



HR HELSINKI FOUNDATION  
for HUMAN RIGHTS

**International  
Partnership**  
for Human Rights

19 February 2015

## **Tajikistan: Briefing on the implementation of recommendations issued by the UN Human Rights Committee in paragraphs 16 and 23 of its 2013 concluding observations<sup>1</sup>**

In paragraph 27 of the concluding observations adopted on 23 July 2013, and published on 22 August 2013 (CCPR/C/TJK/CO/2), the United Nations (UN) Human Rights Committee requested the authorities of Tajikistan to “provide, within one year, relevant information on its implementation of the Committee’s recommendations in paragraphs 16 and 23, (in accordance with rule 71, paragraph 5, of the Committee’s rules of procedure).”

The authorities of Tajikistan submitted follow-up information pertaining to these paragraphs in a letter to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), dated 26 August 2014. The report was recently published on the OHCHR website.

This briefing was jointly prepared by the NGO Coalition against Torture in Tajikistan,<sup>2</sup> the Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights (Poland) and International Partnership for Human Rights (Belgium) in February 2015, based on information provided by the NGO Coalition. The NGO Coalition against Torture in Tajikistan has closely monitored and analyzed domestic legislation pertaining to the issue of torture for many years and documented numerous cases involving allegations of torture or other ill-treatment from across Tajikistan. This document summarizes the state of implementation of the recommendations issued by the Committee under the relevant paragraphs.

### **Comments on the implementation of recommendations under paragraph 16**

Paragraph 16 of the Human Rights Committee’s concluding observations:

“The Committee is concerned at: (a) the frequent failure to register detention following arrest within the time frame prescribed by the law, which facilitates the use of torture and ill-treatment with the aim of extracting confessions, and (b) the failure to apply procedural safeguards immediately after arrest despite the law in place, including access to a lawyer, family members and medical personnel. It is moreover concerned at the lack of systematic oversight of places of detention by organizations independent from the prosecution (arts. 7, 9, 10 and 14).”

<sup>1</sup> This document was produced with financial assistance from the European Union within the project “Action for freedom of torture in Kazakhstan and Tajikistan”. The contents of the document are the sole responsibility of the organizations issuing it and can under no circumstances be regarded as reflecting the positions of the European Union.



<sup>2</sup> The NGO Coalition against Torture in Tajikistan consists of 11 human rights groups (Apeiron, Bureau for Human Rights and Rule of Law, Human Rights Center, Equal opportunities, Independent Centre for Human Rights Protection, Independent School of Journalism «Tajikistan – XXI century», Justice initiative, Association of Pamir Lawyers, Office of civil freedoms, Public foundation «Nota Bene», Right and prosperity), and four independent experts.

**“The State party should guarantee the registration of detainees within the legal time frame, and ensure that all arrested persons, including minors, fully enjoy their rights as required by the Covenant, including access to a lawyer, family members and medical personnel. It should also institute an independent mechanism for inspection of all detention facilities by relevant international humanitarian organizations and/or independent national human rights non-governmental organizations (NGOs).”**

### **Ambiguous definition of the moment of arrest in Tajikistani legislation**

Tajikistani legislation is ambiguous as to when a person is considered a detainee. As a result of the absence of a clear definition in the current Criminal Procedure Code of Tajikistan (CPC), officials in the criminal justice system have held different views about when the clock starts ticking for time limits contained in the CPC that could provide crucial safeguards against torture.

Article 22, part 1 of the CPC stipulates that “everybody can use the services of a lawyer from the moment of detention” and Article 49, part 2 states that the lawyer may “participate in the criminal case [...] from the moment of the actual detention of the suspect.” Article 91, part 1, however, states that “[t]he detention of a person consists of entering him into an agency of criminal prosecution and [his] temporary custody in specialized places defined by law and this Code.”

In June 2012, the Plenum of the Supreme Court issued a decision on “[t]he implementation of norms included in criminal and criminal-procedural legislation regarding torture prevention” that, among others, clarified that a person is considered a detainee as soon as he or she is deprived of his or her liberty and entitled to all relevant legal safeguards. However, this decision was principally directed at judges rather than law enforcement officials and is regarded as a recommendation rather than binding law. It did not result in noticeable improvements in practice.

