



I R

INTERIGHTS



Annual Review

2006/07

The International Centre
for the Legal Protection
of Human Rights

INTERIGHTS, the International Centre for the Legal Protection of Human Rights, works to promote respect for human rights through the use of law. We do so by providing legal expertise on international and comparative human rights law to lawyers, judges, human rights defenders and other partners. The main focus of our work is strategic litigation – initiating or supporting cases where there is either a potential for human rights standards to be developed or where existing standards are under threat. In cases where important principles are at stake, we may act as co-representative, *amicus curiae* or adviser to counsel. We complement our litigation work through legal capacity building and standard setting activities and by publishing and disseminating legal information. Through all of these activities, we seek both to promote the enforcement of human rights standards at the international, regional and domestic levels, and to empower our partners to do the same.

Regionally, we focus on Africa, the Commonwealth, Europe (Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union) and South Asia. Our thematic areas of work – economic and social rights, equality, and security and the rule of law – are priorities across all of these regions.

FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

In 2007 INTERIGHTS celebrated 25 years of promoting human rights through the use of law. During the last quarter century we have made a significant contribution to the expansion of human rights law through key test cases or the development of new standards, as well as helping to develop a cadre of skilled lawyers and judges in the regions in which we work.

This report covers the calendar years 2006 and 2007, a period of significant achievements and opportunities as well as some substantial challenges for the organisation and for human rights defenders generally. In response to demands from legal partners and the burgeoning of cases on key human rights issues before domestic, regional and international tribunals, we substantially increased our focus on strategic litigation. Some of these cases are highlighted in this review, including judgments on critical issues such as the recognition of the principle of indirect discrimination by the European Court of Human Rights, access to health care in the context of a woman seeking a termination of pregnancy on medical grounds, and the extent to which human rights law applies to the actions of armed forces operating outside of a State's territory.

Other issues which INTERIGHTS has tackled recently include the responsibilities of the State to prevent domestic violence, State duties to protect life and investigate killings in the context of counter-terrorism operations, and the extent of the duties which fall on a State which has colluded in the practice of extraordinary rendition.

We have continued to support partners through strategic litigation seminars –

capacity building activities targeting practising lawyers designed to explore a particular thematic issue importance regionally or globally. Our strategic litigation seminars covered issues as diverse as domestic violence, administrative detention, extraordinary rendition and access to justice. More comprehensive training activities took place in the South Caucasus, Egypt (training on the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights), and in Serbia and Montenegro.

This report also profiles our contribution to the development of a more effective and efficient system of protection of human rights in Africa and Europe, notably through efforts to strengthen the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights and the recently established African Court, as well as seeking to influence the on-going process of reform regarding the European Court of Human Rights.

We were delighted to be able to expand our work through the recruitment of additional staff notably in the areas of equality, security and the rule of law and Europe. We also renewed and strengthened membership of our International Advisory Council which had a very successful meeting in the autumn of 2007 during which it reviewed both our on-going work and our future priorities.

Finally, thanks to the generous support of our donors, we recently overhauled and upgraded our website as part of an on-going commitment to make it a key informational tool for lawyers, judges and human rights defenders seeking to use international and comparative human rights law

in their day to day work. Please do take the time to visit it at: www.interights.org

Once more, I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of everyone at INTERIGHTS to thank our many supporters, partners and friends with whom we collaborated in the course of 2006/7. We look forward to working with you in the future.

David Geer
Executive Director

STRATEGIC LITIGATION OUR APPROACH: A CASE STUDY

Czech Roma Children Denied Right to Education

Case name: DH and Others v Czech Republic

Forum: European Court of Human Rights

Articles concerned: European Convention on Human Rights, Article 14 – prohibition against ethnic discrimination, and Article 2 of the First Additional Protocol – right to education

INTERIGHTS' role: Third-party intervener, along with Human Rights Watch

For many years the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) adopted a narrow approach to equality law. While it accepted that State policies or laws that directly discriminate against individuals may violate the Convention, it had never unequivocally stated that the same was true of indirect discrimination; measures, which on the face of them do not discriminate but which nonetheless have a discriminatory impact.

In 2006 INTERIGHTS intervened in *D.H. and Others v the Czech Republic*, a case which raised important issues not only for the legal protection of Roma across Europe but across grounds of discrimination in both Europe and internationally. The case concerned Roma children who had been placed in schools for children with learning difficulties. Although all children had to sit a common examination, research revealed that Roma children were ten times more likely to be assigned to a special school. We intervened in the case with arguments designed to persuade the Court to accept the principle of indirect discrimination, as well

as to recognise that in order to establish that such discrimination exists victims should be able to rely upon statistical evidence of discriminatory impact. We also argued that once evidence of indirect discrimination is provided, it is for the State to show that such discrimination can be justified.

In November 2007, the Court's Grand Chamber ruled in favour of the Roma children, finding that the Czech policy of special schools was a discriminatory denial of the right to education. The Court's analysis widely reflected INTERIGHTS' intervention, determining that indirect discrimination could violate the Convention, that disproportionate impact could be proven through the use of statistics and that once evidence of indirect discrimination was provided it was for the State to prove that such discrimination was lawful and justified.

The case is illustrative of INTERIGHTS approach to litigation. We become involved in cases which we believe are of strategic importance in that they have the potential to strengthen the protection of human rights internationally. We work closely with local or international partners – in this case the European Roma Rights Centre – and only intervene if we believe we can bring real value, normally through our expertise in international and comparative human rights law.

Right: Roma children in the Romanian town of Tulcea. Constantin Cojocariu

THE EUROPEAN COURT'S ANALYSIS WIDELY REFLECTED INTERIGHTS' INTERVENTION, DETERMINING THAT INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION COULD VIOLATE THE EUROPEAN CONVENTION, THAT DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACT COULD BE PROVEN THROUGH THE USE OF STATISTICS AND THAT ONCE EVIDENCE OF INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION WAS PROVIDED IT WAS FOR THE STATE TO PROVE THAT SUCH DISCRIMINATION WAS LAWFUL AND JUSTIFIED.



WORKING WORLDWIDE

Netherlands

Ramzy v the Netherlands – *Amicus* intervention before ECtHR in case on deportation in the face of risk of torture or ill-treatment in destination country.

United Kingdom

Al-Skeini and Others v Secretary of State for Defence – *Amicus* intervention before UK House of Lords in support of demand for judicial inquiry by families of six Iraqi civilians killed by UK forces.

Poland

Tysi c v Poland – Advice to lawyers in successful case before ECtHR, which ruled that a Polish woman's right to private life was violated by lack of access to a medically necessary abortion.

Slovakia

KH v Slovakia – Advice to lawyers applying to the ECtHR on behalf of Roma women who had been forcibly sterilised in Slovakian hospitals.

