



“EUROMAYDAN”

**HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS
DURING PROTESTS IN
UKRAINE**

**AMNESTY
INTERNATIONAL**



Amnesty International Publications

First published in 2013 by
Amnesty International Publications
International Secretariat
Peter Benenson House
1 Easton Street
London WC1X 0DW
United Kingdom
www.amnesty.org

© Amnesty International Publications 2013

Index: EUR 50/020/2013
Original Language: English
Printed by Amnesty International, International Secretariat, United Kingdom

All rights reserved. This publication is copyright, but may be reproduced by any method without fee for advocacy, campaigning and teaching purposes, but not for resale. The copyright holders request that all such use be registered with them for impact assessment purposes. For copying in any other circumstances, or for reuse in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, prior written permission must be obtained from the publishers, and a fee may be payable. To request permission, or for any other inquiries, please contact copyright@amnesty.org

Cover photo: "Berkut" riot police on 1 December © Aleksandr Piliugun

Amnesty International is a global movement of more than 3 million supporters, members and activists in more than 150 countries and territories who campaign to end grave abuses of human rights.

Our vision is for every person to enjoy all the rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights standards.

We are independent of any government, political ideology, economic interest or religion and are funded mainly by our membership and public donations.

AMNESTY
INTERNATIONAL



CONTENTS

1. Introduction	5
2. Violations of freedom of assembly	6
3. Abusive use of force	8
30 November	8
1 December	10
11 December	12
4. Harassment of complainants	13
5. Unfair Trials	14
6. Violations of freedom of expression – Harassment of journalists	16
8. Recommendations	18
Endnotes	19

1. INTRODUCTION

Hundreds of thousands of people have been mainly peacefully protesting in Kyiv and other Ukrainian cities since 21 November when the government announced that it was stopping preparations for an Association Agreement with the EU days before it was due to be signed. Protestors have erected tents in Independence Square (Maydan Nezalezhnosti) in the centre of the capital, Kyiv, and occupied Kyiv City Hall and the Trade Union Building from which the protest was coordinated. The demonstration has been named “EuroMaydan” (ЄвроМайдан) with reference to the anti-government demonstrations in 2004.

The authorities have allowed the protests to continue and have taken steps to remedy some of the more obvious violations that have occurred. For instance on 13 December a criminal case was initiated against a number of officials held accountable for a violent dispersal on 30 November, and on 19 December the Ukrainian parliament passed a law exonerating all participants in the “EuroMaydan” who had been accused of criminal and administrative offences in connection with the demonstrations. The passing of this law may help to stem public unrest in Ukraine, but the Ukrainian authorities cannot exonerate themselves for their responsibility for human rights violations that have taken place since 21 November. Amnesty International calls for a thorough investigation into all human rights violations that have taken place during “EuroMaydan”.

Amnesty International has been monitoring compliance with human rights standards by the authorities since the beginning of the protests and has interviewed over twenty victims of human rights violations, their families and lawyers. Despite public statements by high level officials including the president that human rights were being respected including the right to freedom of assembly, Amnesty International has documented violations of the right to peaceful assembly, excessive use of force by law enforcement officers, unfair trials and harassment of those who have complained about excessive use of force. There have also been violations of the right to freedom of expression as journalists and some media outlets have been prevented from covering the events, and students have come under pressure for their participation in the events. Many of these violations have their roots in systemic flaws in the criminal justice system that successive Ukrainian governments have failed to address.

