INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINT

The Human Rights Committee

c/o Office of the United Nations
High Commissioner for
Human Rights
8-14 avenue de la Paix
1211 Geneva 10
SWITZERLAND

For communication under the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

I. Information on the complainant:

Last Name: XXXXXXX First Name: XXXXXXX
Nationality: Russian Federation Occupation: Lawyer
Date and place of birth: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, XXXXXX XXXXXX, XXXXXXXXX
Residence Address: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Address for correspondence
on this complaint: Russia 101000, Moscow, Chistoprudniy Boulevard 5, office no. 108

If the complaint is being submitted on behalf of another person:

Please provide the following personal details of that person:

Last Name: XXXXXXX First Name: XXX XXXXXX
Nationality: Russian Federation Occupation:
Date and place of birth: XXXXX-X-XX, XXXXX XX
Residence Address
or current whereabouts: XXXXX-X-XX, XXXXX X

If you are acting with the knowledge and consent of that person, please provide that person's authorization for you to bring this complaint

Or

If you are not so authorized, please explain the nature of your relationship with that person:

And detail why you consider it appropriate to bring this complaint in his or her behalf:

_____

II. Information on the States concerned and Articles:

Name of the State that is a party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Optional Protocol thereto, against which the complained is filed.

Russian Federation

Articles of the Covenant alleged to have been violated

Paragraph 1 Article 9 of the International Covenant

Paragraph 1 Article 14 of the International Covenant

III. Exhaustion of domestic remedies

Steps taken by or on behalf of the alleged victims to obtain redress within the State concerned for the alleged violation-detail which procedures have been pursued, including recourse to the courts and other public authorities, which claims you have made, at which times, and with which outcomes (Attach copies of all relevant judicial or administrative decisions, where possible):

1. The judgement of the Central District Court of XXXXXXXXXXXX, XXXXXXXXXXXX of XXXXXXX.
2. The cassation determination of the Judicial Chamber for Criminal Cases of the XXXXXXX.
3. The decision of the judge of the XXXXXXX to reject the supervisory review application of XXXXXXX.
4. The ruling of the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation to refuse to refer the cassation appeal to the Court of Cassation for review during the court proceedings of XXXXXXX.

If domestic remedies have not been exhausted, please explain the reasons in detail:

_____

_____

IV. Application to other international procedures

Have you submitted the same matter for examination under another procedure of international investigation or settlement (e.g. the European Court of Human Rights)? If so, detail at which times, and with which outcomes**:**

No

V. Facts of the complaint and nature of the alleged violation(s)

Detail the facts and circumstances of the alleged violation or violations, including relevant dates:

1. XXXXXXX ("the applicant") alleges, that the Russian Federation has violated his rights guaranteed by Article 9 of the Covenant- the right to liberty and security of person-when domestic court decided to change the measure of restraint (without applicant's knowledge) and apply remand in custody as a measure of restraint following the applicant's failure to appear before the court, without taking in consideration that this failure was due to inadequate notification on the court's part of the date and place of trial. Therefore, the applicant was prevented from attending the hearing and deprived of the opportunity to defend himself in person or by a legal representative.

2. The applicant further alleges, that the Russian Federation has violated his rights under the Article 14 of the Covenant- the violation of the applicant's right to a fair trial due to the fact, that in the absence of credible evidence of the alleged crimes, the court found the applicant guilty of committing grave and especially grave crimes, which had not been properly proven. Particularly, the court relied mainly on contradictory findings of forensic expertise and largely doubtful and contradictory testimonies from police officers and other witnesses proposed by the prosecution.

3. Based on unreliable evidence that had been obtained in a manner contravening the criminal procedure law of Russia, the applicant was held criminally liable and convicted of attempting to unlawful sale of narcotic drugs, illegal acquisition and storage of narcotic drugs on an especially large scale. In accordance with the principle of cumulative crimes and by the partial adding-up of penalties imposed, he was sentenced to imprisonment for a term of 5 years and 6 months (The cassation determination of XXXXXXX).

4. Pursuant to the Order on the institution of criminal proceedings of XXXXXXX under para. 2 article 228 of the Criminal Code of Russia ("the Criminal Code"), the reason for the commencement of criminal proceedings was a report on the discovery of evidence of criminal activity by the criminal investigation division of XXXXXXXXXXX ("the CID").