Moldova

Catan v Moldova – Advice to lawyers bringing case to ECtHR on linguistic discrimination and intimidation in schools in the Transdnistria region.

Georgia

Mamasakhlisi v Russia and Georgia – Advice to lawyers in case before ECtHR concerning the ill-treatment during detention of a Georgian man by the *de facto* Republic of Abkhazia.

Turkey

Opuz v Turkey – *Amicus* intervention in case before ECtHR on Turkish government's failure to protect Turkish woman from ongoing physical abuse and ultimately murder at the hand of her husband.

Czech Republic


DH and Others v Czech Republic – *Amicus* intervention in case before ECtHR concerning the segregation of Roma children into schools for the mentally disabled.

Balkans

ESC Collective Complaints – Drafting of collective complaints against several south-eastern European states on right to housing, education and health care.

Abbreviations

ACHPR – African Court of Human and Peoples' Rights
ECtHR – European Court of Human Rights
ESC – European Social Charter
UN HRC – United Nations Human Rights Committee



Egypt

INTERIGHTS and EIPR v Egypt – Worked with Egyptian Initiative for Personal Rights (EIPR) to obtain stay of execution for three men allegedly involved in Red Sea resort bombings.

Al-Aqqad v Egypt / Metwalli v Egypt – Representation together with EIPR of two Egyptian men imprisoned for their religious views. Both were released from prison after INTERIGHTS filed complaints on their behalf.

Al-Kheir and Others v Egypt – Representation with EIPR before ACHPR of female journalists assaulted and sexually harassed during political protest.

Algeria

Saker v Algeria – Advice to lawyer bringing case to UN HRC regarding the disappearance and secret detention and sentencing of an Algerian school teacher.

Senegal

FIDH v Senegal – Intervention before ACPHR in case seeking to overturn amnesty for human rights violators in Senegal.

Angola

Marques v Angola – Representation before UN HRC of Angolan journalist imprisoned for views critical of government.

Israel

Advice to Israel-based NGO Adalah in successful Supreme Court case granting Palestinians the right to compensation for damage caused by Israeli forces.

Botswana

Good v Botswana – Representation before ACHPR of Australian academic deported from Botswana for publishing an academic paper critical of the government.

Ethiopia

Bekele and Demissie v Ethiopia – Advice on access to justice in treason cases brought against Ethiopian lawyers.

Maldives

Extensive opinion for the Maldivian Detainee Network on the compliance with fair trial standards of the ongoing proceedings against head of the opposition for alleged treason offences.

Sri Lanka

Singarasa v Sri Lanka – Advice to lawyers on follow-up and enforcement of UN HRC decision in case of Sri Lankan man sentenced to 35 years in prison following a forced confession.

Fiji

Advice to Fiji Human Rights Commission on the constitutionality of criminal sanctions against effigy burning. Organisation of regional conference on economic and social rights in the Pacific.

Russia

Maskhadovy v Russia – Representation before ECHR on behalf of family of killed Chechen politician to obtain investigation of circumstances surrounding his death and to secure release of body for burial.

Nepal

Advice to Nepal Disabled Human Rights Centre on legal advocacy for disability rights.

SECURITY AND THE RULE OF LAW

Work in this area seeks to challenge the trend to view human rights as an obstacle to security, particularly security from terrorism, as well as the use of terrorist threats as a justification for the disregard of international human rights law. We provide legal responses to attempts to re-interpret and curtail fundamental rights, such as the right to life, freedom from torture, and due process rights.

While our activities do not focus on developments in the United States, our day-to-day work is informed by them. It seeks to address both the ways in which other States have been complicit in activities sponsored by the US such as the CIA programme of renditions or have used the language of the “war on terror” to undermine human rights and fundamental freedoms more generally. The impact of our activities in this field is enhanced by those partner organisations which have campaigning or educational mandates aimed at governments, political parties and policy makers, as well as the media and wider public.

AREAS OF FOCUS: SECURITY AND THE RULE OF LAW

- EXTRA-LEGAL RENDITIONS AND SECRET DETENTIONS
- RETURNING OF ASYLUM SEEKERS TO COUNTRIES WHERE THEY MAY BE AT RISK OF TORTURE OR ILL-TREATMENT (REFOULEMENT)
- POSITIVE OBLIGATIONS OF THE STATE IN RESPECT OF TORTURE
- DISPROPORTIONATE USE OF VIOLENCE DURING SECURITY OPERATIONS
- RESTRICTIVE APPROACH TO APPLICABILITY OF HUMAN RIGHTS LAW

Wrongful Death and Denial of Burial Rights in Chechnya

Case name: Maskhadov v Russia

Forum: European Court of Human Rights

Articles concerned: European Convention on Human Rights, Article 2 – right to life, Article 3 – prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment, Article 8 – private life, Article 9 – freedom of religion

INTERIGHTS’ role: Co-representative to the applicants

Aslan Maskhadov was widely recognised as President of the then Chechen Republic of Ichkeria. He was the architect of the first peace agreement signed with President Yeltsin in May 1997. Although this accord foundered and Russian forces entered Chechnya in 1999, he remained committed to a negotiated solution to the Chechen conflict. Maskhadov was killed on 8 March 2005 in the village of Tolstoyurt in Chechnya during the course of special operations carried out by Russia’s internal security services, the FSB. The precise circumstances regarding Maskhadov’s death are disputed although Maskhadov’s family contends that he was killed by FSB agents. The Russian authorities failed to inform Maskhadov’s family of his death. The family learned this news via reports on State television which included footage of Mr Maskhadov’s corpse displaying multiple bullet wounds and bruising.

This case raises important questions about the State’s obligations under the European Convention on Human Rights to protect life, to thoroughly and independently investigate

the circumstance of a killing and respect the beliefs and burial customs of close relatives of the deceased. Our submission to the Court is that Russia violated Aslan Maskhadov’s right to life both through its responsibility for his killing and its failure to carry out an independent investigation into his death. We also maintain that by allowing Maskhadov’s corpse to be displayed on State television and refusing to release it for burial in accordance with Chechen customs and beliefs, Russia has subjected the family to inhuman and degrading treatment, violated their right to respect for private and family life, discriminated against them on the grounds of religion and ethnicity, and violated their rights to manifest their religious beliefs. The case is due to be heard in the course of 2008.

“OUR WORK SEEKS TO PROMOTE THE RULE OF LAW BY UPHOLDING COMPLIANCE WITH INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS LAW. WE USE LITIGATION TO STRENGTHEN THE CURRENT LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND ALSO TO DEVELOP MORE PROGRESSIVE LEGAL STANDARDS APPLICABLE TO THE AREA OF COUNTER-TERRORISM.”