2. VIOLATIONS OF FREEDOM OF ASSEMBLY

The right to freedom of peaceful assembly is enshrined in Article 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and guaranteed by the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) as well as the European Convention on Human Rights. The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), together with the Council of Europe's European Commission for Democracy through Law (Venice Commission), has issued detailed Guidelines on the Freedom of Peaceful Assembly with a view to assisting states in ensuring that their law and practice on freedom of peaceful assembly complies with European and international standards.¹ International standards permit states to place certain restrictions on the exercise of the right to freedom of peaceful assembly, but any such restriction must be provided by law, and is only permissible if it is demonstrably necessary and proportionate for the protection of national security or public safety, public order, public health or morals, or protection of the rights and freedoms of others. The European Court of Human Rights has underlined that this means there must be a “pressing social need” for such restrictions. The Ukrainian Constitution guarantees freedom of assembly but there are no other laws regulating freedom of peaceful assembly in Ukraine.²

While the Ukrainian authorities have for the most part tolerated the demonstrations, there have been some notable failures to respect the right to freedom of peaceful assembly in line with international human rights standards.

According to the Ukrainian Helsinki Union for Human Rights, the right to freedom of assembly had been restricted in nine cities. In some cases local authorities sought to ban or restrict public gatherings through court decisions. In most cases riot police have sought to implement court decisions early in the morning when fewest protestors were present.³ On 22 November the Kyiv district administrative court banned the use of “temporary structures such as tents, kiosks and barriers” from 22 November to 7 January. Local authorities in Odessa, on the Black Sea coast, applied to a court to ban a demonstration on Primorsky Boulevard that had attracted 2,000 people on Saturday 23 November. The court sitting at 4am on 24 November supported the ban, and the remaining demonstrators were violently dispersed by the police. Oleksiy Chorny, the leader of the opposition party, Democratic Alliance in Odessa, was beaten by police officers, sprayed with tear gas in a confined space and then sentenced to five days of administrative detention for allegedly shouting anti-government and anti-constitutional slogans. On 25 November, the mayor of Kharkiv used the pretext of a flu epidemic to curtail all public gatherings in the city.

The Ukrainian authorities have attempted to disperse the demonstration in Kyiv twice, on 30 November and on 11 December, and on each occasion the attempt was accompanied by excessive use of force by riot police.⁴ On 30 November the authorities justified the decision to disperse the demonstration by claiming that a New Year tree needed to be erected in the square. On 11 December the Minister of Interior claimed that the decision to attempt to remove barricades from the roads surrounding Independence Square was in response to

citizens' complaints that the demonstration was blocking traffic. Given the number of protestors, the peaceful nature of the protest and seriousness of the issue neither of these reasons can be considered a legitimate restriction on the right of freedom of assembly according to international standards. Neither would pass the test of being a “pressing social need”.

Amnesty International reminds the Ukrainian authorities that they must respect and ensure the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and that any decision to disperse peaceful assemblies is permissible only when it is the least restrictive measure which is strictly necessary for one of the purposes expressly permitted under international.

There have been reports of individuals being prevented from attending demonstrations or being harassed for having done so. For instance on the night of 25 to 26 November a bus organized by the Lviv local council to carry people to the demonstration in Kyiv was stopped by traffic police who ripped the registration plates off the bus and said that the bus could not continue because it did not have registration plates. A group of passengers including three students from the Ukrainian Catholic University (UCU) in Lviv got out of the bus and stood in the road to protest against the actions of the traffic police. They stood in the road for some hours until a replacement bus was organized and they continued their journey. On 9 December police investigators visited Ihor Skochilas, the Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and interrogated him in connection with the criminal investigation into illegal blocking of traffic, a crime that carries a maximum sentence of five year's imprisonment. They asked to see the attendance records of all students and asked other questions about the activities of the university. The Dean refused to sign a report of the interrogation on the basis that he had not been invited officially to an interrogation. At a press conference the same day the rector of the University, Fr. Dr. Bohdan Prakh stated: “I wouldn't say that this is repression, but this is an attempt to intimidate our students and an attempt to put pressure on the university”. Police investigators then started to phone students and ask to interrogate them in connection with the criminal case. All refused and asked to be invited officially and said that they would only speak to police in the presence of a lawyer. Ihor Kochilas told Amnesty International that he believe the police were acting on orders to detain somebody in order to stop participation in the demonstrations. He said that future developments depended on how the political situation in Kyiv developed.