5. The inspection had found that on an unspecified date before 19 XXXXX 2010 the CID carried out an inspection, which revealed that a certain person named XXX, using a cell phone number XXXXXX, was illegally selling drugs-filled cigars. There are no any details regarding the source of this information whatsoever or the circumstances in which such information was received.

6. During the inspection held on XXXXXXXXXXX between 7:50 p.m. and 8p.m. precisely an unknown person while in stairwell of the house located at XXXXX, XXXXXXXXXXX, illegally sold a narcotic substance-hashish oil (0,111 g) to XXXXX. However, the seller failed to bring his criminal intentions to the end due to circumstances beyond his control, as XXXXX acted as a "buyer" during the test drug purchase operation. As a result of this operation, the above narcotic drug was withdrawn from illicit trafficking.

7. On the morning of 20 XXXXX 2010, when the Applicant was at work, he was arrested by police officers on suspicion of murder. No relevant documents were provided to the Applicant; they are also absent in criminal case file. Sometime after, the applicant in handcuffs was taken to police

office of XXXXXXXXXXXX.

8. During the arrest, police offices had searched the applicant in a manner which was inconsistent with the criminal procedure law. In the absence of witnesses, a cigarette case with ordinary cigarettes inside was taken from the applicant. The record of the search was not drawn up. At an unspecified time between the body search and arrival at the police office, the police officer returned the cigarette case to the applicant.

9. On the same day at 11: 50 a.m. the applicant was subjected to a body search again, during the second personal search witnesses were present. Police officers seized a cigarette case from the applicant once again, this time they found four cigars of non-standard filling with a vegetative substance, which reminded narcotic drugs. No fingerprints were taken off the cigarettes.

10. Later that day on 20 XXXXX 2010, between 1:10 p.m. and 1:50 p.m. police officers examined the living apartment (XXXXX Ave.), in which the applicant regularly stayed overnight. It is not clear whether the landlord's consent for an examination of living quarter was received, criminal case file does not contain any relevant documents. The applicant claimed, that he had not consented to the search of his rented room, but consented to the search of his apartment located at, XXXXX str., where he was registered and lived with his mother. Notwithstanding this, police officers deceived the applicant and brought him to the apartment located at XXXXXAve., where police officers discovered and removed 9 cigars of a non-standard filling, a plastic bag with a vegetative substance, reminding narcotic drugs, and 3 900 rubles in banknotes of 100 rubles. Two of these banknotes were allegedly transferred to him by the "buyer" XXXXX in the course of test drug purchase operation.

11. The applicant did not see where exactly, when and how the indicated items were found since during the examination he was in the kitchen with the police officers. No fingerprints were lifted off the seized items for further verification or comparison with those of the applicant's.

12. Examination report № of 25 XXXXX 2010 revealed, that vegetative mass, contained in above 4 cigars, seized from the applicant during the second personal search on 20 XXXXX 2017, contained narcotic drug- hashish oil.

13. Expert (see Expert report № of 29 XXXXX 2010) had found that vegetative mass in the plastic bag and 9 cigars discovered in and removed from the room located at XXXXXAve. on 20 XXXXX 2010 contained narcotic drug- hashish oil. The total amount of hashish oil was 8, 432 grams. The vegetative mass in 4 cigars seized from the applicant on 20 XXXXX 2010., also contained a narcotic substance – hashish oil. Hand wipes test, taken from the applicant on 20 XXXXX 2010, contained traces of the drug. Yet, the above report did not contain information on traces of any other substance.

14. On XXXXX 2010, the applicant failed to appear at the court session because he had not received a notice of the date and time of the hearing, which is confirmed by the case files. The notice (subpoena) was not sent to the place of registration and permanent residence of the applicant (XXXXX str), despite the fact that the applicant had clearly indicated this address as a proper

Address for correspondence. Instead, the court's notice had been sent to the place where he had temporarily rented a room (XXXXXAve.), at the time when the notice was sent, the applicant was no longer living there.

15. On 27 XXXXX 2010, the Central District Court of the XXXXXXXXXXXX, XXXXXXXXXXXX decided to put the applicant on the wanted list and changed the measure of restraint from signed undertaking not to leave the place of residence to detention.

16. On 23 XXXXX 2011, the applicant lodged a complaint regarding the change of the preventive measure. He claimed that he was not given a subpoena and was not informed in any other legal way. On 11 XXXXX 2011, the Central District Court of XXXXXXXXXXXX of XXXXXXXXXXXX refused to grant the above appeal and change the preventive measure to a signed undertaking not to leave the place of residence.

