Your Excellency, Dear Ambassador

With this letter, we are transmitting to you, as the Chairperson of Human Rights Meetings of the Committee of Ministers’ Deputies (CM/DH), the attached address to the members of the Committee of Ministers’ Deputies signed by 20 members of Parliament of Georgia.

We would be most grateful for your support in distributing the attached address to the members of the Committee.

Yours faithfully,

David Bakradze,
Minority Leader
Chairman of European Georgia – Movement for Liberty
Member of the Georgian Delegation to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe

Giorgi Kandelaki, MP
Member of the Georgian Delegation to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe

Attachment: Four (4) pages
To: members of the Committee of Ministers’ Deputies of the Council of Europe

Dear Ambassador,

As you are aware, in its landmark decision published on 14 June 2016 the European Court of Human Rights ruled that fundamental rights of the former Prime Minister of Georgia – imprisoned since 2013 – were violated by the Georgian state party. The Court specifically established that Article 18 of the European Convention of Human Rights was breached in relation to Article 5 and that the authorities pursued “ulterior motive” and “hidden agenda” when prosecuting him. On 27 November 2017 the Grand Chamber of the Strasbourg Court confirmed the earlier unanimous decision.

In almost 60-year history of the European Court there are only seven cases, including that of Mr Merabishvili, in which breach of Article 18 of the European Convention of Human Rights was established, but first time ECHR’s Grand Chamber has addressed the issue. Mr Merabishvili is only third politician in relation to whom this breach was established by the Strasbourg Court and the first case of this kind in the history of Georgia. Article 18 of the Convention is essentially an article prohibiting governments to use restrictive measures (such as arrest and/or prosecution) for reasons other than those considered legitimate by the Convention - for instance, political motivation. In other words, in addition to declaring Mr Merabishvili’s continued detention in breach of article (5§3) of the Convention, the Court unanimously established that the reasons of restrictive measures applied to Mr Merabishvili (arrest and detention) were not those declared by the Government of Georgia, but rather the Government was politically motivated in those actions. Thus, while the Court does not use definition of “political prisoner” in any of its cases, this decision, virtually declares Mr Merabishvili to be a political prisoner just like Mr Lutsenko, Ms Timoshenko and others were.

Unfortunately, reaction of the Georgian authorities to this landmark judgment has been disappointing. Senior Georgian Government figures have tried to downplay its significance and have argued that payment of 4,000 EUR to Mr Merabishvili would constitute its actual execution. In addition, by exploiting timeframe allowed by relevant procedures to their limit, the Georgian State party has been trying to delay discussion of the matter by the CM DH.

In the Annual Human Rights Report presented to the Georgian Parliament on 12 July of this year the Georgian Public Defender (Ombudsman) Nino Lomjaria (see Annex I) called the Georgian authorities for timely execution of the judgment also mentioning that in most cases when violation of Article 18 is found member states tend to release individuals in question.

Unfortunately, it has come to our attention that the implementation of the execution is still not on the agenda of the DH meeting in September not least because the Georgian Government has chosen to fully exhaust deadlines allowed by different procedures, essentially pursuing delay tactics. In this light, our most sincere request to members of the Committee of Ministers would be to discuss the execution of the judgment without further delay at earliest possible convenience and call upon the Georgian authorities to release Mr Merabishvili as it has done in all other Article 18 judgments.

Sincerely,
Irakli Abesadze, MP
David Bakradze, Chairman
George Bokeria, MP
Mamuka Chikovani, MP
Khatuna Gogorishvili, MP
Tengiz Gunava, MP
Otar Kakhidze, MP
Giorgi Kandelaki, MP
Sergi Kapanadze, MP
Lela Keburia, MP
Zaza Kedelashvili, MP
Elene Khoshtaria, MP
Irma Nadirashvili, MP
Sergo Ratiani, MP
Zur ab Tchiaberashvili, MP
George Tsereteli, MP
George Tugushi, MP
Lasha Damenia, MP
George Gviniaashvili, MP
Akaki Bobokhidze, MP
6.3. THE CASE OF IVANE MERABISHVILI

In the case of Ivane Merabishvili, the European Court of Human Rights found a serious violation of the right to liberty and security of person for the purposes other than those prescribed by the European Convention on Human Rights. For the restoration of this right, Georgia has yet to carry out effective measures. The violation of Article 18 taken in conjunction with a serious interference with the right to liberty of person is a rare occasion in the European Court’s practice. In such cases, the respondent states mostly respond with the domestic measures involving the applicant’s release. The Public Defender of Georgia deems that for the enforcement of the European Court’s judgment regarding Ivane Merabishvili, the Georgian authorities, under the supervision of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, should take all necessary individual and general measures for comprehensive and timely execution of the judgments as required by article 46 of the European Convention.

---


208 The violation of Article 18 of the Convention for the Protection Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms were only found in 7 cases: Gusinskiy v. Russia (application no. 70276/01); Cebotari v. Moldova (application no. 35615/06); Lutsenko v. Ukraine (application no. 6492/11); Tymoshenko v. Ukraine (application no. 49872/11); Merabishvili v. Georgia (application no. 72508/13); Rasul Jafarov v. Azerbaijan (application no. 69981/14); and Ilgar Mammadov v. Azerbaijan (application no. 919/15). All the applicants, except for Ilgar Mammadov have been released from the places of deprivation of liberty.

209 Among other examples, the following cases are noteworthy: Ukraine released former Prime Minister Tymoshenko by a parliamentary resolution and released former Minister of Internal Affairs by a presidential pardon; Azerbaijani journalist Rasul Jafarov was also released by a presidential pardon. Information is available at: https://rm.coe.int/compilation-decisions-2014-2018-en/-/168077e33a, (accessed on 4.3.2018).

210 Under Article 46.1 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, the High Contracting Parties undertake to abide by the final judgment of the Court in any case to which they are parties.