*Vesselina Vandova, Senior Lawyer,
Security and the Rule of Law Programme*

First Rendition Case Before European Court

Case name: Boumediene and Others v Bosnia and Herzegovina

Forum: European Court of Human Rights

Articles concerned: European Convention on Human Rights, Article 3 – prohibition of torture, Article 5 – right to liberty and security of the person.

INTERIGHTS' role: Third party intervener, along with the International Commission of Jurists

Renditions and secret detentions not only disregard any legal process and blatantly violate human rights, they are committed through international cooperation and reveal an international acceptance of the practice. We are challenging this trend of international collaboration in the first case before the European Court on 'extraordinary rendition' which we expect will have a significant impact on the legal standards of protection throughout and beyond Europe.

The case concerns the unlawful handover by Bosnia and Herzegovina of six Algerians, some of who are Bosnian nationals, to the United States. Since their transfer in January 2002, the applicants have been detained in Guantanamo and subjected to ill-treatment and indefinite detention. Their attempts to secure release from Guantanamo have repeatedly failed. The applicants complain before the Court that after rendering them into us custody in breach of the domestic courts orders prohibiting their forcible removal, Bosnia and Herzegovina failed to take any meaningful

measures aimed at ensuring their release and so failed to protect their rights under the European Convention. Together with the International Commission of Jurists, we submitted written comments to the court which responded to the increasingly trans-national nature of human rights violations involving multiple violations by several States. The comments provide an overview of the positive obligations of States in circumstances where the wrongful act of a State has led to a continuing deprivation of human rights by another State, and propose particular measures of protection that are required in such circumstances.



Below: INTERIGHTS intervened as an *amicus curiae* in the *Al-Skeini* case focusing on the extra-territorial application of the European Convention to UK troops in Basra, Iraq. Panos Pictures/Elio Colavolpe/Editing

Stay of Execution in Taba Bombings Case

Case name: INTERIGHTS and EIPR (on behalf of Sabah and Others) v Egypt

Forum: African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights

Articles concerned: African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, Article 4 – right to life, Article 5 – prohibition of torture, Article 7 – right to fair trial

INTERIGHTS' role: Co-representative, with Egyptian Initiative for Personal Rights

In November 2006, the Egyptian State Security Emergency Court passed sentences of death on three defendants accused of bombings in the Sinai Peninsula in 2004. There is no right of appeal against sentences passed by this Court. Together with a partner organisation in Egypt, the Egyptian Initiative for Personal Rights, we brought a complaint to the African Commission arguing a number of violations of the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, including torture in detention, failure to meet fair trial standards and the absence of a right of appeal from a sentence of death. The Egyptian government ratified the African Charter in 1984, thus accepting to be bound by its provisions.

The Commission has not yet ruled on the substance of the case, but in June 2007 requested the Egyptian authorities to stay execution pending consideration of the complaint.

Read more on our security and rule of law work at <http://www.interights.org/serol-programme/index.htm>

EQUALITY

The aim of our work in this area is to assist in the elaboration of stronger international and regional jurisprudence in respect of key principles of equality. We work to ensure that equality is understood as a dynamic principle of human rights law, which can inform and shape enjoyment of rights across the board. Our case docket over the last year has included cases on a number of important issues such as violence against women, reproductive and sexual rights, freedom of religion and expression, and the rights of persons with disabilities.

Failure of Turkish and Bulgarian Authorities to Halt Ongoing Domestic Violence

Case names: Bevacqua v Bulgaria, Opuz v Turkey

Forum: European Court of Human Rights

Articles concerned: In Bevacqua and Opuz:

European Convention on Human Rights, Article 2 – right to life, Article 3 – prohibition of torture or inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, Article 13 – right to effective remedy, Article 14 – freedom from discrimination

INTERIGHTS' role: In Bevacqua – co-representative, with the Bulgarian Gender Research Foundation; In Opuz – third party intervener

The Council of Europe recognises domestic violence as the leading killer of women aged between 19 and 44. INTERIGHTS is currently supporting two domestic violence cases before the European Court, both highlighting the particular vulnerability of women to violence by family members and the challenges faced by women in seeking the protection of the State from such violence. More specifically they explore the obligations of the State to prosecute perpetrators of domestic violence and to ensure that the onus to initiate and drive prosecutions should not lie with the victim of such violence.

INTERIGHTS' intervention in the Opuz case emphasises the importance of treating domestic violence as a matter of public

interest, rather than as a private or family matter. Our brief set out the international human rights framework in which State obligations to protect, and to effectively investigate, prosecute and punish perpetrators should be considered in the particular context of domestic violence. We maintained that while the obligation to prosecute perpetrators requires that the criminal justice process must be responsive to victims' needs, it should not be the responsibility of victims to initiate and drive that process. Our intervention further highlighted the increasing recognition of violence against women as a form of discrimination prohibited by international human rights law, submitting that the failure to adequately respond to such gender-specific violence amounts to discrimination under Article 14 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Read our intervention in the Opuz case at <http://www.interights.org/opuz>

LITIGATION: SUPPORT & LEADERSHIP IN AFRICA

INTERIGHTS' equality work in Africa is led by Sibongile Ndashe, a South African lawyer who joined the organisation in 2007. She is currently exploring litigation opportunities provided by the recently adopted Women's Protocol to the African Charter. Included in the litigation docket is a case concerning sexual violence in Egypt, the first before the African Commission directly addressing the human rights of women.

Violent Sexual Harassment at Egyptian Political Protest

Case name: INTERIGHTS and EIPR (on behalf of Al-Kheir and Others) v Egypt

Forum: African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights

Articles concerned: African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, Article 2 – equal enjoyment of rights, Article 3 – equality before the law, Article 5 – right to human dignity, Article 16 – right to health, Article 18.3 – State obligation to eliminate discrimination against women

INTERIGHTS' role: Co-representative, with Egyptian Initiative for Personal Rights

The case raises issues concerning discrimination on the basis of both sex and political opinion as well as positive obligations on the part of the State to protect women from sexual assaults. It concerns events which occurred in Cairo during opposition demonstrations against a referendum to amend the Egyptian Constitution in May 2005. The applicants are women journalists who were indecently assaulted, intimidated and sexually harassed while attending the protest. Police present at the protest did nothing to protect the applicants and in fact actively encouraged the assaults which took place in their full view. Some of the applicants were allegedly assaulted and sexually harassed by senior officials within the Security Police. In spite of complaints and criminal charges laid on behalf of the women, the State has failed to adequately investigate or prosecute those responsible.

“I WOULD LIKE TO THANK YOU FOR THE LEGAL AND OTHER SUPPORT YOU PROVIDED. YOUR INVOLVEMENT AND HELP WAS KEY TO OUR VICTORY. WE CERTAINLY HOPE TO WORK WITH YOU IN THE FUTURE.”

