### 4. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

**New York, 16 December 1966**

**ENTRY INTO FORCE:**

23 March 1976, in accordance with article 49, for all provisions except those of article 41; 28 March 1979 for the provisions of article 41 (Human Rights Committee), in accordance with paragraph 2 of the said article 41.

**REGISTRATION:**

23 March 1976, No. 14668.

**STATUS:**


**TEXT:**


*Note:* The Covenant was opened for signature at New York on 19 December 1966.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Accession(a), Succession(d), Ratification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>24 Jan 1983 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>4 Oct 1991 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>12 Sep 1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andorra</td>
<td>22 Sep 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>10 Jan 1992 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>8 Aug 1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>23 Jun 1993 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>13 Aug 1980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>10 Sep 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>13 Aug 1992 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>23 Dec 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>20 Sep 2006 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>6 Sep 2000 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>5 Jan 1973 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>12 Nov 1973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>21 Apr 1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>10 Jun 1996 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>12 Mar 1992 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia (Plurinational State of)</td>
<td>12 Aug 1982 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina¹</td>
<td>1 Sep 1993 d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>8 Sep 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>24 Jan 1992 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>21 Sep 1970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>4 Jan 1999 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>9 May 1990 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabo Verde</td>
<td>6 Aug 1993 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia²</td>
<td>26 May 1992 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Accession(a), Succession(d), Ratification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>27 Jun 1984 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>19 May 1976 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>8 May 1981 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>9 Jun 1995 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>10 Feb 1972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China⁴,⁵,⁶</td>
<td>5 Oct 1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>29 Oct 1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>25 Sep 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>5 Oct 1983 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>29 Nov 1968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d'Ivoire</td>
<td>26 Mar 1992 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia¹</td>
<td>12 Oct 1992 d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>28 Feb 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>2 Apr 1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic²</td>
<td>22 Feb 1993 d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic People's Republic of Korea⁸</td>
<td>14 Sep 1981 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>1 Nov 1976 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>6 Jan 1972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>5 Nov 2002 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>17 Jun 1993 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>4 Jan 1978 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>6 Mar 1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>14 Jan 1982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>30 Nov 1979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>25 Sep 1987 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>22 Jan 2002 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Accession(a), Succession(d), Ratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>21 Oct 1991 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eswatini</td>
<td>26 Mar 2004 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>11 Jun 1993 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>16 Aug 2018 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>11 Oct 1967</td>
<td>19 Aug 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>4 Nov 1980 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>21 Jan 1983 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>22 Mar 1979 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>3 May 1994 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>9 Oct 1968</td>
<td>17 Dec 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>7 Sep 2000</td>
<td>7 Sep 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>6 Sep 1991 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>5 May 1992 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>28 Feb 1967</td>
<td>24 Jan 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>12 Sep 2000</td>
<td>1 Nov 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>22 Aug 1968</td>
<td>15 Feb 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>6 Feb 1991 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>30 Dec 1968</td>
<td>22 Aug 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>10 Apr 1979 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>23 Feb 2006 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (Islamic Republic of)</td>
<td>4 Apr 1968</td>
<td>24 Jun 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>18 Feb 1969</td>
<td>25 Jan 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1 Oct 1973</td>
<td>8 Dec 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>19 Dec 1966</td>
<td>3 Oct 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>18 Jan 1967</td>
<td>15 Sep 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>19 Dec 1966</td>
<td>3 Oct 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>30 May 1978</td>
<td>21 Jun 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>30 Jun 1972</td>
<td>28 May 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>2 Dec 2003</td>
<td>24 Jan 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>1 May 1972 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>21 May 1996 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>7 Oct 1994 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao People's Democratic Republic</td>
<td>7 Dec 2000</td>
<td>25 Sep 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>14 Apr 1992 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>3 Nov 1972 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>9 Sep 1992 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>18 Apr 1967</td>
<td>22 Sep 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>15 May 1970 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liechtenstein</td>
<td>10 Dec 1998 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Accession(a), Succession(d), Ratification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>20 Nov 1991 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>26 Nov 1974</td>
<td>18 Aug 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>17 Sep 1969</td>
<td>21 Jun 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>22 Dec 1993 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>19 Sep 2006 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>16 Jul 1974 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>13 Sep 1990 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td>12 Mar 2018 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>17 Nov 2004 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>12 Dec 1973 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>23 Mar 1981 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>5 Jun 1968</td>
<td>18 Nov 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>23 Oct 2006 d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>19 Jan 1977</td>
<td>3 May 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>21 Jul 1993 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>28 Nov 1994 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauru</td>
<td>12 Nov 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>14 May 1991 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>12 Nov 1968</td>
<td>28 Dec 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>12 Mar 1980 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>7 Mar 1986 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>29 Jul 1993 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Macedonia</td>
<td>18 Jan 1994 d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>20 Mar 1968</td>
<td>13 Sep 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>17 Apr 2008</td>
<td>23 Jun 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>20 Sep 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>27 Jul 1976</td>
<td>8 Mar 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>21 Jul 2008 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>10 Jun 1992 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>11 Aug 1977</td>
<td>28 Apr 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>19 Dec 1966</td>
<td>23 Oct 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2 Mar 1967</td>
<td>18 May 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>7 Oct 1976</td>
<td>15 Jun 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>21 May 2018 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>10 Apr 1990 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>26 Jan 1993 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>27 Jun 1968</td>
<td>9 Dec 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>16 Apr 1975 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sao Tome and Principe</td>
<td>10 Dec 1998 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.