In paragraph 8(a) of its concluding observations adopted in November 2012, the UN Committee against Torture recommended that Tajikistan “[a]mend the CPC to ensure that arrest starts from the moment of de facto apprehension.” The UN Special Rapporteur on Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman and Degrading Treatment or Punishment visited Tajikistan in May 2012. In the January 2013 report on his mission to Tajikistan he called on the authorities to “[a]mend the Code of Criminal Procedure to ensure that the time of arrest starts from de facto apprehension and delivery to a police station” (Recommendation 99e).

Despite these recommendations, the CPC has not been amended. Thus, law enforcement agencies and courts typically continue to consider a person a detainee when the detention record is drawn up. This may be several hours, or even several days, after the de facto arrest. As a result, during this time detainees typically have no access to any of the legal safeguards enshrined in Tajikistani legislation, including access to their family, a lawyer and medical attention, and are de facto held incommunicado.

### **Witnesses and those detained on administrative charges frequently held incommunicado**

Police often apprehend people for administrative offences as a pretext for keeping them in custody for five to 15 days. In Tajikistani legislation the legal safeguards pertaining to those detained on criminal charges are significantly stronger than those pertaining to people detained on administrative charges.

Another way of detaining people without granting them the protection of legal safeguards is the frequent police practice of summoning people as “witnesses” or simply calling them in for “a conversation.”

Often police officers reportedly torture them in order to obtain “information” or “confessions” that subsequently form the basis for opening criminal cases against these individuals.

For example, on 13 January 2015, police detained **Bobojon Akhmedov**, who lives in Bobojongafurov district of Sughd Region. The same day, the court ruled to administratively detain him for insulting police officers. On 12 February, his wife was able to gain access to him for the first time and he told her that while in police custody officers subjected him to violence in order to force him to confess to theft.

In another case, **Umed Todzhiev** was detained on 30 October 2013 and taken to Isfara City Police in Sughd Region. Isfara City Court ruled to administratively detain him for ten days. From 30 October to 2 November, Umed Todzhiev was believed to have been tortured by Isfara City police officers. When he

could not bear the torture anymore he jumped out of the window of the third floor of the police station on 2 November. He sustained numerous injuries and broke his legs. On 4 November 2013, a criminal case was opened against Umed Todzhiev. The lawyer his relatives hired on 5 November was only given access to Umed Todzhiev on 13 November. In the meantime, the investigator had called in a state-appointed lawyer, who claimed that Umed Todzhiev was not subjected to torture or other ill-treatment. On 19 November 2013, Umed Todzhiev died in the Central Hospital of the penitentiary system in Sudhd Region.

### **Failure to promptly inform detainees of their rights**

In the State Party's submission on the implementation of the Human Rights Committee's recommendations in paragraphs 16, 18 and 23, dated 24 August 2014, the Tajikistani authorities state that "when the detention record is presented to the detainee, the detainee is explained his rights, including the right to invite a lawyer and testify in his/her presence."

The CPC of Tajikistan stipulates that detainees should be informed of their rights after the detention record is drawn up (Article 94). Under Article 94.1 of the CPC the detention record should be drawn up within three hours of the detainee's arrival at the police station. Domestic legislation does not specify the time frame within which detainees have to be admitted to a police station after being apprehended. In practice the arrival of a detainee at the police station can be hours or even days after the detainee was apprehended, according to members of the NGO Coalition against Torture in Tajikistan. Thus, the UN Committee against Torture's recommendation to the authorities, to "[e]nsure that suspects are informed of their rights at the very moment of apprehension as well as reasons for their detention" (Recommendation 8(c)), has yet to be implemented.

### **Failure to include the identity of the arresting officer/s in the detention record facilitates impunity**

The CPC does not require police to include the identity of the arresting officers in the detention record, thus facilitating impunity. Both the Committee against Torture and the UN Special Rapporteur on torture called on Tajikistan to ensure that detention is recorded from the very moment when a person is deprived of liberty and that, among other issues, the identity of the arresting officer/s is recorded. In addition, the Committee against Torture called on Tajikistan to "[e]stablish an official, central register in which the arrest is scrupulously and immediately recorded". However, to date no amendments have been made to the CPC to this effect and no central register has been established.

### **Lack of immediate access to a lawyer of the detainee's choice**

The Constitution of Tajikistan stipulates that "a person is entitled to services of a lawyer from the moment of detention" and the CPC includes similar guarantees.

However, in practice police investigators often deny lawyers access to their clients for days and lawyers in many cases see their clients for the first time at the remand hearing.