Wanda Nowicka, *Federation for Women and Family Planning and ASTRA Secretariat*, Poland

An admissibility hearing of this case was held at the 40th Session of the African Commission of Human of Peoples' Rights in November 2006 in the Gambia. INTERIGHTS, together with the Egyptian Initiative for Personal Rights, attended the hearing on behalf of the applicants. Following oral arguments from both sides, the Commission declared the case admissible. It should now be heard on the merits during 2008.

Woman's Rights Violated by Lack of Procedure to Access Termination of Pregnancy in Poland

Case name: Tysi c v Poland

Forum: European Court of Human Rights

Articles concerned: European Convention on Human Rights, Article 8 – right to private life, Article 14 – freedom from discrimination

INTERIGHTS' role: Adviser to counsel

Alicja Tysi c had suffered for many years from severe myopia. When she became pregnant she consulted doctors in Poland to determine what impact her pregnancy might have on her sight. Although doctors concluded that there would be a serious risk to her eyesight if she carried the pregnancy to term, they refused to issue a certificate authorising termination. Two months into the pregnancy, her eyesight deteriorated significantly. She secured a referral for a termination on medical grounds but the gynaecologist refused to perform it. There was no procedure through which Ms Tysi c could appeal this decision and she gave birth to a child in November 2000. Her eyesight deteriorated further following the delivery. She now cannot see objects more than 1.5 metres away, risks becoming completely blind, and requires daily assistance.

In March 2007, the European Court found that the Polish legal framework did not provide an effective mechanism to resolve disagreements as to the availability or legality of therapeutic terminations, either between a pregnant woman and doctors or between medical staff themselves. Concluding that Poland had violated Ms Tysi c's right to respect for private life and noting the severe distress and anguish caused to her, the Court ordered Poland to pay a substantial sum in non-pecuniary damages. In September 2007, the Grand Chamber of the Court announced that it would not be considering the Court's earlier decision.

The judgment is significant in several respects. In the context of termination in Poland and those countries with narrow exceptions to prohibition, it requires the adoption of meaningful mechanisms by which the conditions for obtaining a lawful abortion can be determined in a certain and timely fashion. The judgment is a call for objectivity, clarity and fairness in decision-making that should assist those whose rights have been affected by State regulation of reproductive choice. Beyond the issue of termination, the judgment clarifies the procedural obligations of States generally in respect of the right to privacy and family life, in particular to ensure an effective and accessible decision-making process that can resolve disagreements.

Read more on our work on equality issues at <http://www.interights.org/equality-programme/index.htm>

“OVER THE LAST YEAR WE HAVE LOOKED MORE CLOSELY AT APPROACHES TO LITIGATION ACROSS GROUNDS OF DISCRIMINATION, EXPLORING INTERSECTIONS, FOR EXAMPLE BETWEEN DISABILITY AND GENDER, OR SEXUAL ORIENTATION AND RACE. WE ARE PARTICULARLY CONCERNED WITH STRUCTURAL INEQUALITIES AND STRENGTHENING THE WAYS IN WHICH SUCH CLAIMS CAN BE PROVED IN COURTS.”

Andrea Coomber, *Senior Lawyer*, Equality Programme

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RIGHTS

In recent years, increasing attention has been devoted to economic and social rights (ESR) and the opportunities that exist for litigation at the domestic, regional and international levels – even if the jurisprudence remains relatively undeveloped. Our work in this area seeks to give full effect to economic and social rights through a consistent strategy of litigation. At the same time, given the systemic and widespread nature of ESR violations in all jurisdictions, it is clear that litigation can only be effective if it forms part of a broader integrated advocacy and campaigning strategy.

Collective Complaints on the Right to Health under the European Social Charter

Case name: INTERIGHTS v Croatia

Forum: European Committee of Social Rights

INTERIGHTS' role: Co-applicant, with Center for Reproductive Rights and Centre for Education Counseling and Research

In October 2007, INTERIGHTS, in partnership with the Center for Reproductive Rights in New York and the Centre for Education, Counseling and Research in Croatia, submitted a complaint to the European Committee of Social Rights against Croatia for its sponsorship of and efforts to expand a discriminatory and non-science based sex education programme.

Under the European Social Charter, signatory States agree to protect the social and economic rights of their citizens, including providing young people with an accurate and comprehensive sex education. For the last decade Croatia has used a sex education curriculum which emphasises abstinence-only approaches; discourages the use of contraceptives, including condoms; disparages any relationship outside of the traditional family model, such as analogising gay relationships to socially “deviant” phenomena; and reinforces gender stereotypes, including the notion

that stay-at-home mothers make for better families. It is now seeking to implement another sex education programme expounding the same values.

We argued that Croatia is endangering the sexual health of its citizens through misleading and inadequate sex education and therefore is in breach of its obligations under the European Social Charter.

Linguistic Discrimination in Transdnestrian Schools

Cases: Catan and 27 Others v Moldova and Russia, Caldare and 16 Others v Moldova and Russia, Cercavschi and 52 Others v Moldova and Russia

Forum: European Court of Human Rights

Articles concerned: European Convention on Human Rights, Article 14 – linguistic and ethnic discrimination, taken together with Article 8 – respect for private and family life, Article 13 – access to an effective domestic remedy, and Article 2 of the First Additional Protocol – right to education

INTERIGHTS' role: Advisers to counsel

The applicants, Moldovan nationals living in the *de facto* Moldavian Republic of Transdnestria (MRT), are children of school age, their parents, and teachers who attend or work at three of the seven schools in the MRT which use the Moldovan/Romanian language with Latin script. In 1999 the self-proclaimed authorities of the MRT ordered that all schools functioning on the territory of the MRT should be registered with them,

failing which such schools would not be recognised and would be deprived of their rights. The schools in question refused to register, since registration would involve using the Cyrillic script curriculum devised by the MRT regime. In July 2004 the MRT authorities used military and police forces to storm these schools and close them down. Some parents and teachers were arrested and subsequently sentenced to administrative imprisonment. Local police and civil servants also visited the parents of children registered with these schools, asking them to enrol their children into schools registered with the MRT regime. They were threatened with loss of their jobs and even removal of their parental rights if they failed to comply. The applicants have filed a number of unsuccessful petitions and complaints with the authorities of the Russian Federation as well as with the Moldovan authorities.

INTERIGHTS advised Moldovan lawyers in drafting written comments in reply to the Governments' observations.

Read more about our work on economic and social rights at <http://www.interights.org/esr-programme/index.htm>



"OUR AIM IS TO SHOW THAT INTERNATIONAL LAW DOES HAVE A ROLE IN HELPING TO DELIVER ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS."