Amnesty International reminds the Ukrainian authorities that nobody should face threats or intimidation for the peaceful exercise of their right to freedom of assembly.

3. ABUSIVE USE OF FORCE

“Here in Ukraine we don’t expect to get compensation, but I want them to find the men who are guilty”.

Vasyl Panchenko, victim of excessive use of force by riot police.

When policing public assemblies police should not use force except only when strictly necessary and to the minimum extent required under the circumstances. The UN Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials provide that, “[i]n the dispersal of assemblies that are unlawful but non-violent, law enforcement officials shall avoid the use of force or, where that is not practicable, shall restrict such force to the minimum extent necessary.”

Amnesty International and others have documented the use of excessive force against peaceful demonstrators by law enforcement officers on three key days during the “EuroMaydan” events.

30 NOVEMBER

Shortly before 4am on 30 November large numbers of riot police moved in on less than a hundred entirely peaceful demonstrators. They were preceded by local authority workers in trucks who were bringing equipment to erect the traditional New Year tree in the square. According to eyewitnesses interviewed by Amnesty International, riot police first told the demonstrators to disperse because the demonstration was “illegal”, then started beating those that remained. Video footage shows riot police officers using batons and kicking protestors and in some cases pursuing men and women in order to hit them. It shows the crowd remaining peaceful despite the police onslaught. About 35 peaceful protestors were briefly detained and charged with hooliganism under the Administrative Code and dozens of people have been treated for their injuries in connection with the incident.

The violent dispersal on 30 November prompted international condemnation and resulted in renewed determination by the protestors. The government was quick to distance itself from the actions taken by the Kyiv city police by blaming senior law enforcement officials for the operation. On 2 December the head of the Kyiv city police department was dismissed. On 13 December the Ministry of Internal Affairs announced that it had found violations of the law by some police officers involved in the dispersal of the demonstration on 30 November. On 14 December the General Prosecutor’s office announced that it had started criminal proceedings for exceeding authority against Vladymyr Sykovych, the Head of the National Security Committee, Alexander Popov, the Head of the Kyiv City Administration, and the Head of the Kyiv city police and his Deputy, Valery Koryak and Petro Fedchuk.



© Alexandr Piliugin

These actions do not absolve the authorities from the responsibility to investigate each individual complaint of the abusive use of force by riot police, and to ensure accountability of the officers responsible.

Vasyl Panchenko, an architect from Kyiv, told Amnesty International what happened to him: “I saw them beating people - they were beating people as they fell to the ground. They pushed me to the ground – I saw three of them (riot police). They beat me and a couple who were near me. Then they picked us up and told us to go away.” Vasyl later helped a woman who had been beaten to seek medical attention and they were beaten again as they looked for an ambulance. Vasyl Panchenko has been charged with the administrative offence of hooliganism for preventing the erection of the New Year tree. He has complained to the General Prosecutor’s Office about the police ill-treatment.

Viktor,⁵ an electrical welder from Lviv, described what he witnessed on the square on 30 November: “When we started to sing they moved towards us and started to beat people. I didn’t notice what was happening to me, I just saw what was happening around me in this bloody place... I remember this girl – she was about 18 I think – and when I think about it even now I feel sick. I saw how one of the officers raised his leg and brought it down on the girl’s leg below her knee. I wanted to help her with another man but when we tried to lift her we were pushed aside and I lost my balance and ended up under the feet of the spetsnaz (special police force).” Viktor lost consciousness and was diagnosed later as suffering from concussion, and bruises to his head and neck. He returned to Lviv where he was treated for his injuries.