When a detainee requests the support of a lawyer or when the participation of a lawyer is obligatory by law (cases of especially serious crimes), the investigator draws up a written decision, which is usually sent to a local representation of a Collegium of Advocates. Typically, the lawyer on duty at the time passes the case to a colleague who is able to take on the case. Subsequently, the lawyer is paid from the state budget. On average it takes 24 hours until a lawyer starts working on a case.

For example, on 8 or 9 January 2015, officers of the Sixth Department of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, also referred to by its Russian acronym UBOP, detained **Furkhat Okhunov** in his home and took him to the Sixth Department in the city of Khujand in Northern Tajikistan. The lawyer, Fayziniso Vohidova, who took on the case on 10 January, was only able to gain access to her client on 15 January. During their first meeting Furkhat Okhunov reported that he had been tortured by UBOP officers.

Apart from that, there is a common practice in Tajikistan of using the services of so-called "pocket lawyers". These lawyers are ex officio (state-appointed) lawyers who are usually hand-picked by investigators in the knowledge that this particular lawyer will put up a weak defense, sign all procedural documents necessary for the investigation and may be inclined to overlook ill-treatment. In some cases involving "pocket lawyers" detainees are unaware that they have a lawyer until his relatives contract with an independent lawyer who informs him of the existence of another lawyer in his case.

On 25 March 2014, UBOP officers detained **Tolib Shodiev** in his home and held him until the afternoon of 26 March 2014 in UBOP's temporary detention facility (IVS) in Tursunzade District in the west of Tajikistan. On 27 March he was transferred to the IVS in the capital Dushanbe. Tolib Shodiev's relatives were not informed of his whereabouts and of the grounds for his arrest. The remand hearing took place on 1 April, seven days after his arrest. Following permission of the investigator, a lawyer of the Collegium of Independent Lawyers of the city of Dushanbe was present when charges were brought against Tolib Shodiev on 7 April. When the lawyer was briefly able to speak to Tolib Shodiev in confidential circumstances, he reportedly told her that he had been subjected to torture. He later reported that he had shown the lawyer bruises on the left side of his back and the left forearm. However, the lawyer took no steps to address the detainee's complaint. Subsequently, Tolib Shodiev's relatives turned to a member organization of the NGO Coalition against Torture in Tajikistan for help and engaged the NGO's lawyer. This lawyer was only able to gain access to his client ten days after he had officially taken on the case. The lawyer submitted complaints during pre-trial detention and the court hearing highlighting procedural violations and allegations of torture or other forms of ill-treatment. However, the investigators and the court took no action to investigate the allegations. Only when Tolib Shodiev's criminal case reached the Collegium on criminal cases of the Supreme Court was an order directed to the General Prosecutor's Office to examine the allegations of unlawful detention and torture. However, we are concerned about the conduct of the General Prosecutor's examination as it was carried out without participation of the lawyer. The General Prosecutor's Office concluded that no criminal case had to be opened.

Lawyers continue to experience obstacles visiting their clients in investigation-isolation facilities (SIZOs), the detention facilities under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Justice. In some cases lawyers have been prevented from seeing clients until the police investigator sent confirmation to the SIZO administration certifying that the lawyer is involved in the specific criminal case.

Both the Committee against Torture and the Special Rapporteur have recommended that Tajikistan guarantee the right to access to a lawyer of their choice at the very moment of apprehension (Recommendations 8(c) and 100(a) respectively). However, these recommendations have yet to be implemented.

#### **Lack of prompt access to family**

The CPC stipulates that family members should be notified of the detention and the detainee's whereabouts within 12 hours of apprehension, either by police or the detainee (Article 100, part 1). However, in practice this time frame is not adhered to in the majority of cases. In the current context in Tajikistan notification of family is a particularly important safeguard as family members in many cases try to contract an independent lawyer for the detainee and prevent them from being issued with a state-appointed lawyer, who may not put up a strong defense.

The UN Committee against Torture recommended Tajikistan in its concluding observations adopted in November 2012 to "[a]mend the CPC to repeal the 12-hour period for notification of arrest by law enforcement officers to family members" (Recommendation 8 (g)). However, this recommendations remains yet to be implemented.

