care system and to clearly prohibit any treatment which could be considered inhuman or degrading, such as the use of “cage beds”.³¹

22. The CoE CHR, in his 2006 follow-up report on the Czech Republic, welcomed the new powers given to the Public Defender of Rights to strengthen the protection of persons deprived of their liberty – including the mentally disabled and ill – against torture or inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. The Commissioner took note with satisfaction that the Public Defender of Rights is already active in this area and that additional means have been allocated to his Office for the proper exercise of these new functions. The Commissioner urged the authorities to consider setting up community-based alternatives to residential care in psychiatric and social care institutions. Regulations clearly banning the use of “cage beds” should be introduced.³²

23. With respect to the issue of detention of irregular migrants, the CoE CHR welcomed the efforts made by the State to improve the material situation in centres hosting asylum

seekers and the creation of new centres for unaccompanied minors, refugees and families. The Commissioner noted with satisfaction that the running of detention centres has been transferred from the Police to a specialized agency and that children below the age of 15 are not sent to detention centres and attend ordinary school. The Commissioner continues to urge the Czech Republic to abolish the strict detention regime and further reduce the maximum detention period of irregular migrants, in particular for those between 15 and 18 years of age.³³ The State provided comments to these recommendations.³⁴

24. The Global Initiative to End all Corporal Punishment of Children (GIEACP) pointed out that corporal punishment of children is lawful in the home. Children are legally protected from physical and mental violence by the Act on Social and Legal Protection of Children (amended 2002), and from “cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment” by the Charter on Fundamental Rights and Freedoms (1992). Family relationships are governed by the Act on the Family (1993, amended 1998), under which parents have the right to use appropriate measures that do not affect the child’s dignity or endanger the child’s health or physical, emotional, intellectual and moral development. There is no explicit prohibition of corporal punishment in schools. In the penal system, corporal punishment is unlawful as a sentence for crime, but it is not explicitly prohibited as a disciplinary measure in penal institutions. Regulation No. 345/1999, Rules for the Service of Prison Sentences, covers the right to protection from “unjustified” violence and degradation of human dignity (section 35). There is no explicit prohibition of corporal punishment in alternative care settings. The GIEACP recommended that the Czech Republic introduce legislation as a matter of urgency to prohibit corporal punishment of children in all settings, including in the home.³⁵

3. Administration of justice and the rule of law

25. According to COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT, extensive empirical evidence indicates a system-wide failure in the Czech Republic to ensure rights of equality in administrative and judicial matters crucial for the realization of fundamental human rights. The continuing failure to remedy extreme exclusion driven by efforts by the State to deprive Czechoslovak Roma residing in the Czech Republic of Czech citizenship at the time of the break-up of Czechoslovakia, and the failure subsequently to adequately remedy these State-led acts of exclusion, raises concerns as to whether all persons in the Czech Republic enjoy adequate recognition as persons before the law.³⁶

26. The Public Defender of Rights reported that employees of his office had conducted unannounced visits to 19 police establishments, inspecting a total of 110 police cells. The Public Defender concluded that the right of persons confined to police cells to be advised of their rights and obligations is not always observed.³⁷

4. Right to privacy and family life

27. COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT stated that patterns and practices of arbitrary removal of Roma children from the care of their biological parents and their remand into State or other alternate care call seriously into question the compliance of the Czech Republic with international human rights law.³⁸

28. According to the Public Defender of Rights, there is a persisting issue of disallowing contact of children with their parent or parents by persons to whom the child’s custody has been awarded by a court.³⁹

29. The Public Defender of Rights also noted that social care institutions fail to provide clients with a sufficient privacy, that institutes for long-term patients do not address the legal standing of patients in the correct way, and that these institutes display a clear lack of privacy.⁴⁰

5. Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work

30. The CoE CHR stated, that in light of the continuing high unemployment of Roma, the Commissioner urged an effective practical implementation of the new legislation providing for protection against discrimination in employment.⁴¹

6. Right to social security and to an adequate standard of living

31. The Public Defender of Rights addressed the general issue of “social housing“, its non-existence in the Czech legal system, its connotations to the possible expulsion from the society and consequently to the right to respect for private and family life.⁴²