For objections thereto and declarations recognizing the competence of the Human Rights Committee under article 41, see hereinafter.)

AFGHANISTAN
[See chapter IV.3.]

ALGERIA
[See chapter IV.3.]

ARGENTINA
The Argentine Government states that the application of the second part of article 15 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights shall be subject to the principle laid down in article 18 of the Argentine National Constitution.

AUSTRALIA

Article 10
"In relation to paragraph 2 (a) the principle of segregation is accepted as an objective to be achieved progressively. In relation to paragraph 2 (b) and 3 (second sentence) the obligation to segregate is accepted only to the extent that such segregation is considered by the responsible authorities to be beneficial to the juveniles or adults concerned".

Article 14
"Australia makes the reservation that the provision of compensation for miscarriage of justice in the circumstances contemplated in paragraph 6 of article 14 may be by administrative procedures rather than pursuant to specific legal provision.

Article 20
"Australia interprets the rights provided for by articles 19, 21 and 22 as consistent with article 20; accordingly, the Commonwealth and the constituent States, having legislated with respect to the subject matter of the article in matters of practical concern in the interest of public order (ordre public), the right is reserved not to introduce any further legislative provision on these matters.

Australia has a federal constitutional system in which legislative, executive and judicial powers are shared or distributed between the Commonwealth and the constituent States. The implementation of the treaty throughout Australia will be effected by the Commonwealth, State and Territory authorities having
regard to their respective constitutional powers and arrangements concerning their exercise."

**AUSTRIA**


2. Article 9 and article 14 of the Covenant will be applied provided that legal regulations governing the proceedings and measures of deprivation of liberty as provided for in the Administrative Procedure Acts and in the Financial Penal Act remain permissible within the framework of the judicial review by the Federal Administrative Court or the Federal Constitutional Court as provided by the Austrian Federal Constitution.

3. Article 10, paragraph 3, of the Covenant will be applied provided that legal regulations allowing for juvenile prisoners to be detained together with adults under 25 years of age who give no reason for concern as to their possible detrimental influence on the juvenile prisoner remain permissible.