Domestic law in Tajikistan does not allow detainees the right to notify their families or their lawyers of transfers between pre-trial detention facilities or of their removal from detention facilities for the purpose of investigative activities, such as taking them to the crime scene. Nor are law enforcement officers under an obligation to inform the relatives. Members of the NGO Coalition against Torture in Tajikistan have documented many cases where detainees were subjected to torture or other ill-treatment in the context of such transfers or removals.

#### **Lack of access to qualified and independent medical personnel**

In June 2011, the Law "On Detention Procedures and Conditions of Suspects, Accused Persons and Defendants" was adopted providing for medical examinations upon admission to a place of detention. However, the law states that medical examinations should be conducted in line with internal regulations, which are not public. As a result, the procedure and purpose of the examination remains unclear.

Following a request submitted by the NGO Independent Centre for the Protection of Human Rights to the Ministry of Health and Social Protection of the Population of the Republic of Tajikistan (Ministry of Health

and Social Protection) on 24 January 2014, the Ministry provided the following information on 15 February 2014:

«We believe it is necessary to note that following an instruction of the Head of the Executive Office of the President of the Republic of Tajikistan, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Ministry of Health and Social Protection of the Population of the Republic of Tajikistan have jointly elaborated a draft Decision of the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan 'On conditions of detention, food and medical treatment' and passed it to the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan for adoption.” However, to date the NGO Coalition against Torture in Tajikistan has not received any information regarding the adoption of the above Decision.

The UN Committee against Torture recommended Tajikistan to “[e]nsure that anyone arriving at a detention facility undergoes a routine medical examination, and that access to independent doctors is provided when requested by the detainee without conditioning such access on the permission or request of officials” (Recommendation 8 (e)). However, this recommendation has yet to be implemented.

In practice detainees still do not routinely undergo a medical examination upon admission to police stations and temporary detention facilities. To our knowledge, there is only one medical doctor in the temporary isolation facility of the city of Dushanbe, who is an employee of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, while other temporary isolation facilities in Tajikistan do not have their own medical personnel.

Before transferring detainees to temporary isolation facilities, police often take detainees to public health clinics where medical personnel usually certify that the detainee has no injuries. The NGO Coalition against Torture in Tajikistan is aware of cases where medical personnel certified that no injuries were found during the examination although the detainee complained of torture or other ill-treatment and injuries were visible on his body. The examinations are usually conducted in the presence of police officers. Upon admission, temporary detention facilities usually accept these certificates as proof that the detainee has no injuries.

When detainees request access to a doctor for a forensic medical examination this is only done with the investigator’s permission (Article 208 of the CPC). Article 175, part 2 of the CPC stipulates that “the applicant has to be informed of the results of the consideration of the complaint within no more than five days.”

In those cases where the investigator grants permission to conduct a forensic medical examination, the injuries sustained through torture or other ill-treatment are usually not visible anymore.

Medical personnel in pre-trial detention facilities under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Justice are supervised by the Ministry of Health and Social Protection, but are employees of the penitentiary administration of the Ministry of Justice, the agency that runs SIZOs. There are cases in which medical personnel have come under pressure from the penitentiary administration as well as investigators, which undermines the required independence and impartiality of medical personnel.

When judges – in the course of court hearings – find violations of time limits pertaining to detention set out in the CPC the judge usually issues a decision for further examination that is forwarded to the procuracy. However, judges usually do not follow-up on these cases and prosecutors typically only superficially conduct examinations into such cases. Those officers who are responsible for violating time limits, thus subjecting a detainee to unlawful detention, are usually only punished with disciplinary measures.

### **Lack of sufficient independent inspections of detention facilities**

Independent inspections of detention facilities are another effective safeguard against torture and other ill-treatment. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) has not had access to detention facilities in Tajikistan for the purpose of monitoring since 2004. Tajikistan has not ratified the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and has thus not obligated itself to set up a National Preventive Mechanism.

In February 2014, a Monitoring Group established as part of the Ombudsman’s office and consisting of Ombudsman staff and civil society activists began visiting detention facilities. However, the Monitoring Group has to announce its visits and when it receives allegations of torture in a specific case and wants to visit, the administration of the detention facility typically only admits staff of the Ombudsman's Office and denies access to the civil society members of the Monitoring Group. In 2014, the Monitoring Group was not able to document a single case of torture or other ill-treatment in pre-trial detention facilities.

Independent monitoring of detention facilities is not regulated in domestic legislation and other than in the framework of the Monitoring Group, human rights defenders in Tajikistan are not permitted to enter detention facilities in order to conduct independent monitoring.