Iain Byrne, Senior Lawyer, Economic and Social Rights

CAPACITY BUILDING

As well as developing litigation with partners, INTERIGHTS also carries out a range of activities across various jurisdictions, designed to increase the capacity of others to litigate strategically. Recent trainings have included: an extensive programme of “training for trainers” seminars regarding non-discrimination law (in Poland, Latvia and Lithuania), a short training seminar focusing on the issue of sexual violence and a workshop on use of the African Charter (both in Cairo), as well as specialist “litigation surgeries”. The latter consist of seminars bringing together

“WE REGULARLY USE THE EXPERIENCE AND KNOWLEDGE RECEIVED FROM THE TRAINING EXPERTS DURING THE SESSIONS. AFTER THE TRAINING, SEVERAL APPLICATIONS WERE INITIATED AND SENT TO THE EUROPEAN COURT. PARTICIPANT LAWYERS HAVE ALSO STARTED REGULARLY APPLYING ECHR CASE-LAW IN DOMESTIC SETTINGS.”

Marina Chokheli, Georgian lawyer

relatively experienced lawyers who are already involved in case-work at the regional or international level to examine strategies for litigating particular areas and discuss common challenges.

Caucasus Litigation Project

We are now in the second year of a five-year litigation project in the South Caucasus that we are implementing together with the Netherlands Helsinki Committee. The aim is to build capacity in lawyers from Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaijan to litigate human rights cases successfully through legal advice and “litigation surgeries” – where lawyers bring real life cases for support and advice on strategies. As part of the project, we are hosting interns from the focus regions and holding workshops on a variety of legal themes. We are working with partner organisations in each country – Article 42 in Georgia, the Legal Education Society in Azerbaijan, and the Bar Association of the Republic of Armenia.

So far, over 45 lawyers, selected through competitive recruitment, have attended litigation surgeries in Tbilisi, Yerevan and Baku. During the sessions experts have led discussions of case studies submitted by participants and given presentations on current relevant case law of the European Court of Human Rights with regard to each country. The local partners have selected cases to work on reflecting priority human rights issues for each country.

“THE TRAINING AND MEETINGS ARE VERY HELPFUL. WE RECEIVE SPECIFIC, UPDATED INFORMATION ON THE EUROPEAN CONVENTION AND EUROPEAN COURT CASE-LAW. WE HAVE BEEN ABLE TO GET ACQUAINTED WITH THE JUDGMENTS AND DECISIONS OF THE ECTHR ON ARMENIA. WE SHARE OUR CASES WITH EACH OTHER IN DETAIL, THUS HELPING OTHERS TO CHOSE AND ADJUST THEIR STRATEGIES FOR THEIR OWN CASES AND TO GET MORE INFORMATION ABOUT LEGAL REFORM IN ARMENIA.”

Arman Poghosyan,
Armenian lawyer

INTERNSHIPS AND VISITING LAWYERS



INTERIGHTS' internship programme is designed to provide lawyers with experience of working in an international NGO in a multicultural environment and to expose them to international human rights practice in a variety of legal jurisdictions around the world. The programme aims to equip interns with the knowledge and skills necessary to bolster their existing activity as litigators and to develop their career in the field of human rights. In the past two years INTERIGHTS has hosted interns from Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, India, Nigeria, Poland, Sudan and the USA. Our links with the Central European University, Columbia University and Georgetown University provide access to the internship programme for students at those institutions.

Above: Catalina Devandas, intern working on disability issues with INTERIGHTS Equality lawyers.

"THERE IS CURRENTLY A LARGE GAP BETWEEN HUMAN RIGHTS ORGANISATIONS AND DISABILITY RIGHTS ORGANISATIONS. INTERIGHTS IS THE ONLY MAINSTREAM HUMAN RIGHTS ORGANISATION THAT IS CURRENTLY SERIOUSLY COMMITTED TO THE INCLUSION OF DISABILITY ISSUES IN ITS PERMANENT WORK. MY TIME AT INTERIGHTS HAS GIVEN ME THE OPPORTUNITY TO BE A BRIDGE-BUILDER BETWEEN MAINSTREAM HUMAN RIGHTS ORGANISATIONS AND THE DISABILITY RIGHTS MOVEMENT."

Catalina Devandas (COSTA RICA) – intern working on disability issues with INTERIGHTS' Equality lawyers

"MY INTERNSHIP AT INTERIGHTS WAS AN EXCEPTIONAL EXPERIENCE AS IT ALLOWED ME TO BE A PART OF A PROFESSIONAL TEAM OF SPECIALISTS. IT WAS CHALLENGING TO WORK ON CASES OF STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE KNOWING THE IMPACT THESE CASES COULD HAVE ON PEOPLE'S LIVES AND THE CONTRIBUTION THEY COULD MAKE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF VITAL CASE-LAW. THE EXPERIENCE I GAINED IN LITIGATION AND LEGAL RESEARCH WHILE WORKING AT INTERIGHTS IS HARD TO OVER-ESTIMATE."


Arpine Avetisyan (ARMENIA) – intern on a 12-month placement funded by the Open Society Institute's Internship Initiative programme

INFORMATION DISSEMINATION

INTERIGHTS produces and disseminates a range of regular and one-off publications, keeping lawyers, judges and NGOs abreast of developments in human rights law that affect their work. Providing access to accurate, informative and analytical legal information is a crucial component of our capacity building work and complements our litigation activities.

INTERIGHTS Bulletin

Each edition of our journal, the *Bulletin*, contains a thorough analysis of developments in international human rights law from leading practitioners and academics, each issue centring on a different aspect of human rights law. The most recent editions examined the right to education and the positive obligations of States to protect human rights. The *Bulletin* also includes international law reports summarising major recent human rights decisions from different international tribunals.



Commonwealth Human Rights Law Digest

Published together with the Commonwealth Secretariat, the *Digest* contains summaries of significant human rights decisions from across the Commonwealth. Redesigned in the course of last year, it has an estimated readership of 8,000. It is complemented by the *CommonwealthNet*, a regular monthly electronic case bulletin covering significant recent decisions from across the common law world.



Website – www.interights.org

Over the past year we have been paying particular attention to developing our website and an improved version went online at the end of 2007. Our aim is for the site to be a one-stop portal for practitioners, the judiciary and activists in search of human rights legal information. A major development to the site is the legal resource library, which allows users to perform advanced full-text searches of publications, legal briefs, judgments, and related materials. Each of our areas of thematic or geographic focus has its own page, gathering together related news, legal materials, links to partners and other resources.

The website also hosts our *Manuals for Lawyers on Articles of the ECHR*. Designed initially as a much needed training resource for lawyers studying the European Convention, they have proved a very useful resource for practitioners.