4. Article 14 of the Covenant will be applied provided that the principles governing the publicity of trials as set forth in article 90 of the Federal Constitutional Law as amended in 1929 are in no way prejudiced and that

   (a) paragraph 3, sub-paragraph (d) is not in conflict with legal regulations which stipulate that an accused person who disturbs the orderly conduct of the trial or whose presence would impede the questioning of another accused person, of a witness or of an expert can be excluded from participation in the trial;

   (b) paragraph 5 is not in conflict with legal regulations which stipulate that after an acquittal or a lighter sentence passed by a court of the first instance, a higher tribunal may pronounce conviction or a heavier sentence for the same offence, while they exclude the convicted person's right to have such conviction or heavier sentence reviewed by a still higher tribunal;

   (c) paragraph 7 is not in conflict with legal regulations which stipulate that after an acquittal or a lighter sentence passed by a court of the first instance, a higher tribunal may pronounce conviction or a heavier sentence for the same offence, while they exclude the convicted person's right to have such conviction or heavier sentence reviewed by a still higher tribunal;

5. Articles 19, 21 and 22 in connection with article 2 (1) of the Covenant will be applied provided that they are not in conflict with legal restrictions as provided for in article 16 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

6. Article 26 is understood to mean that it does not exclude different treatment of Austrian nationals and aliens, as is also permissible under article 1, paragraph 2, of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

**BAHAMAS**

"The Government of The Bahamas recognizes and accepts the principle of compensation for wrongful imprisonment contained in paragraph 6 of article 14, but the problems of implementation are such that the right not to apply that principle is presently reserved."

**BAHRAIN**

1. The Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain interprets the Provisions of Article 3, (18) and (23) as not affecting in any way the prescriptions of the Islamic Shariah.

2. The Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain interprets the provisions of Article (9), Paragraph (5) as not detracting from its right to layout the basis and rules of obtaining the compensation mentioned in this Paragraph.

3. The Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain interprets Article (14) Paragraph (7) as no obligation arise from it further those set out in Article (10) of the Criminal Law of Bahrain which provides:

   "Legal Proceedings cannot be instated against a person who has been acquitted by Foreign Courts from offenses of which he is accused or a final judgement has been delivered against him and the said person fulfilled the punishment or the punishment has been abolished by prescription."

**BANGLADESH**

"Article 14:

The Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh reserveapply paragraph 3 (d) of Article 14 in view of the fact, that, while the existing laws of Bangladesh provide that, in the ordinary course a person, shall be entitled to be tried in his presence, it also provides for a trial to be held in his absence if he is a fugitive offender, or is a person, who being required to appear before a court, fails to present himself or to explain the reasons for non-appearance to the satisfaction of the court."

"Article 10:

So far as the first part of paragraph 3 of Article 10 relating to reformation and social rehabilitation of offenders is concerned, Bangladesh does not have any facility to this effect on account of financial constraints and for lack of proper logistics support. The last part of this paragraph relating to segregation of juvenile offenders from adults is a legal obligation under Bangladesh law and is followed accordingly.

"Article 11:

Article 11 providing that "no one shall be imprisoned merely on the ground of inability to fulfil a contractual obligation," is generally in conformity with the Constitutional and legal provisions in Bangladesh, except in some very exceptional circumstances, where the law provides for civil imprisonment in case of willful default in complying with a decree. The Government of People's Republic of Bangladesh will apply this article in accordance with its existing municipal law.

"Article 14:

So far as the provision of legal assistance in paragraph 3 (d) of Article 14 is concerned, a person charged with criminal offences is statutorily entitled to legal assistance if he does not have the means to procure such assistance.

The Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, notwithstanding its acceptance of the principle of compensation for miscarriage of justice, as stipulated in Article 14, paragraph 6, is not in a position to guarantee a comprehensive implementation of this provision for the time being. However, the aggrieved has the right to realise compensation for miscarriage of justice by separate proceedings and in some cases, the court suo moto grants compensation to victims of miscarriage of justice. Bangladesh, however, intends to ensure full implementation of this provision in the near future."

**BARBADOS**

"The Government of Barbados states that it reserves the right not to apply in full, the guarantee of free legal assistance in accordance with paragraph 3 (d) of Article 14 of the Covenant, since, while accepting the principles contained in the same paragraph, the problems of implementation are such that full application cannot be guaranteed at present."