Both the Committee against Torture and the Special Rapporteur on torture recommended that Tajikistan grant unimpeded access to the ICRC and independent non-governmental organizations to all places of detention for the purpose of independent monitoring (Recommendations 14(c) and 100(i) respectively).

## **Comments on the implementation of recommendations under paragraph 23**

Paragraph 23 of the Human Rights Committee's concluding observations:

"The Committee expresses concern that the Law on Non-governmental Associations (2007) imposes undue conditions and restrictions on the registration of public associations and endows the Ministry of Justice with excessive oversight power, resulting in major practical obstacles and delays in the registration and operation of such groups. The Committee is further concerned at reports of the arbitrary shutting-down of various human rights-based NGOs, without observance of procedural safeguards or as a disproportionate response to technical irregularities (arts. 22, 25)."

**"The State party should bring its law governing the registration of NGOs into line with the Covenant, in particular with articles 22, paragraph 2, and 25. The State party should reinstate NGOs which were unlawfully shut down and should refrain from imposing disproportionate or discriminatory restrictions on the freedom of association."**

**Since Tajikistan's second periodic report to the Human Rights Committee was considered on 9 and 10 July 2013, the situation regarding the right to freedom of association has remained tense. The authorities have not taken effective measures to ensure the full enjoyment of freedom of association. No legal amendments have been adopted regarding freedom of association. Instead, draft amendments to the Law on Public Associations have been prepared that may further limit the space within which NGOs can operate.**

### **Draft legal amendments on registering foreign grants**

Some 3,000 NGOs<sup>3</sup> currently operate in Tajikistan; their projects are funded by local and international donors. Current legislation requires NGOs to present annual reports about their activities, sources and size of funding to the Ministry of Justice and the tax authorities.

After representatives of the Ministry of Justice had repeatedly denied that draft amendments to the Law on Public Associations were being prepared by the Ministry, local human rights groups were able to obtain the proposed amendments from a representative of the Ministry in November 2014. According to the draft, local NGOs would only be able to carry out projects funded by foreign governments, international organizations and other foreign sources following the official registration and inclusion of these grants in a special state register on humanitarian assistance. The draft amendments also require the registration of funds received "through other physical and legal entities," an ambiguous provision that leaves it unclear whether the same requirements outlined in the amendments would also apply to funds received from local sources. In addition, the draft law leaves it unclear whether the registration requirement would apply to all funds originating from these sources, irrespective of size, and there is no information about the procedure of registering funds.

The proposed amendments evoked broad criticism by civil society in Tajikistan and the international community who accused the authorities of lack of transparency in the process of elaborating the draft amendments and failure to consult with NGOs. In a statement entitled "Tajikistan: Drop draft legislation restricting access to NGO funding," that was jointly issued by 92 local and international organizations on 25 November 2014, NGOs expressed concern about attempts by the government of Tajikistan to unduly

---

<sup>3</sup> This figure is an estimate. It takes into account that the Ministry of Justice declared in January 2015 (see below) it had registered a total of 2,800 public associations. In addition, there are public foundations that are only registered by the tax authorities and monitored by them.

limit access of NGOs to funding.<sup>4</sup> They pointed out that in their view the draft amendments are in contravention of international standards protecting the right to freedom of association and pose a serious threat to NGO activities in the country.

In response to criticism about the lack of transparency when elaborating the draft law, the Ministry of Justice conducted a meeting with representatives of civil society organizations on 4 December 2014, in order to discuss the proposed amendments. At the meeting Justice Minister Rustam Mengliev stated that the amendments were necessary to implement recommendations made by the intergovernmental Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering (FATF). He claimed that the registration of grants was of a solely “informative nature” and would not be used by the authorities to control NGOs.

However, on 21 January 2015, the Tajik news agency Avesta reported Justice Minister Rustam Mengliev as saying that “we have nothing against civil society organizations, but questions about what political views they support, what political activities they engage in, all this has to be monitored by the government.”<sup>5</sup>

At the 4 December 2014 meeting, Ministry of Justice officials asked NGOs for their recommendations on the draft law. Representatives of local civil society groups subsequently submitted a list of recommendations but no significant changes have been made to the draft since.

It is expected that the draft law will be considered by Parliament following parliamentary elections due on 1 March 2015.