Through searchable databases, the site also provides access to over 2,000 summaries of significant human rights decisions from both domestic Commonwealth courts and from tribunals applying international human rights law. We are also in the process of adding cases from the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights – when complete, the entire body of jurisprudence will be available on-line for the first time.

Right: Opening of the Judicial Year of the European Court of Human Rights, Strasbourg.
www.coe.int



STANDARD SETTING

Africa

As a member of the Coalition for an Effective African Court we are working closely with both the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights and the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights on improving the efficiency and effectiveness of African mechanisms for the protection of human rights. Drawing on our experience with the European Court, we have advised on and closely monitored election of judges to the African Court.

As a member of an African Commission internal Working Group we have been able to assist in the drafting of new rules of procedure for the Commission and are supporting a similar exercise with respect to the Court.

Europe

We also played a significant role as a member of an NGO coalition in developing responses to the Group of Wise Persons' report on reform of the Euro-

pean Court of Human Rights and are continuing to review proposals for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the Court. In the course of 2007/8 21 judges were elected to the Court. INTERIGHTS followed this process closely, building on our previous work in this area which culminated in a report by a group of independent experts "Judicial Independence: Law and Practice of Judicial Appointments to the European Court of Human Rights".

CASE DOCKET

COUNSEL/CO-COUNSEL

Maskhadov v Russian Federation

Forum: European Court of Human Rights

Submission: October 2007, pending communication to the Russian Government

Extra-judicial killing of Chechen politician by Russian security forces, followed by failure to investigate, and failure to return his body for burial.

Good v Botswana

Forum: African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights

Partners: Anton Katz and Max Du Plessis (South Africa)

Submission: Spring 2006, decision on merits pending

Unlawful deportation of foreign academic based on political opinion.

INTERIGHTS v Croatia

Forum: European Social Charter Committee

Partners: Center for Reproductive Rights, CESI

Submission: November 2007

Challenge to discriminatory and unscientific

sexual education programme in Croatian schools, resulting in violations of rights to education, health and equality.

INTERIGHTS and EIPR v Egypt

Forum: African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights

Partner: Egyptian Initiative for Personal Rights

Submission: November 2006, hearing on admissibility scheduled for May 2008

Conditions of arrest, trial and sentencing to death of three men accused of carrying out the Taba terrorist attacks violate provisions of the African Charter.

Al-Kheir and Others v Egypt

Forum: African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights

Partner: Egyptian Initiative for Personal Rights

Submission: May 2006, declared admissible in November 2006, merits hearing scheduled for May 2008

Failure of Egyptian authorities to prevent and subsequently investigate violent sexual harassment of female journalists at freedom of speech protest.

Al-Aqqad v Egypt

Forum: African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights

Partner: Egyptian Initiative for Personal Rights

Submission: December 2006, hearing on withdrawal of complaint scheduled for May 2008

Egyptian man imprisoned under Emergency Law for his conversion to Christianity. Released in May 2007, shortly before admissibility hearing.

Hadijatou Mani Korau v Republic of Niger

Forum: ECOWAS Court of Justice

Partners: Anti Slavery International, Timidria

Submission: September 2007, hearing April 2008

Challenge to practice of slavery in Niger.

INTERIGHTS and ASADHO v Democratic Republic of the Congo

Forum: African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights

Partner: ASADHO

Submission: Summer 2006, still pending before Commission

Challenge to conviction by unconstitutional military tribunal of military officers, civil servants and their family members for alleged involvement in assassination of Laurent Kabila.

Kajikabi and Others v Egypt

Forum: African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights

Partner: International Refugee Rights Initiative

Submission: Spring 2007, admissibility hearing scheduled for May 2008

State obligations to protect Sudanese refugees attacked and killed by Egyptian riot police, and subsequent failure to investigate killing.

Ezatt and Enayet v Egypt

Forum: African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights

Partner: Egyptian Initiative for Personal Rights

Submission: November 2007, admissibility hearing scheduled for May 2008

Refusal to recognise legal registration of citizens of Baha'i faith.

Bekele and Demissie v Ethiopia

Forum: African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights

Partner: ActionAid

Submission: October 2007, admissibility hearing scheduled for May 2008

Arbitrary detention of two Ethiopian human rights lawyers in the aftermath of 2005 presidential election.

AMICUS/THIRD PARTY INTERVENTIONS

Ramzy v the Netherlands

Forum: European Court of Human Rights

Partners: Amnesty International, Association for the Prevention of Torture, Human Rights Watch, International Commission of Jurists, Open Society Justice Initiative, REDRESS

Submission: October 2006

Case involving a challenge to the deportation of Algerian national from the Netherlands in the face of likely exposure to torture upon return to Algeria. The third party intervention focused on international and comparative law on States' obligations with respect to the absolute prohibition on torture in such cases.

Al-Skeini and Others v the Secretary of State for Defence

Forum: Appellate Committee of the UK House of Lords

Partners: AIRE Centre, Amnesty International, the Association for the Prevention of Torture, the Bar Human Rights Committee, British Irish Rights Watch, JUSTICE, Kurdish Human Rights Project, the Law Society of England and Wales, LIBERTY, REDRESS

Judgment: June 2007, finding in favour of one applicant, finding against remaining applicants

The case concerned the killing of a number of Iraqis in the course of the UK occupation of Iraq. The third party intervention focused on the extra-territorial application of the European Convention to UK troops in Iraq.

Opuz v Turkey

Forum: European Court of Human Rights

Submission: June 2007

The case concerns a woman killed after prolonged and extreme domestic violence, which she had reported to the police. The third party intervention focuses on international and comparative law approaches to the State duty to prevent domestic abuse and killings where reports of such violence are made.

Jones and Others v Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Forum: Appellate Committee of the UK House of Lords

Partners: REDRESS, Amnesty International, JUSTICE

Judgment: June 2006, finding against the applicants

The case concerned the torture and ill-treatment of UK and Canadian nationals in Saudi prisons by Saudi officials. The third party intervention focused on the incompatibility of blanket immunity for such officials with the absolute prohibition on torture recognised in international law.

DH and Others v Czech Republic

Forum: European Court of Human Rights

Partners: Human Rights Watch

Judgment: November 2007, finding in favour of the applicants

Case concerned the segregation of Roma children in schools for children with intellectual disabilities. INTERIGHTS third party intervention on the parameters of “indirect discrimination” and the admissibility of statistics was accepted by the Court in its analysis.

Boumediene and Others v Bosnia and Herzegovina

Forum: European Court of Human Rights

Partner: International Commission of Jurists

Submission: November 2007

Case concerned the failure of diplomatic efforts following the extraordinary rendition and ill-treatment of Bosnian and Algerian nationals to Guantanamo Bay. The third party intervention focused on State obligations to ensure measures of protection in such cases.