1 DECEMBER



© Alexandr Piliugin

On 1 December violent clashes erupted between riot police and a small number of violent protestors at the front of a group of hundreds of peaceful demonstrators on Bankova Street outside the presidential administration building. Video footage shows these protestors driving a tractor and wielding heavy chains and other weapons. Many observers have claimed that the violent protestors were in fact provocateurs with links to law enforcement officials, but this information has not been confirmed. None of those that the video footage shows as being responsible for the worst of the violence have been arrested or charged.

At least 50 riot police and hundreds of protestors were injured before the protest was dispersed a few hours later at about 5pm. There are reports of indiscriminate and excessive use of force by riot police towards peaceful protestors and the wounded. Further video footage shows about a dozen injured people lying on the street and riot police kicking and hitting them with batons.

Valery Garagutz, a journalist from Dnipropetrovsk, arrived on Bankova Street after the demonstration had been dispersed to tend to the wounded. His friend, Andriy Denisenko, described events on the street: “The Berkut forces attacked the protestors indiscriminately, whether it was those who had actively fought the police or peaceful citizens who were just present on the street at the same time. After this about a dozen people were left lying on the ground with various injuries. Valery had his first aid kit with him and he went to Bankova Street after the dispersal to help tend to the wounded. While he was bandaging the head of one of the wounded he was hit from behind without any warning with a baton by a riot police officer. He was pushed to the ground and kicked in the head.”



©Amnesty International

International standards require that law enforcement officials should not use force unless it is strictly necessary and to the extent required for the performance of their duty. This means that when using any force in policing demonstrations they must differentiate between peaceful and non-peaceful participants. However, riot police appear to have beaten all those present at Bankova Street irrespective of whether or not the individuals were engaging in violence.

Valery Garagutz and eight other allegedly peaceful protestors were detained on suspicion of “organizing mass disorder”, a crime that carries a maximum sentence of eight years’ imprisonment, despite the fact that none of them knew each other before the event, (see Unfair Trials).

11 DECEMBER



© Alexandr Piliugin

At about 1 am on 11 December large numbers of riot police attempted to dismantle the barricades that protestors had erected around Independence Square and neighbouring streets, with the declared purpose of unblocking the streets for traffic. Later in the day, the Minister of Internal Affairs stated that there would be no violent dispersal of the demonstrations, but that the actions of the riot police had been necessary to respond to numerous complaints from citizens about the disruption of traffic in the city centre.⁶ Riot police and Interior Ministry Troops attempted to try and push protestors off the streets and they were accompanied by local authority workers who dismantled the barricades wherever possible. The “shoving match” between protestors and law enforcement officers continued until about 4.30am, but the numbers of protestors continued to grow and finally the police retreated back to their buses.

About 10 people were detained, but they were not charged and were released after a few hours. While the use of force by riot police was not on the scale witnessed on 30 November or 1 December, there were reports of unnecessary use of force towards peaceful protestors.

Serhiy Demenko, a computer programmer, was on the street on 11 December and described how the demonstrators attempted to keep the barricades in place as riot police pushed against them with riot shields: “We soon got warm. You could say we were dancing. We would push them (the Berkut forces) for a few minutes then they would push us and we would take a break. After about 20 minutes I was thrown to the ground. I was beaten and then I was forced down the corridor (of riot police). They had formed a corridor and threw people from one to the other like sacks and beat them as they passed them on. You would take a step, get beaten, fall down, and then take a step again and get beaten.”

4. HARASSMENT OF COMPLAINANTS

Victims and witnesses must be protected against any retribution or intimidation, including counter-charges, as a result of making a complaint.⁷ Yet in Ukraine complainants are sometimes pressured into giving up their complaints, some face further torture and other ill-treatment or prosecution because of their complaint against the police.⁸ Amnesty International has documented two cases where those who have complained about excessive use of force by law enforcement officers during “EuroMaydan” have been threatened or pressurized by police and prosecutors in order to force them to drop their complaints.