32. With respect to Roma, AI noted that discriminatory practices in public and private rental markets mean that they can frequently not obtain housing, even when they are able to present financial guarantees, and as a result they often live in segregated sub-standard housing. Ostensibly neutral eligibility requirements, such as an adequate level of education for all members of the family applying for housing, disproportionately affect Roma whose level of education is often lower than that of ethnic Czechs.⁴³ COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT added that recently adopted Czech laws in the field of housing constitute an open invitation to municipal and private landlords and others to arbitrarily invade the privacy of any tenant. They added that Roma, a particularly disadvantaged group in the Czech Republic, are routinely subjected to invasive actions by landlords.⁴⁴

33. The CoE CHR stated that he viewed positively the focus on integration of Roma communities, the efforts to close the gap between socially excluded Roma and mainstream Czech society and the support offered to Roma culture and language. The Commissioner noted an increased awareness among the authorities and society about the difficulties and needs of Roma/Gypsies. However, in spite of a number of achievements, the initiatives taken have had so far a limited impact in reducing social exclusion of large sectors of Roma population.⁴⁵ COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT noted that a growing number of Roma live in socially excluded locations characterized by substandard conditions on the edges of towns, segregated from the rest of the population. No acts of the national Government have been effective in countering racially segregating forces in the field of housing.⁴⁶ According to the CoE CHR, effective mechanisms must be created to prevent socially insensitive procedures on the part of towns and municipalities when handling housing needs. In particular, the Czech authorities should intervene more actively in situations where implementation of housing projects for Roma is hampered by local authorities. Moreover, anti-discrimination legislation in the field of private and public housing must be enacted or strengthened, while special measures must be taken to ensure that seemingly neutral allocation criteria do not negatively affect Roma populations.⁴⁷ The State provided comments to these recommendations.⁴⁸

34. With regards to the issue of evictions, the Public Defender of Rights reported that he had dealt in detail with the fate of the six families (68 persons) evicted by the Vsetín council to the Olomouc and Jeseník districts. In the first place the Defender ascertained that the “*media myth*” of the alleged bad payers was untrue. All the families concerned had been paying for the use of the apartments in the balcony house in Smetanova street. Three families had been in debt on rent from the previous lease, but they had been repaying it. The remaining three

families had been free of any debts. The families had been moved to houses in a very poor structural and technical condition, and the planning authority had to order the demolition of the building in Čechy pod Kosířem in June 2007. The Public Defender of Rights added that if the eviction of the persons from the balcony house in Smetanova street had been determined by the adverse condition of the house and concerns about the residents' health, moving them to other inconvenient premises in the Jeseník, Prostějov and Uherské Hradiště districts had not resolved the issue. In general, the forced eviction of the Romani families outside the territory of the Vsetín municipality is the most problematic aspect of the issue and it is reasonable to conclude that fundamental human rights and freedoms were actually violated by the aforementioned intervention (the freedom of movement and residence, the right to respect for private and family life).⁴⁹

7. Right to education

35. Regarding the right to education, COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT noted that officials consistently deny equal access to Romani children, placing them in alarming numbers in segregated, substandard schools and classes. In addition to the inherent harms flowing from this practice, the racial segregation of Romani children in the Czech school system virtually ensures that Roma will remain, for the foreseeable future, a systemically excluded underclass.⁵⁰

36. The CoE CHR stated that, in spite of the efforts made to increase the number of preparatory classes and assistant teachers for Roma pupils, the situation still remains of concern. As the Commissioner recommended in his final report on the situation of the Roma, Sinti, and Travellers in Europe, where segregated education still exists in one form or another, it must be replaced by regular integrated education, and where appropriate, prohibited through legislation. The Commissioner called upon the Czech authorities, therefore, to pursue their efforts in this direction and make greater resources available for the provision of pre-school education, language training and school assistant training in order to ensure the success of efforts to fully integrate Roma pupils into the regular school system.⁵¹ Similar recommendations were made by the Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers.⁵²

III. ACHIEVEMENTS, BEST PRACTICES, CHALLENGES AND CONSTRAINTS

37. The CoE CHR welcomed the National Employment Action Plan for 2004-2006 and, in particular, the variety of measures designed to integrate Roma, and other disadvantaged groups, into the labour market.⁵³