17. On 21 XXXXXX 2011, the Central District Court of XXXXXXXXXXXX of XXXXXXXXXXXX found the applicant guilty of the charges under para. 3. art.30 and para.1 art. 228.1 of the Criminal Code of Russia and sentenced him to six years' imprisonment (by the partial adding-up of penalties imposed) in the strict-regime corrective colony without imposition of penalty or restriction of liberty.

18. The court found that the applicant's arguments were groundless, since, in the court's view, they had not been confirmed in the course of legal proceedings.

19. The applicant disagreed with this verdict and appealed against the court's decision in cassation. On 12 XXXXX 2011, the Judicial Chamber for Criminal Cases of the XXXXXXX issued the cassation determination. It partially amended the verdict of the court of first instance, reducing the sentence to 5 years and 6 months of imprisonment. Yet, the court considered the remainder of the appeal ill-founded, almost completely reproducing the text of the court of first instance.

20. In 2013, the applicant appealed to the XXXXXXX under the supervisory review procedure due to the inconsistency of the court's arguments with the actual circumstances of the case and requested that the verdict and the appeal judgment to be quashed.

21. On 3 XXXXX 2013, the judge of the XXXXXXX XXXXX K.A. ruled against the above appeal and affirmed the findings made by the Central District Court of XXXXXXXXXXXX of XXXXXXXXXXXX and the Judicial Chamber for Criminal Cases of the XXXXXXX of 21 XXXXX 2011 and 15 XXXXX 2011, respectively. Therefore, it decided that there were no any grounds for re-examination of the case.

22. In 2015, following consideration of the applicant's cassation appeal, the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation came to the same conclusion. The Court stated that considering all the factual circumstances of the crimes committed (which were not properly proven in the applicant's view), the actions of the applicant were qualified correctly. In this regard, on 2 XXXXX 2015, the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation issued a decision to refuse a referral of the cassation appeal to the Court of Cassation for its subsequent review during the court proceedings.

Alleged violation of Article 9 and article 14 of the International Covenant- unlawful detention in custody

23. The applicant submits that the preventive measures of remand in custody, which had been imposed on him, and the further refusal of the court to change this preventive measure constituted a violation of his right to liberty and security of person. Article 9 recognizes and protects both liberty of person and security of person. According to article 3 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, everyone has the right to life, liberty, and security of person. This is the first substantive right protected by the Universal Declaration, which demonstrates the great importance of Article 9 of the Covenant, both for individuals and for society as a whole. Liberty and security of person have value in themselves, as well as for the reason that, as history shows, deprivation of liberty and interference with personal integrity is the main way of preventing other human rights from being exercised. The lack of proper judicial notice of the date and place of the court hearing is a flagrant disregard for the elementary principle to which each judicial authority must obey; Such situations constitute a gross and obvious procedural violation of the criminal procedure legislation by the Russian Federation.

24. In the present case, the applicant did not receive notice of the upcoming court hearing. The address of registration and permanent residence of the Applicant had been available in the case file. The same address was indicated by the Applicant in the text of the written pledge not to leave, however, no notification was sent to this address and, accordingly, the Applicant was not duly notified of the upcoming hearing. In the criminal case file there are 2 (two) addresses of the Applicant: the first is the place of his registration (XXXXX st., 78, ap.191), the second is the place of his actual residence (32, XXXXX Ave., ap.8) this is the address at which the inspection of the dwelling was conducted on XXXXX 20, 2010.These facts are confirmed by the relevant documents in the case file. Notwithstanding, the court changed the measure of restraint in a form of a written undertaking not to leave to detention on remand. Later, the court did not take into account the applicant's arguments that he had not received the notification.

25. It should not be the general practice to subject suspects and accused persons to pre-trial detention. Detention pending trial must be based on an individualized determination that it is reasonable and necessary taking into account all the circumstances, for such purposes as to prevent flight, interference with evidence or the recurrence of crime (see: 1502/2006, Mikhail Marinich v. Belarus, para. 10.4; 1940/2010 Eligio Cedeño, para. 7.10; 1547/2007 Munarbek Torobekov v. Kyrgyzstan, para. 6.3). Pre-trial detention should not be mandatory for all defendants charged with a particular crime, without regard to individual circumstances (see concluding observations: Argentina (CCPR/CO/70/ARG, 2000), para. 10; Sri Lanka (CCPR/CO/79/LKA, 2003), para. 13).