OFF-RECORD ADVISER

Tysi c v Poland

Forum: European Court of Human Rights

Partners: Monika Gasi rowska and Anna Wilkowska-Landowska

Judgment: March 2007, finding in favour of the applicant

The Court found that the Polish State had failed to safeguard woman’s right to effective respect for her private life, given her inability to access a lawful therapeutic abortion.

Mamasakhlisi v Georgia and Russian Federation

Forum: European Court of Human Rights

Partners: Pavle Beria, Vakhtang Vakhtangidze and Natia Katsitadze

Observations submitted: March 2007

Ill-treatment, refusal of medical assistance and denial of access to lawyer of Georgian national convicted by a Russian military court, in the break away republic of Abkhazia. Case raises important questions on the extra-territorial application of the European Convention.

Association of North-West Victims of the 1992 Post-Presidential Electoral Violence v Cameroon

Forum: African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights

Status: Ongoing

Access to justice for victims of violence following the 1992 Cameroonian presidential elections

FIDH and Others v Senegal

Forum: African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights

Partner: Rencontre Africaine pour la D fense des Droits de l’Homme

Submission: Autumn 2006

Challenge to law giving blanket amnesty to Senegalese officials involved in human rights violations between 1993 and 2006.

Makkawi v Sudan

Forum: African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights

Partner: Rifaat Mak kawi

Submission: Spring 2006

Challenge to death sentence passed on Sudanese minor.

KAOS v Turkey

Forum: European Court of Human Rights

Partner: KAOS GL

Submission: February 2007

Gay and lesbian magazine banned in Turkey.

Adalah and Others v The Minister of Defense and the State of Israel

Forum: Supreme Court of Israel

Partner: Adalah

Judgment: December 2006, finding in favour of the applicant

Judgment ended impunity of Israeli Defence Force in civil suits on the destruction of property in the Occupied Territories.

Catan and Others v Russian Federation and Moldova

Forum: European Court of Human Rights

Partner: Ion Manole and Alexandru Postica (Moldova)

Observations submitted: May 2007

Linguistic discrimination against and intimidation of Moldovan school children and their parents.

David v Moldova

Forum: European Court of Human Rights

Judgment: November 2007, finding in favour of the applicant

Illegal and involuntary psychiatric detention in Moldova.

FIDA and Another v Attorney General of Kenya

Forum: Kenyan Constitutional Court

Partner: FIDA (Kenya)

Case Submitted:

Challenge to law criminalising false reporting of rape.

Colibaba v Moldova

Forum: European Court of Human Rights

Decision: October 2007, finding in favour of the applicant

Right of individual petition violated through threats to applicant’s lawyer.

FINANCIAL REPORT 2006/2007 SUMMARISED

Statement of Financial Activities Incorporating Income and Expenditure for the year ended 31 March 2007

	Unrestricted Funds	Restricted Funds	Total 2007	Total 2006
Incoming Resources				
Grants and donations	738,855	838,009	1,576,864	1,131,082
Subscriptions and sales	6028	0	6,028	3,267
Investment Income	13,968	0	13,968	8,857
Other Income	0	0	0	2,040
Total Incoming Resources	758,851	838,009	1,596,860	1,145,246
Resources Expended				
Costs of generating funds				
Costs of generating voluntary income	90,900	0	90,900	65,181
Charitable Expenditure				
Regional Advisory and Development Programme	330,778	430,270	761,048	784,238
Strengthening Human Rights Jurisprudence and Enforcement Mechanisms	103,557	247,042	350,599	184,316
Information Services	36,580	27,938	64,518	100,400
Development	0	3380	3,380	0
Governance Costs	8,287	0	8,287	10,338
Total Resources Expended	570,102	708,630	1,278,732	1,144,473
Net Movement in Funds	188,749	129,379	318,128	773
Fund balances at 1 April 2006	184,275	129,398	313,673	312,900
Fund balances at 31 March 2007	373,024	258,777	631,801	313,673

Directors' Statement

- a) these accounts are not the statutory accounts but a summary of information relating to both the Statement of Financial Activities and the Balance Sheet;
- b) the full accounts from which the summarised financial statements are derived have been the subject of an independent audit;
- c) the independent Auditors' report was the standard report without any qualifications;
- d) the full annual accounts of the Charity which include the independent Auditors' report and the Directors' annual report can be obtained from the Charity's secretary;
- e) the annual accounts were approved on 10 September 2007
- f) the Directors' annual report and accounts have been submitted to the Charity Commission.

The Auditors' Statement on Summarised Financial Statements

Independent Auditors' statement to the Directors of INTERRIGHTS, the International Centre for the Legal Protection of Human Rights

We have examined the summarised financial statements of INTERRIGHTS, the International Centre for the Legal Protection of Human Rights.

Respective responsibilities of trustees and auditors

The Directors are responsible for preparing the summarised financial statements in accordance with the Charity Commission's Statement of Recommended Practice (SORP)

Our responsibility is to report to you the our opinion on the consistency of the summarised financial statements with the full financial statements and Directors' annual report. We also read the other information contained in the summarised annual report and consider the implications for our report if we become aware of any apparent misstatements or material inconsistencies with the summarised financial statements.

Basis of opinion

We conducted our work in accordance with Bulletin 1999/6 'The Auditors' statement on the summary financial statement' issued by the Auditing Practices Board for use in the United Kingdom.

Opinion

In our opinion the summarised financial statements are consistent with the full financial statements and the Directors' annual report of INTERRIGHTS, the International Centre for the Legal Protection of Human Rights for the year ended 31 March 2007.

10 September 2007.

FW Berringer & Co
Registered Auditors and Chartered Accountants
Lygon House
50 London Road
Bromley BR1 3RA

Balance Sheet

	End 2007	End 2006
Tangible Fixed Assets	79,530	17,753
Current Assets		
Debtors	116,248	138,438
Cash at bank and in hand	626,499	447,777
	742,747	586,215
Creditors		
Amounts falling due within 1 Year	163,476	290,295
Net Current Assets	579,271	295,920
Total Assets Less Current Liabilities	658,801	313,673
Creditors		
Amounts falling due after 1 year	27,000	0
Net Assets	631,801	313,673
Funds		
Restricted Funds	258,777	129,398
Unrestricted Funds	373,024	184,275
Total Funds	631,801	313,673

Our Primary Financial Aims

During the last 3 years our primary financial aims for the organisation have been to:

1. Increase our overall income and widen our funding base;
2. Increase expenditure on our charitable work in real terms after allowing for inflation;
3. Improve our financial stability in order to provide a more sustainable base for the future.