Viktor,⁹ lodged a complaint with the prosecutor immediately in Kyiv about the fact that he was beaten on 30 November. However, after he returned home to Lviv he and his family have come under pressure. A police officer visited the workers' dormitory (Obshchezhytie) where he lives with his wife and child, and questioned his eight-year-old son, Alexander, in their absence. He asked for Viktor's phone number. Viktor told Amnesty International he has since received repeated phone calls from police officers trying to convince him to withdraw his complaint or to come to the police station and write the report “correctly”. Viktor has been advised by his lawyer to refuse to go to the police station. During one call he was told to withdraw his complaint about the “spetsnaz” (special forces) and to complain instead about the police at Shevchenkovskiy police station in Kyiv although the police officers there had not ill-treated him.

Yevgeniy Serdyuk, a journalist from Kyiv, was on Independence Square on 30 November when riot police surrounded protestors. He was hit on the back, kidneys and shoulder and complained to the prosecutor about the beating. On 2 December he was called into the Kyiv city prosecutor's office for questioning regarding his status as a victim in the case. He told Amnesty International that the questions had been manipulative, confusing and leading, and that somebody with less experience or worse legal advice might have been led into confessing to having participated in “mass disorder”. At one point an investigator from the Prosecutor General's office joined the interrogation and after the report of the interrogation had been signed he attempted to continue the interrogation but was prevented by Yevgeniy Serdyuk's lawyer. After four hours of interrogation Yevgeniy Serdyuk asked for an ambulance to be called because he started to suffer chest pains and feared he was having a heart attack.

5. UNFAIR TRIALS

Dozens of people who participated in the demonstrations have been detained and subjected to unfair legal proceedings and charged with criminal offences; Amnesty International believes that these measures have been taken against them solely because of their exercise of their right to peaceful assembly.

Twelve people have been charged with criminal offences in connection with the violent clashes on Bankova Street on 1 December. Gennadiy Cherevko, Sergiy Nuzhnenko, Mykola Lazarevskiy, Oleksandr Ostashchenko, Valeriy Garagutz, Yegor Previr, Yuriy Bolotov, Vladyslav Zagorovko, and Yaroslav Prytulenko were detained on Bankova Street immediately after the dispersal of the demonstration, and charged with the serious criminal offence of “organizing mass disorder”, that carries a maximum sentence of eight years. Andriy Dzyndzya and Volodymyr Kadura were detained on 5 December and Oleg Panas was detained on 10 December in Lviv. All those detained on 1 December were seriously injured after being hit with batons and kicked by riot police on Bankova Street. All were initially remanded in custody after flawed proceedings - judges approving their detention disregarded obvious contradictions and inconsistencies. They also failed completely to consider whether alternative measures such as bail or house arrest would not be more appropriate, despite this being a requirement under Ukrainian law and despite the applications of their lawyers on this point.



From left to right: Gennadiy Cherevko, Mykola Lazarevskiy, Oleksandr Ostashchenko and Yegor Previr
© Amnesty International

Andriy Dzyndzya, Volodymyr Kadura and Yaroslav Prytulenko remain in detention while the others have been either released under various bail conditions or have confessed to the lesser administrative offence of “participation in public disorder” and been fined.

Andriy Dzyndzha is a journalist working for a police monitoring NGO called “Road Control”. On 1 December he was caught on camera following the tractor that had been requisitioned by demonstrators and was being taken to Bankova Street. Videos show him walking beside the tractor photographing events. On 5 December he was detained and is being investigated for “seizing a means of transport through force”. According to his wife and legal representative some of the evidence brought against him consisted of statements from witnesses concerning handing over the keys of the tractor which did not identify him personally. Another witness claimed to have seen him on the tractor, but failed to describe him correctly. On 9 December his lawyer, Viktor Smaliy, was also detained and is being investigated for allegedly “attempting to murder a judge”. The charge relates to the detention hearing of Andriy Dzyndzha on 8 December. When the judge read out the decision to detain him for two months those present in the court room rushed towards the judge shouting “Shame”. Witnesses told Amnesty International that no-one was seen attacking the judge.