38. The CoE Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities reported that the Czech Republic has taken new commendable measures to improve the protection of national minorities. These measures demonstrate the authorities' commitment to establish a genuine public policy in the field. The CoE Advisory Committee also noted positive developments at the legislative level, in particular as regards the use of minority languages in the public sphere, as well as in the field of education. As regards practice, increased efforts have been made in most of the relevant sectors, with particular accent on the situation of the Roma. Additional measures have been also taken to improve inter-ethnic dialogue. According to the CoE Advisory Committee, difficulties persist, however, in the implementation of certain parts of the relevant legislation, notably at the local level. Further efforts should be taken to strengthen prevention of, and fight against, intolerance and discrimination.⁵⁴

VI. KEY NATIONAL PRIORITIES, INITIATIVES AND COMMITMENTS

39. [n/a]

V. CAPACITY BUILDING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

40. [n/a]

Notes

¹ The following stakeholders have made a submission (all original submissions are available in full text on: www.ohchr.org):

Civil Society:

AI	Amnesty International, London (UK)*;
COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT	Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions*, European Roma Rights Centre, Peacework Development Fund and Vzájemné Soužití (Life Together), joint submission;.
GIEACP	Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, London (UK);
ILGA	Global Rights*, ILGA-Europe*, joint submission.

National Human Rights Institution

Public Defender of Rights.

Regional intergovernmental organization:

CoE Council of Europe, Strasbourg (France).

NB: *NGOs with ECOSOC status.

² AI, page 1.

³ COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT, pages 2 and 3.

⁴ CoE CHR, follow-up report, page 4.

⁵ ILGA, pages 4 and 5.

⁶ ILGA, pages 4 and 5.

⁷ Public Defender of Rights, page 1.

⁸ COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT, pages 3 and 4.

⁹ AI, pages 2 and 3.

¹⁰ ILGA, pages 1 and 2.

¹¹ ILGA, pages 3 and 4.

¹² ILGA, page 2.

¹³ ILGA, page 4.

¹⁴ ILGA, pages 2 and 3.

¹⁵ COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT, page 3.

¹⁶ AI, page 3.

¹⁷ CoE CHR, page 12.

¹⁸ AI, page 1.

¹⁹ Comité des Ministres, Resolution ResCMN(2006)2 on the implementation of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities by the Czech Republic, adopted on 15 March 2006, page 3.

²⁰ COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT, page 5.

²¹ COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT, page 4.

²² Public Defender of Rights, page 3.

²³ COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT, page 3. See also AI, page 3.

²⁴ AI, page 3.

-
- ²⁵ COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT, pages 3 and 4.
- ²⁶ Public Defender of Rights, page 2.
- ²⁷ Report to the Czech Republic on the visit carried out by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT), published on 12 July 2007, page 23.
- ²⁸ Response of the Czech Republic to the Report of the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT), published on 12 July 2007, page 11.
- ²⁹ CPT, pages 23 and 24.
- ³⁰ Response of the Czech Republic to the Report of the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT), published on 12 July 2007, pages 66 and 67.
- ³¹ AI, pages 1 and 2.
- ³² CoE CHR, page 23.
- ³³ CoE CHR, page 15.
- ³⁴ CoE CHR, page 26.
- ³⁵ GIEACP, pages 1 and 2.
- ³⁶ COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT, page 4.
- ³⁷ Public Defender of Rights, page 2.
- ³⁸ COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT, page 4.
- ³⁹ Public Defender of Rights, page 1.
- ⁴⁰ Public Defender of Rights, pages 2 and 3.
- ⁴¹ CoE CHR, page 11.
- ⁴² Public Defender of Rights, page 1.
- ⁴³ AI, pages 2 and 3.
- ⁴⁴ COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT, page 4.
- ⁴⁵ CoE CHR, pages 6 and 7.
- ⁴⁶ COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT, page 3.
- ⁴⁷ CoE CHR, page 10.
- ⁴⁸ CoE CHR, page 25.
- ⁴⁹ Public Defender of Rights, page 4.
- ⁵⁰ COHRE/ERRC/PDF/LT, page 3. See also AI, pages 2 and 3.
- ⁵¹ CoE CHR, page 8.
- ⁵² Comité des Ministres, Resolution ResCMN(2006)2 on the implementation of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities by the Czech Republic, adopted on 15 March 2006, page 3.
- ⁵³ CoE CHR, page 11.
- ⁵⁴ CoE Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, Second Opinion on the Czech Republic, adopted on 24 February 2005, p.1.