**BELARUS**

**BELGIUM**
2. The Belgian Government considers that the provision of article 10, paragraph 2 (a), under which accused persons shall, save in exceptional circumstances, be segregated from convicted persons is to be interpreted in conformity with the principle, already embodied in the standard minimum rules for the treatment of prisoners [resolution (73) 5 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe of 19 January 1973], that untried prisoners shall not be put in contact with convicted prisoners against their will [rules 7 (b) and 85 (1)]. If they so request, accused persons may be allowed to take part with convicted persons in certain communal activities.

3. The Belgian Government considers that the provisions of article 10, paragraph 3, under which juvenile offenders shall be segregated from adults and be accorded treatment appropriate to their age and legal status refers exclusively to the judicial measures provided for under the régime for the protection of minors established by the Belgian Act relating to the protection of young persons. As regards other juvenile ordinary-law offenders, the Belgian Government intends to reserve the option to adopt measures that may be more flexible and be designed precisely in the interest of the persons concerned.

4. With respect to article 14, the Belgian Government considers that the last part of paragraph 1 of the article appears to give States the option of providing or not providing for certain derogations from the principle that judgements shall be made public. Accordingly, the Belgian constitutional principle that there shall be no exceptions to the public pronouncements of judgements is in conformity with that provision. Paragraph 5 of the article shall not apply to persons who, under Belgian law, are convicted and sentenced at second instance following an appeal against their acquittal of first instance or who, under Belgian law, are brought directly before a higher tribunal such as the Court of Cassation, the Appeals Court or the Assize Court.

5. Articles 19, 21 and 22 shall be applied by the Belgian Government in the context of the provisions and restrictions set forth or authorized in articles 10 and 11 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of 4 November 1950, by the said Convention.

6. The Belgian Government declares that it does not consider itself obligated to enact legislation in the field covered by article 20, paragraph 1, and that article 20 as a whole shall be applied taking into account the rights to freedom of thought and expression, freedom of opinion and freedom of assembly and association proclaimed in articles 18, 19 and 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and reaffirmed in articles 18, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant.

7. The Belgian Government declares that it interprets article 23, paragraph 2, as meaning that the right of persons of marriageable age to marry and to found a family presupposes not only that national law shall prescribe the marriageable age but that it may also regulate the exercise of that right.

**BELIZE**

"(a) The Government of Belize reserves the right not to apply paragraph 2 of article 12 in view of the statutory provisions requiring persons intending to travel abroad to furnish tax clearance certificates;
(b) The Government of Belize reserves the right not to apply in full the guarantee of free legal assistance in accordance with paragraph 3 (d) of article 14, since, while it accepts the principle contained in that paragraph and at present applies it in certain defined cases, the problems of implementation are such that its application cannot be guaranteed at present;
(c) The Government of Belize recognizes and accepts the principle of compensation for wrongful imprisonment contained in paragraph 6 of article 14, but the problems of implementation are such that the right not to apply that principle is presently reserved."

**BOTSWANA**

“The Government of the Republic of Botswana considers itself bound by:...”

**Bulgaria**

[See chapter IV.3.]

**CONGO**

The Government of the People's Republic of Congo declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 11 [...] Article 11 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights is quite incompatible with articles 386 et seq. of the Congolese Code of Civil, Commercial, Administrative and Financial Procedure, derived from Act 51/83 of 21 April 1983. Under those provisions, in matters of private law, decisions or orders emanating from conciliation proceedings may be enforced through imprisonment for debt when other means of enforcement have failed, when the amount due exceeds 20,000 CFA francs and when the debtor, between 18 and 60 years of age, makes himself insolvent in bad faith.

**CUBA**

The Republic of Cuba hereby declares that it was the Revolution that enabled its people to enjoy the rights set out in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America and its policy of hostility and aggression against Cuba constitute the most serious obstacle to the Cuban people's enjoyment of the rights set out in the Covenant.