Mykola Lazarevskiy is being investigated for the criminal offence of organizing mass disorder. A police witness stated that he actively took part in mass disorder and struck a Berkut officer. According to his lawyer, the witness made many errors and claimed, for instance, that Mykola Lazarevskiy was wearing a red jacket when in fact he was wearing a black jacket.

Vladyslav Zagorovko, a 38-year-old long-distance truck driver and father of three from Brovary in Kyiv district, took part in the demonstrations on 1 December because he wanted to witness the “historic events”. He was beaten by riot police and suffered numerous injuries including broken ribs and a detached retina. He was initially charged with “organizing mass disorder” an offence that carries a maximum sentence of eight years, but on 11 December, after 10 days in detention, he confessed to having taken part in mass disorder and was released on payment of a fine of 850 Hryvnya (80 Euros).

On 19 December the Ukrainian parliament passed a law “absolving of responsibility” (Звільнити від відповідальності) all those accused of administrative and criminal offences in connection with the events starting on 21 November.¹⁰ At the time of writing Viktor Smaliy, Andriy Dzyndzha, Volodymyr Kadura and Yaroslav Prytulenko remain in detention.

6. VIOLATIONS OF FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION – HARASSMENT OF JOURNALISTS

“I have been working for 19 years and I can only remember one occasion when Berkut beat peaceful protestors, and that was a huge scandal”.

Gleb Garanich, Reuters Cameraman

The OSCE Guidelines stress the important role played by journalists, in monitoring public assemblies and in facilitating exercise of the right to freedom of expression, including the right of the public to information on such matters. As such, journalists must be treated as distinct from participants and be given as much access as possible by the authorities. In cases where public assemblies are dispersed, journalists may also be asked to disperse, but they should not be prevented from observing and recording the policing operation.¹¹

According to media reports at least 40 journalists suffered injuries during the “EuroMaydan” events mostly at the hands of riot police.¹² The law firm Juscutum is representing 11 journalists who have lodged complaints about being injured by riot police.

Roman Kupriyanov, a cameraman for Euronews, was working on Bankova Street on 1 December from 3pm when the police started dispersing the protestors. He saw riot police beating people lying on the ground and continued filming. He was wearing his accreditation badge around his neck and he told Amnesty International that the size of his camera made it obvious that he was a professional journalist. A police officer ordered him to lie down and he was approached by 3-4 others who started hitting him. He was beaten on the head, body, and limbs with batons and kicked. He then got up with help of friends and they went to find an ambulance. He has lodged a complaint with the General Prosecutor’s Office about the beating.

Gleb Garanich works as a cameraman for Reuters. He was on Independence Square on 30 November when riot police moved in to disperse demonstrators. He told Amnesty International what happened: “They started to kick and beat people with batons including the journalists. I asked one officer, politely, why he was behaving like that and he hit me on the head with a baton so that I wouldn’t ask stupid questions.” He was wearing a fluorescent

Reuters jacket and knew the officer who hit him. Gleb Garanich required five stitches to his scalp as a result of the beating.

There have also been reports of raids on media outlets covering the demonstration or linked to opposition parties. On 9 December the opposition newspaper Vechirni Visti, the online TV station INTV and the news website Cenzor.net were raided by riot police and forced to stop operations temporarily. The police claimed that the raids were in connection with ongoing investigations.¹³

On 13 December a TV Radio station, Marion, in Evpatoriya in the Crimea was raided by law enforcement officers and closed down. On 5 December at a meeting of the city council the Deputy mayor of Evpatoriya had stated: “If you don’t stop broadcasting Evromaidan on Marion we will just close you down. The people of Evpatoriya don’t need such information.”