26. In the case at hand, individual circumstances were not even taken into account. Improper judicial notification of the applicant resulted in the applicant’s detention pending the final decision of the court in his case. These circumstances violate the principles laid down in Article 9 of the

Covenant and the practice of the Human Rights Committee. In the present case, the reason for detention was the applicant's failure to appear for trial on XXXXX 27, 2010, through the fault of the court- judicial notice informing him about the date and time of the hearing was sent to the address where the Applicant no longer resided. And due to the fact that the subpoena did not come at the place of registration, he was not able to receive the judicial notice.

27. According para. 4 article 231 of the Code of Criminal Procedure public prosecutor, the defendant, his counsel, as well as the victim and his representative, the civil plaintiff and the civil defendant and their representatives must be notified at least 5 days before its start. The Instruction on judicial proceedings in the district courts, approved by the order of the Judicial Department of the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation of XXXXX 29, 2003, № 36 provides notification of the parties through the court summons sent by registered letters with registered notices.

28. However, none of the court's notifications of the date of the hearing was received by the Applicant. The court, knowing that the applicant did not receive a notice of the court hearing, considered the applicant's case in his absence, replacing the written pledge not to leave on arrest, and put the applicant on a wanted list.The applicant pointed out these circumstances in the cassation appeal, but in its decision of XXXXXXXXX5, 2011, the court indicated without any explanation or argument that "…the judicial board finds no violations of the Code of Criminal Procedure of the Russian Federation in respect of the change of preventive measures. The measure of restraint was changed because
29. evaded the court".The Applicant had no reason or desire to "hide" from the investigation, as he initially denied the charges against him. At the same time, the fact of inadequate notification in itself violated his right to a fair trial regarding his attendance at the hearing, as well as the right to be able to defend himself in person and /or through his representative.

30. Meanwhile, according to the clarification made by the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation contained in the Resolution of the Plenum of XXXXX of XXXXX 22, 2009 No. 28 "On the application by courts of criminal procedure legislation governing the preparation of a criminal case for trial", when deciding on the notification of the persons specifies in resolutions on the appointment of a court session (article 232 of the Code of the Criminal Procedure), courts shall bear in mind that notification of such persons can be exercised, *inter alia*, via SMS, if above persons agree to be notified in this way and when it is recorded that the SMS was sent and delivered to the addressee. The consent to be notified via SMS-notification shall be confirmed by the written consent, indicating the information about the participant of a trial and his/her consent to be notified in that way along with the mobile phone number to which such notice must be sent. Such SMS-notification had also not been received by the applicant, which means that the court completely disregarded all laws of the Russian Federation on mandatory notification of the persons taking part in a case.

31. The Code of Criminal Procedure of the Russian Federation has a clause, which provides as follows: if the defendant which is not remained in detention fails without reasonable excuse to appear in court, the court has a right to enforce the presence of the defendant, as well as a right to impose or change the defendant's restraint measure (Article 247 of the Criminal Procedure Code).

32. However, having changed the applicant's measure of restraint and placing him on the wanted list, the court did not verify the initial reasons for the applicant's absence at the court session on XXXXX 27, 2010.

33. Article 14, para. 3(d) of the Covenant guarantees everyone charged with a criminal offence the right to be tried in his presence. Proceedings in the absence of the accused may in some circumstances be permissible in the interest of the proper administration of justice, i.e. when accused persons, although informed of the proceedings sufficiently in advance, decline to exercise their rights to be present.

34. Therefore, such trials are only compatible with article 14, para. 3(d) if the necessary steps are taken to summon accused persons in a timely manner and to inform them beforehand about the date and place of their trial and to request their attendance (See: Communication No. 16/1977, Mgenge v. Zaire, para. 14.1; Maleki v. Italy, para. 9.3).