The rights protected under this Covenant are enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic and in national legislation.

The State's policies and programmes guarantee the effective exercise and protection of these rights for all Cubans.

With respect to the scope and implementation of some of the provisions of this international instrument, Cuba will make such reservations or interpretative declarations as it may deem appropriate.

**CZECH REPUBLIC**

**DENMARK**

Modification of the reservation made upon ratification:

"2 (b) (i) Article 14, paragraph 5, shall be applied in such a manner that:
- An unlimited right to appeal does not have to be instituted in cases where the conviction concerns a minor offence and the sentence imposed is a fine and/or confiscation below a certain amount to be laid down by law.
- A right to a further appeal does not have to be instituted in cases where the accused person, having been
acquitted by a lower court, is convicted for the first time by a higher court hearing an appeal of the acquittal.

- A right to appeal does not have to be instituted in criminal proceedings against a Member of Government or any other person brought before the High Court of the Realm (Rigsretten).

(ii) Article 14, paragraph 7, shall be applied in such a manner that criminal proceedings which led to a final conviction or acquittal may be reopened in certain circumstances to be laid down by law.

The Government of Denmark confirmed that the reservation to Article 14, paragraph 5 above is a narrowing of the reservation made upon ratification and that the reservation to Article 14, paragraph 7 above is a clarification of the reservation made upon ratification.

Paragraphs 1, 2 (a) and 3 of Denmark’s reservation made upon ratification remain unchanged:"1. The Government of Denmark makes a reservation in respect of Article 10, paragraph 3, second sentence. In Danish practice, considerable efforts are made to ensure appropriate age distribution of convicts serving sentences of imprisonment, but it is considered valuable to maintain possibilities of flexible arrangements.

2. (a). Article 14, paragraph 1, shall not be binding on Denmark in respect of public hearings. In Danish law, the right to exclude the press and the public from trials may go beyond what is permissible under this Covenant, and the Government of Denmark finds that this right should not be restricted.

3. Reservation is further made to Article 20, paragraph 1. This reservation is in accordance with the vote cast by Denmark in the XVI General Assembly of the United Nations in 1961 when the Danish Delegation, referring to the preceding article concerning freedom of expression, voted against the prohibition against propaganda for war."

**EGYPT**

[See chapter IV.3.]

**FINLAND**

"With respect to article 10, paragraph 2 (b) and 3, of the Covenant, Finland declares that although juvenile offenders are, as a rule, segregated from adults, it does not deem appropriate to adopt an absolute prohibition not allowing for more flexible arrangements;

With respect to article 14, paragraph 7 of the Covenant, Finland declares that it is going to pursue its present practice according to which a sentence can be changed to the detriment of the convicted person, if it is established that a member or an official of the court, the prosecutor or the legal counsel have through criminal or fraudulent activities obtained the acquittal of the defendant or a substantially more lenient penalty, or if false evidence has been presented with the same effect, and according to which an aggravated criminal case may be taken up for reconsideration if within a year until then unknown evidence is presented, which would have led to conviction or a substantially more severe penalty;

With respect to article 20, paragraph 1, of the Covenant, Finland declares that it will not apply the provisions of this paragraph, this being compatible with the standpoint Finland already expressed at the 16th United Nations General Assembly by voting against the prohibition of propaganda for war, on the grounds that this might endanger the freedom of expression referred in article 19 of the Covenant."

**FRANCE**

(1) The Government of the Republic considers that, in accordance with Article 103 of the Charter of the United Nations, in case of conflict between its obligations under the Covenant and its obligations under the Charter (especially Articles 1 and 2 thereof), its obligations under the Charter will prevail.

