

Raihman v. Latvia

Follow Up (as of July 2011)

CCPR/C/100/D/1621/2007
Communication No. 1621/2007
28 Oct. 2010 (adoption of views)
26 April 2011 (180 days)

Recommendation and Implementation *Legend below

Recommendation	Implementation Grade
Remedy (amendment of legislation)	B2
Prevent Similar Violations	B2
Publications	B2

Implementation

- On 12 July 2011 the Government held a secret meeting regarding the case but information has become available via mintues.
- On 12 May 2011 The Senate agreed that UN Human Rights Committee Views should be treated in the same way as ECtHR decisions, meaning that the case can be initiated for de novo review.
- On 15 June 2011, the application was rejected by the Senate in the decision on the merits.
- Senate concluded that case can be reopened but the case first has to be applied to State Language Centre.
- Victim is in the process of submitting new application to State Language Centre referring to the UN Human Rights Committee's Views.

Assessment of Implementation

- There are no developments, as regards general measures in the case, the legislation on the issue of minority names spelling remains in force in its previous version.
- The Minutes from the 12 July 2011 minutes show that a report should be drafted by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Justice, State Language Centre and Ombudsman's Office and submitted for approval of the Government by 1 October.
- The same decision stipulates that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has to translate and publish the Views in the Official Gazette, but there was no mention of the deadline.
- The situation requires general measures, not only in this particular case, as the issue is systematic.

Victim

The victim and attorney are in the process of writing a new application to the State Language Centre referring to the UN Human Rights Committee Views. If the decision is not favorable they retain the right to go back to court.

Violations

- Article 17

Concerns

- No developments
- Legislation still in force

Sources

- Aleksejs Dimitrovs:
victim's attorney.

Legend

- A: State party response / action largely satisfactory
B1: Substantive action taken, but additional information required
B2: Initial action taken, but additional information/action required
C: No action taken to implement the recommendation
All rights reserved to the Centre for Civil and Political Rights