Alleged violation of Article 14 of the International Covenant-
Right to a fair trial

35. Subsequently, the Central District Court of XXXXXXXXXXXX of XXXXXXXXXXXX during sentencing based its judgment on the evidence obtained in breach of the law; inaccurate conclusions of the expert examinations; highly questionable testimony of police officers; found the applicant guilty of the offenses, which commission has not been properly proven. The court wrongly assessed the testimony of prosecution witnesses. Regarding the test drug purchase operation of XXXXX 19 2010, and subsequent charges of attempted illegal selling of drugs, both the criminal investigation and the court relied primarily on the testimony of XXXXX. At the same time, statements made by XXXXX during the pre-trial investigation and the court hearings contradict each other, as well as statements made by other witnesses present during the police operation. Moreover, no one but XXXXX himself had been present during the alleged physical handing of the cigarette containing drugs; no one but XXXXX has ever seen a person who allegedly handed a cigarette with narcotic substances to XXXXX.

36. There is no evidence in the case file (e.g. video, audio recordings, surveillance footage) that could prove conclusively the fact of the handing of the cigarette containing drugs and, accordingly, that the Applicant is a person who handed the cigarette.

37. A question arises regarding the impartiality of the judge regarding the outcome of the present case. The practice of the Committee suggests that the impartiality test has two dimensions. First, judges must not allow their judgement to be influenced by personal bias or prejudice, nor harbor preconceptions about the particular case before them, nor act in ways that improperly promote the interests of one of the parties to the detriment of the other. Second, the tribunal must also appear to a reasonable observer to be impartial (Human Rights Committee, General Comment No. 32, Article 14: Right to equality before courts and tribunals and to a fair trial, UN Doc. CCPR/C/GC/32 (2007), para. 21).

38. In the process of appeal against the verdict of the Central District Court of XXXXXXXXXXXX of XXXXXXXXXXXX of XXXXX 6,2011, the applicant submitted that he was deprived from the right to fair trial (guaranteed under Article 14 of the Covenant).

39. The notion of fair trial includes the guarantee of a fair trial and public hearing. Fairness of proceedings entails the absence of any direct or indirect influence, pressure or intimidation or intrusion from whatever side and for whatever motive (Human Rights Committee, General Comment No. 32, see above, para. 25).

40. In considering the question of the fairness of a trial, account must be taken of the proceedings as a whole, including evidence-gathering stage and the way in which such evidence was obtained. In the case file, there are no phone records that could confirm conclusively XXXXX's and other witnesses' statements that XXXXX had indeed called the Applicant immediately before the beginning of the drug purchase operation.

41. The Applicant denied wrongdoing, however the court found that the applicant's arguments were groundless, since they had not been confirmed in the course of legal proceedings and had been refuted by the testimony of prosecution witnesses and documents of the investigation, which in turn were based mainly on the testimony of the same prosecution witnesses. The court found that the testimony of witnesses for the defence was not an appropriate evidence of the applicant's innocence simply on the basis that it contradicted the testimony of prosecution witnesses.

42. As a general rule, it is for the courts of States parties to the Covenant to review facts and evidence, or the application of domestic legislation, in a particular case, unless it can be shown that such evaluation or application was clearly arbitrary or amounted to a denial of justice, or that the court otherwise violated its obligation of independence and impartiality (Communications No. 1188/2003, Riedl-Riedenstein and Others v. Germany, para. 7.3; No. 886/1999, Bondarenko v. Belarus, para. 9.3; No. 1138/2002, Arenz et al. v. Germany, decision on admissibility, para. 8.6).
43. Moreover, all higher courts (when rejecting the claim or refusing to refer a complaint to the Court for adjudication) had merely echoed all the provisions contained in the decision of the court of first instance; none of the higher courts referred to the provisions of the law and/or not in any way considered the arguments of the complaints submitted by the applicant.

44. All of the violations in question that have occurred during the court proceedings, violate the principles of international law, particularly those enshrined in Article 14(1) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which reads as follows: "...In the determination of any criminal charge against him, or of his rights and obligations in a suit at law, everyone shall be entitled to a fair and public hearing by a competent, independent and impartial tribunal established by law…". This article provides guarantees that States parties to the Covenant are bound to respect, regardless of their legal traditions and domestic law. While they should report on how these guarantees are interpreted in relation to their respective legal systems, the Committee noted that it cannot be left to the sole discretion of domestic law to determine the

essential content of Covenant guarantees (Human Rights Committee, General Comment No. 32, see above, para. 4).