(2) The Government of the Republic enters the following reservation concerning article 4, paragraph 1: firstly, the circumstances enumerated in article 16 of the Constitution in respect of its implementation, in article 1 of the Act of 3 April 1978 and in the Act of 9 August 1849 in respect of the declaration of a state of siege, in article 1 of Act No. 55-385 of 3 April 1955 in respect of the declaration of a state of emergency and which enable these instruments to be implemented, are to be understood as meeting the purpose of article 4 of the Covenant; and, secondly, for the purposes of interpreting and implementing article 16 of the Constitution of the French Republic, the terms "to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation" cannot limit the power of the President of the Republic to take "the measures required by circumstances."

(3) The Government of the Republic enters a reservation concerning articles 9 and 14 to the effect that these articles cannot impede enforcement of the rules pertaining to the disciplinary régime in the armies.

(4) The Government of the Republic declares that article 13 cannot derogate from chapter IV of Order No. 45-2658 of 2 November 1945 concerning the entry into, and sojourn in, France of aliens, nor from the other instruments concerning the expulsion of aliens in force in those parts of the territory of the Republic in which the Order of 2 November 1945 does not apply.

(5) The Government of the Republic interprets article 14, paragraph 5, as stating a general principle to which the law may make limited exceptions, for example, in the case of certain offences subject to the initial and final adjudication of a police court. However, an appeal against a final decision may be made to the Court of Cassation which rules on the legality of the decision concerned.

The Government of the Republic declares that articles 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant will be implemented in accordance with articles 10, 11 and 16 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of 4 November 1950.

(7) The Government of the Republic declares that the term "war", appearing in article 20, paragraph 1, is to be understood to mean war in contravention of international law and considers, in any case, that French legislation in this matter is adequate.

(8) In the light of article 2 of the Constitution of the French Republic, the French Government declares that article 27 is not applicable so far as the Republic is concerned.

**GAMBIA**

"For financial reasons free legal assistance for accused persons is limited in our constitution to persons charged with capital offences only. The Government of the Gambia therefore wishes to enter a reservation in respect of article 14 (3) (d) of the Covenant in question."

**GERMANY**

**GUINEA**

In accordance with the principle whereby all States whose policies are guided by the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations are entitled to become parties to covenants affecting the interests of the international community, the Government of the Republic of Guinea considers that the provisions of article 48, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights are contrary to the principle of the universality of international treaties and the democratization of international relations.
GUYANA

"While the Government of the Republic of Guyana accept the principle of Legal Aid in all appropriate criminal proceedings, is working towards that end and at present apply it in certain defined cases, the problems of implementation of a comprehensive Legal Aid Scheme are such that full application cannot be guaranteed at this time."

"While the Government of the Republic of Guyana accept the principle of compensation for wrongful imprisonment, it is not possible at this time to implement such a principle."

HUNGARY

[See chapter IV.3.]

ICELAND

1. …
2. Article 10, paragraph 2 (b), and paragraph 3, second sentence, with respect to the separation of juvenile prisoners from adults. Icelandic law in principle provides for such separation but it is not considered appropriate to accept an obligation in the absolute form called for in the provisions of the Covenant.
3. …
4. Article 14, paragraph 7, with respect to the resumption of cases which have already been tried. The Icelandic law of procedure has detailed provisions on this matter which it is not considered appropriate to revise.
5. Article 20, paragraph 1, with reference to the fact that a prohibition against propaganda for war could limit the freedom of expression. This reservation is consistent with the position of Iceland at the General Assembly at its 16th session.
6. Other provisions of the Covenant shall be inviolably observed.

INDIA

[See chapter IV.3.]

INDONESIA

"With reference to Article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Government of the Republic of Indonesia declares that, consistent with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation Among States, and the relevant paragraph of the Vienna Declaration and Program of Action of 1993, the words "the right of self-determination" appearing in this article do not apply to a section of people within a sovereign independent state and can not be construed as authorizing or encouraging any action which would dismember or impair, totally or in part, the territorial integrity or political unity of sovereign and independent states."

IRAQ

[See chapter IV.3.]

IRELAND

Ireland accepts the principles referred to in paragraph 2 of article 10 and implements them as far as is practicable. It reserves the right to regard full implementation of these principles as objectives to be achieved progressively.