On 10 December Dmitri Avaliani, a journalist for the Georgian television station “Tabula” covering the events in Kyiv was visited in his hotel by representatives of the State Ukrainian Security Service and asked to leave the country within a day. He was told that it was connected to his coverage of the events in Kyiv. On 21 December another Georgian journalist David Kakulia from Rustavi 2 TV channel was denied entry to Ukraine at Boryspil airport in Kyiv. He told Amnesty International: “They told me I am denied entry to Ukraine for one year starting from 8 December 2013.”

Amnesty International reminds the Ukrainian authorities that it has an obligation to respect and ensure the right to freedom of expression, which includes the right of the public to receive information. Exercise of the right to freedom of expression can only be restricted where it is demonstrably necessary and proportionate for the protection of national security, public order, public health or morals, or respect for the rights and reputation of others. The Ukrainian authorities must allow journalists and media outlets to carry out their work unhindered. All allegations of use of excessive use of force by riot police against journalists or other independent monitors must be promptly independently and effectively investigated.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Ukrainian authorities should:

- Immediately and unconditionally release all those detained solely in connection with their peaceful participation in the demonstration, and drop all criminal or administrative charges against them;
- Investigate promptly, independently and effectively all allegations of disproportionate and/or indiscriminate use of force during the policing of “EuroMaydan” in Kyiv and other cities. Any police officers found to be responsible for these violations, and those officers who ordered, or condoned the use of excessive force must face criminal or disciplinary proceedings as appropriate;
- Ensure that all those who were ill-treated or arbitrarily detained for their peaceful participation in the demonstration are provided with effective reparation, including fair and adequate compensation, and appropriate medical care where necessary;
- Provide adequate and effective protection from intimidation and harassment to all those who lodged complaints about violations of their rights by police officers during the “EuroMaydan” events;
- Investigate all reports of harassment of journalists, or closure or harassment of media outlets for their coverage of the events;
- Investigate all allegations of arbitrary attempts to deny the right to freedom of peaceful assembly, such as the decisions to disperse peaceful protests, suspend the right to hold peaceful assemblies, and prevent individuals, including students, from exercising their right to peaceful assembly, and any alleged reprisals for the exercise of this right, and take measures to prevent any repetition of such violations.

ENDNOTES

¹ OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), Guidelines on freedom of Peaceful Assembly, 2nd ed (2010), referred to hereafter as the OSCE/ODIHR Guidelines, <http://www.osce.org/odihr/73405>

² In the absence of a national law on freedom of peaceful assembly, courts in Ukraine refer to local authority regulations or to the Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) of 28 July 1988 on the procedure for organizing and holding meetings, rallies, street marches and demonstrations in the USSR.

³ This is in violation of the Ukrainian Law on Enforcement Proceedings court judgements which requires that judgements should be enforced between 6am and 10pm unless there is grave risk to life.

⁴ Otherwise known as Berkut (Golden Eagle), the riot police are a special division within the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

⁵ Viktor requested that his surname should not be used.

⁶ <http://mvs.gov.ua/mvs/control/main/uk/publish/article/939358>

⁷ Article 13 of the Convention against Torture, Guideline VII of the Council of Europe Guidelines on eradicating impunity for serious human rights violations.

⁸ See ‘No Evidence of a Crime’: *paying the price for police impunity in Ukraine*, AI Index: EUR 50/009/2011, October 2011, pp. 39 – 42, <http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/info/EUR50/009/2011>

⁹ The same Viktor who was beaten by riot police on 30 November and chose not to give his surname.

¹⁰ http://w1.c1.rada.gov.ua/pls/zweb2/webproc4_1?pf3511=49375

¹¹ See OSCE Guidelines on Freedom of Peaceful Assembly, second edition,.

¹² http://news.liga.net/news/politics/933645-v_kieve_postradali_bolshe_desyatka_zhurnalistov_spisok.htm

¹³ http://en.rsf.org/ukraine-raids-on-three-opposition-media-as-09-12-2013_45584.html

AMNESTY
INTERNATIONAL



www.amnesty.org