45. The notion of "the court" as used in article 14(1) means-regardless of its denomination- a body that is established in accordance with the law, is either independent of the executive and legislative branches or must enjoy in specific cases judicial independence in deciding legal matters in proceedings that are judicial in nature. Article 14, paragraph 1, second sentence, guarantees access to such tribunals to all who have criminal charges brought against them. This right cannot be limited, and any criminal conviction by a body not constituting a tribunal is incompatible with this provision. Similarly, whenever rights and obligations in a suit at law are determined, this must be done at least at one stage of the proceedings by a tribunal within the meaning of this sentence. The failure of a State party to establish a competent tribunal to determine such rights and obligations or to allow access to such a tribunal in specific cases would amount to a violation of article 14 if such limitations are not based on domestic legislation, are not necessary to pursue legitimate aims such as the proper administration of justice, or are based on exceptions from jurisdiction deriving from international law such, for example, as immunities, or if the access left to an individual would be limited to an extent that would undermine the very essence of the right (Human Rights Committee, General Comment No. 32, see above para.18).

Therefore:

46. Article 14 of the Covenant guarantees that in the case of trials in absentia (3(a)), notwithstanding the absence of the accused, all due steps have been taken to inform accused persons of the charges and to notify them of the proceedings (Mbenge v. Zaire, communication No. 16/1977, para. 14.1). The first instance court improperly notified the Applicant of the date and place of the hearing. Such improper notification resulted in applicant's detention in custody, which undoubtedly had an independent negative impact on the severity of the sentence imposed upon the applicant. Paragraph 3(b) of the Article 14 of the Convenant stipulates that accused persons must have adequate time and facilities for the preparation of his/her defence and communicate with counsel of his own choosing. This provision is an important element of the guarantee of a fair trial and an application of the principle of equality of arms (Smith v. Jamaica, Communication No. 282/1988, para. 10.4; Michael Sawyers, Michael and Desmond McLean v. Jamaica, Communication No. 226/1987 and No.256/1987, para. 13.6). The Court of first instance (and later higher courts as well) disregarded this principle by delivering its judgement, based on the unsubstantiated statements of the "buyer" XXXXX, contradictory statements of prosecution witnesses in the absence of phone calls and other strong evidence and conclusive proof of the prosecution's position.

47. The courts failed to establish the circumstances of the case in a comprehensive and complete manner, made an incorrect legal assessment of the evidence provided in the case file and misread legally significant circumstances of the present case. The applicant therefore considers that Russian Federation has violated the applicant's right to fair trial under the article 14 of the Covenant, has violated the applicant's right to liberty and to the security of his person under the article 9 of the Covenant.

48. We believe that the satisfaction of this complaint will provide an opportunity to appeal against the unjust sentence.

VI. Checklist of supporting documents

1. Incident report of XXXXXXXXXXX г.
2. Order on declassification of the police investigative operation results of XXXXXXXXXXX
3. Record on the examination of the scene of XXXXXXXXXXX
4. Examination report №617 of XXXXXXXXXXX
5. Examination report №619 of XXXXXXXXXXX
6. Order on the institution of criminal proceedings of XXXXXXXXXXX
7. Report on witness interrogation of XXXXXXXXXXX
8. Expert report №635 от XXXXXXXXXXX г.
9. Record of witness interrogation of XXXXXXXXXXX г.
10. Record of witness interrogation of XXXXXXXXXXX г.
11. Record of witness interrogation of XXXXXXXXXXX г.
12. Record of interrogation of the suspect of XXXXXXXXXXX г.
13. The Decision to apply signed undertaking not to leave a place of residence and proper behavior as a measure of restrained XXXXXXXXXXX
14. Copy of formal charge of XXXXXXXXXXX
15. Record of interrogation of the accused of XXXXXXXXXXX
16. Indictment act of XXXXXXXXXXX
17. Trial transcript of XXXXXXXXXXX
18. Trial transcript of от XXXXXXX
19. The judgement of the Central District Court of XXXXXXXXXXXX of XXXXXXXXXXXX of XXXXXXX
20. Cassation appeal of XXXXXXX
21. Addition to the cassation appeal XXXXXXX
22. Trial transcript of XXXXXXX
23. The cassation determination of the Judicial Chamber for Criminal Cases of the XXXXXXXof XXXXXXXXXXX1.
24. The decision of the judge of the XXXXXXXto reject the supervisory review application of XXXXXXXXXXX3.
25. The ruling of the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation to refuse to refer the cassation appeal to the Court of Cassation for review during the court proceedings of XXXXXXXXXX5.

Date: _____

Author's Signature: XXXXXXX XXXXXXX, lawyer