Our financial performance in the year demonstrates the success we have been able to achieve in working towards these key goals. INTERIGHTS takes immense satisfaction from the fact that these achievements have enabled the organisation to pass on many of the resulting benefits to our partners and other associates in the form of increased activities and closer co-operation.

Summary of 5 Year Financial Performance – £000's

	2002/3	2003/4	2004/5	2005/6	2006/7
Income					
Restricted	839	558	600	557	838
Unrestricted	369	371	432	588	759
Total Income	1208	929	1032	1145	1597
Charitable Expenditure					
Regional Advisory and Development Programmes	635	533	636	784	761
Strengthening Human Rights Jurisprudence and Enforcement Mechanisms	93	94	192	184	350
Information Services	83	106	121	101	65
Development and Support Services	29	78	5	0	4
Total Expenditure on Charitable Activities	840	811	954	1069	1180
Funds	End 2003	End 2004	End 2005	End 2006	End 2007
Restricted	213	227	180	129	259
Unrestricted Funds	223	138	133	184	373
Total Funds	436	365	313	313	632

FUNDERS AND SUPPORTERS

Allen & Overy LLP

Blackstone Chambers

Commonwealth Secretariat

Council of Europe

Dechert LLP

European Commission Community Action
Programme to Combat Discrimination
2001-2006

Ford Foundation

JEHT Foundation

Joffe Charitable Trust

John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur
Foundation

Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs
through the Netherlands Helsinki
Committee

Network for Social Change

Oak Foundation

Open Society Institute

Sigrid Rausing Trust

Swedish International Development
Co-operation Agency

Swedish NGO Foundation for
Human Rights

UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office
Global Opportunities Fund

*And those supporters wishing to remain
anonymous*

WHO WE ARE

STAFF

MANAGEMENT TEAM

David Geer *UK*
Executive Director

Helen Duffy *UK*
Legal Director

Joe Curran *UK*
Resources Director

LEGAL TEAM

Iain Byrne *UK*
*Senior Lawyer, Commonwealth/Economic
and Social Rights*

Andrea Coomber *Australia*
Senior Lawyer, Equality

Vesselina Vandova *Bulgaria*
Senior Lawyer, Security and the Rule of Law

Constantin Cojocariu *Romania*
Lawyer, Europe

Sibongile Ndashe *South Africa*
Lawyer, Equality

Judith Oder *Uganda*
Lawyer, Africa

Doina Ioana Straisteanu *Moldova*
Lawyer, Europe

Dina Vedernikova *Russia*
Lawyer, Europe

Silvia Borelli *Italy*
Legal Researcher

Beth Fernandez *UK*
Programme Co-ordinator, Europe

Justin Fraterman *Canada*
*Information and Publications Officer/
Programme Co-ordinator,
Commonwealth*

Juliet McDermott *UK*
*Programme Co-ordinator, Africa/Security
and the Rule of Law*

Moni Shrestha *Germany*
Programme Co-ordinator, Equality

RESOURCES TEAM

Bernise Fullerton *UK*
Facilities and IT Manager

Sarah Harrington *UK*
Fundraising and Development Manager

Michelle Ofondu *UK*
Resources Administrator

Iryna Peleshko *Ukraine*
Finance Manager

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

as at March 18, 2008

Lord Lester of Herne Hill
Honorary President
Barrister, Blackstone Chambers.

Jeremy McBride*
Chair
Barrister, Monckton Chambers.

Priscilla Ashun-Sarpy*
Treasurer
Head of Financial Planning and Analysis,
Help the Aged

Chaloka Beyani
Lecturer in International Law and Human
Rights, London School of Economics and
Political Science

Christine Chinkin
Professor of International Law, London
School of Economics and Political Science

Helena Cook [◊]
Former Deputy Director, Human Rights
Centre, London School of Economics and
Political Science

Jonathan Cooper
Barrister, Doughty Street Chambers

Tim Eicke
Barrister, Essex Court Chambers

Michael Griffin ^{*} [◊]
Former partner, PricewaterhouseCoopers

Anne Lapping
Brook Lapping Productions

Neville Linton [◊]
Consultant in Political Affairs; former
official, Commonwealth Secretariat

Alexandra Marks
Solicitor; Partner, Linklaters

Rachel Murray
Professor of Law, University of Bristol

Lynn Welchman
Senior Lecturer in Islamic and Middle
Eastern Law, School of Oriental and
African Studies

^{*} member of Management Committee
[◊] member of Staffing Committee

INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

Philip Alston *Australia*
Professor of Law and Director of the Center
for Human Rights and Global Justice at New
York University; UN Special Rapporteur
on Extrajudicial, Summary, or Arbitrary
Executions

Florence Butegwa *Uganda*
Advocate; specialist in women's human
rights and co-founder of Women in Law
and Development (Africa)

Roger Errera *France*
Visiting Professor, Central European

University; former senior member of
the *Conseil d'Etat*, former member of the
Conseil supérieur de la magistrature

Yash P Ghai *Kenya*
Member of the English Bar; Professor of
Law, Universities of Warwick and Hong
Kong; Special Representative of the UN
Secretary-General for human rights in
Cambodia

Asma Khader *Jordan*
Minister of State and Government
Spokesperson; Lawyer

Viviana Kristicevic *Argentina*
Executive Director of the Center for Justice
and International Law (CEJIL), New York

Harold Koh *USA*
Dean, Yale Law School

Marek A Novicki *Poland*
President of the Polish Helsinki Foundation
for Human Rights; former member,
European Commission on Human Rights

Sonia Picado *Costa Rica*
President of the UN Voluntary Trust for
Victims of Torture; Advocate; former judge
of the Inter-American Court

Gerard Quinn *Ireland*
Professor of Law at the National University
of Ireland, Galway; former vice-president
of the European Social Charter Committee

Mary Robinson *Ireland*
President, Ethical Globalization Initiative;
former President of Ireland; former UN
High Commissioner for Human Rights

Martin Scheinin *Finland*
UN Special Rapporteur on Terrorism and
Human Rights; Professor of Constitutional
and International Law and Director of the
Institute of Human Rights at Åbo Akademi
University, Finland

Suriya Wickremasinghe *Sri Lanka*
Barrister, Attorney-at-Law



For further information about any aspect of our work or how you can become involved please look at our website or get in touch:

INTERIGHTS
Lancaster House
33 Islington
High Street
London N1 9LH
United Kingdom

Tel:
+44 (0)20 7278 3230
Fax:
+44 (0)20 7278 4334
Email:
ir@interights.org
Website:
www.interights.org

We hold consultative status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council, the Council of Europe and the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights. We are also accredited to the Commonwealth Secretariat.

INTERIGHTS is a registered charity in the UK (number 292357) and a company limited by guarantee incorporation (number 1927581).