... Ireland accepts the principle in paragraph 1 of article 20 and implements it as far as it is practicable. Having regard to the difficulties in formulating a specific offence capable of adjudication at a national level in such a form as to reflect the general principles of law recognised by the community of nations as well as the right to freedom of expression, Ireland reserves the right to postpone consideration of the possibility of introducing some legislative addition to, or variation of, existing law until such time as it may consider that such is necessary for the attainment of the objective of paragraph 1 of article 20.

ISRAEL

"With reference to Article 23 of the Covenant, and any other provision thereof to which the present reservation may be relevant, matters of personal status are governed in Israel by the religious law of the parties concerned.
"To the extent that such law is inconsistent with its obligations under the Covenant, Israel reserves the right to apply that law."

ITALY

With reference to article 15, paragraph 1, last sentence: "If, subsequent to the commission of the offence, provision is made by law for the imposition of a lighter penalty, the offender shall benefit thereby", the Italian Republic deems this provision to apply exclusively to cases in progress.

Consequently, a person who has already been convicted by a final decision shall not benefit from any provision made by law, subsequent to that decision, for the imposition of a lighter penalty.

The provisions of article 19, paragraph 3, are interpreted as being compatible with the existing licensing system for national radio and television and with the restrictions laid down by law for local radio and television companies and for stations relaying foreign programmes.

JAPAN

[See chapter IV.3.]

KUWAIT

"The Government of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic accepts Article 22 of the Covenant on the basis that Article 22 shall be interpreted in accordance with the right to self-determination in Article 1, and shall be so applied as to be in conformity with the Constitution and the relevant laws of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic."


The Government of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic declares that Article 18 of the Covenant shall not be construed as authorizing or encouraging any activities, including economic means, by anyone which directly or indirectly, coerce or compel an individual to believe or not to believe in a religion or to convert his or her religion or belief. The Government of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic considers that all acts creating division and discrimination among ethnic groups and among religions are incompatible with Article 18 of the Covenant."
LIBYA

"The acceptance and the accession to this Covenant by the Libyan Arab Republic shall in no way signify a recognition of Israel or be conducive to entry by the Libyan Arab Republic into such dealings with Israel as are regulated by the Covenant."

LIECHTENSTEIN

"The Principality of Liechtenstein declares that it does not interpret the provisions of article 3 of the Covenant as constituting an impediment to the constitutional rules on the hereditary succession to the throne of the Reigning Prince."

"The Principality of Liechtenstein reserves the right to apply the provisions of article 14, paragraph 1 of the Covenant, concerning the principle that hearings must be held and judgments pronounced in public, only within the limits deriving from the principles at present embodied in the Liechtenstein legislation on legal proceedings."

"The Principality of Liechtenstein makes the reservation that the right to respect for family life, as guaranteed by article 17, paragraph 1 of the Covenant, shall be exercised, with regard to aliens, in accordance with the principles at present embodied in the legislation on aliens."...

"The Principality of Liechtenstein reserves the right to guarantee the rights contained in article 26 of the Covenant concerning the equality of all persons before the law and their entitlement without any discrimination to the equal protection of the law only in connection with other rights contained in the present Covenant."

LUXEMBOURG

"(a) The Government of Luxembourg considers that article 10, paragraph 3, which provides that juvenile offenders shall be segregated from adults and accorded treatment appropriate to their age and legal status, refers solely to the legal measures incorporated in the system for the protection of minors, which is the subject of the Luxembourg youth welfare act. With regard to other juvenile offenders falling within the sphere of ordinary law, the Government of Luxembourg wishes to retain the option of adopting measures that might be more flexible and be designed to serve the interests of the persons concerned."