### **NGOs under threat of liquidation**

Unregulated inspections of NGOs continue in the country. The Law on Public Associations provides for inspections to be undertaken, but does not regulate how they should be carried out. The Minister of Justice of Tajikistan was reported by the news agency Avesta on 21 January 2015 as saying that in 2014 the Oversight Service of his Ministry had inspected 67 public associations out of a total of 2,800 groups.

The draft amendments to the Law on Public Associations that are currently under consideration (see above) state that “the order of inspecting the statutory activities of public associations is established by the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Tajikistan” (draft amendment to Article 34, part 2 of the Law on Public Associations). However, to date there is no publicly accessible legislation in Tajikistan regulating the procedure of how inspections should be carried out. On the Ministry’s website (<http://www.minjust.tj/>) there is no information about methods and procedures of inspections.

We are also concerned about the lack of transparency regarding comprehensive information on how many public associations were newly registered as well as those that were liquidated. Some information can be obtained from those NGOs that are under threat of liquidation themselves or at press conferences conducted by the Ministry of Justice. On the Ministry’s website there is a section entitled “Register of public associations,” but it has no content.

The Ministry of Justice, the tax authorities and other state institutions have extensive powers to monitor and oversee NGO activities. The Ministry of Justice can issue an order to close down an NGO for alleged violations of the law, including the failure to comply with requirements of a technical nature (e.g. failure to re-register an organization after a change of legal address).

On 24 June 2014, the Constitutional Court of Tajikistan considered a complaint by the **Young Lawyers Association “Amparo”**, an NGO closed down on technical grounds in 2012, requesting the Court to look into what it believed were contradictions between articles of the Law on Public Associations and the Constitution of Tajikistan. The Constitutional Court ruled there were no contradictions. However, it stated that provisions of the Law on Public Associations concerning the closure of NGOs are not sufficiently clear and recommended Parliament to analyze the law and make necessary changes to Article 37 of the Law on Public Associations to specify the grounds on which NGOs can be liquidated. We are not aware of any relevant draft legislation elaborated since.

---

<sup>4</sup> The statement can be found on: <http://www.iphronline.org/tajikistan-ngo-law-appeal-20141125.html>

<sup>5</sup> News article by the news agency Avesta, entitled “The Minister of Justice explained the amendments of the Law ‘On Public Organizations’”, 21 January 2015 (in Russian): <http://www.vesta.tj/sociaty/30257-glava-minyusta-razyasnil-sut-popravok-v-zakon-ob-obschestvennyh-obedineniyah.html>

Representatives of NGOs whom the authorities perceive as promoting Western values have increasingly been subject to discrimination. Several such NGOs have been liquidated by court orders in recent years. Others are under threat of liquidation.

For example, the **Public Association “Sakhi”**, founded in 2010 to prevent the spreading of illnesses in the population and promote a healthy way of life, was liquidated by a decision of Firdavsi District Court in the capital of Dushanbe on 6 May 2014. The ruling was based on an accusation brought forward by the State Committee of National Security claiming that the NGO was engaged in illegal proselytizing of the Christian faith and recruited drug addicts for forced labour.

Representatives of the **Public Association “Equal Opportunities”**, which supports and defends the rights and interests of LGBT people and a range of other groups in Tajikistan, have been subjected to several inspections in recent years by officers of the Interior Ministry's Department dealing with so-called “moral crimes.” The NGO's representatives reported that during the inspections it became clear that senior representatives of the Ministry of Internal Affairs were concerned about “propaganda of homosexuality” in Tajikistan and intended to stop “the influence of Western countries” in this regard. During another inspection police officers urged representatives of the NGO to give them the names and contact details of people the NGO works with, as well as information about locations where LGBT people meet. They also urged NGO activists to refrain from supporting the LGBT community in Tajikistan and from carrying out “propaganda of homosexuality”. Instead, they called on them to promote “traditional” values.

Another example is the case of the **Public Association “Rushd”**, which promotes education and participation in elections and works towards strengthening civil society in the Southern Khatlon region. In early February 2015, officers inspecting the NGO accused the group of violating the law as NGO representatives were unable to present a document confirming re-registration after moving its office into the flat of an NGO member. The NGO's director reported that they had to move offices for financial reasons and had informed the Ministry of Justice of this move in writing. During the inspection the NGO was told that unless it was able to rectify this and other violations of the law by 9 March 2015, the case would be passed to court and the organization would be liquidated.