"(b) The Government of Luxembourg declares that it is implementing article 14, paragraph 5, since that paragraph does not conflict with the relevant Luxembourg legal statutes, which provide that, following an acquittal or a conviction by a court of first instance, a higher tribunal may deliver a sentence, confirm the sentence passed or impose a harsher penalty for the same crime. However, the tribunal's decision does not give the person declared guilty on appeal the right to appeal that conviction to a higher appellate jurisdiction."

"The Government of Luxembourg further declares that article 14, paragraph 5, shall not apply to persons who, under Luxembourg law, are remanded directly to a higher court."

MALDIVES

"The application of the principles set out in Article 18 of the Covenant shall be without prejudice to the Constitution of the Republic of Maldives."

MALTA

"1. Article 13 - The Government of Malta endorses the principles laid down in article 13. However, in the present circumstances it cannot comply entirely with the provisions of this article.

2. Article 14 (2) - The Government of Malta declares that it interprets paragraph 2 of article 14 of the Covenant in the sense that it does not preclude any particular law from imposing upon any person charged under such law the burden of proving particular facts;

3. Article 14 (6) - While the Government of Malta accepts the principle of compensation for wrongful imprisonment, it is not possible at this time to implement such a principle in accordance with article 14, paragraph 6, of the Covenant;

4. Article 19 - The Government of Malta desiring to avoid any uncertainty as regards the application of article 19 of the Covenant declares that the Constitution of Malta allow such restrictions to be imposed upon public officers in regard to their freedom of expression as are reasonably justifiable in a democratic society. The code of Conduct of public officers in Malta precludes them from taking an active part in political discussions or other political activity during working hours or on the premises.

The Government of Malta also reserves the right not to apply article 19 to the extent that this may be fully compatible with Act 1 of 1987 entitled "An act to regulate the limitations on the political activities of aliens", and this in accordance with Article 16 of the Convention of Rome (1950) for the protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms or with Section 41 (2) (a) (ii) of the Constitution of Malta:

5. Article 20 - The Government of Malta interprets article 20 consistently with the rights conferred by Articles 19 and 21 of the Covenant but reserves the right not to introduce any legislation for the purposes of article 20;

6. Article 22 - The Government of Malta reserves the right not to apply article 22 to the extent that existing legislative measures may not be fully compatible with this article.

MAURITANIA

Article 18
1. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. This right shall include freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of his choice, and freedom, either individually or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in worship, observance, practice and teaching.

2. No one shall be subject to coercion which would impair his freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of his choice.

3. Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs may be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law and are necessary to protect public safety, order, health, or morals or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others.

4. The States Parties to the present Covenant undertake to have respect for the liberty of parents and, when applicable, legal guardians to ensure the religious and moral education of their children in conformity with their own convictions.

The Mauritanian Government, while accepting the provisions set out in article 18 concerning freedom of thought, conscience and religion, declares that their application shall be without prejudice to the Islamic Shariah.

**Article 23, paragraph 4**

States Parties to the present Covenant shall take appropriate steps to ensure equality of rights and responsibilities of spouses as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution. In the case of dissolution, provision shall be made for the necessary protection of any children.

The Mauritanian Government interprets the provisions of article 23, paragraph 4, on the rights and responsibilities of spouses as to marriage as not affecting in any way the prescriptions of the Islamic Shariah.

**MEXICO**

**Article 9, paragraph 5**

Under the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States and the relevant implementing legislation, every individual enjoys the guarantees relating to penal matters embodied therein, and consequently no person may be unlawfully arrested or detained. However, if by reason of false accusation or complaint any individual suffers an infringement of this basic right, he has, *inter alia*, under the provisions of the appropriate laws, an enforceable right to just compensation.

**Article 18**

Under the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States, every person is free to profess his preferred religious belief and to practice its ceremonies, rites and religious acts, with the limitation, with regard to public religious acts, that they must be performed in places of worship and, with regard to education, that studies carried out in establishments designed for the professional education of ministers of religion are not officially recognized. The Government of Mexico believes that these limitations are included among those established in paragraph 3 of this article.

**Article 23, subparagraph (b)**

The Government of Mexico also makes a reservation to this provision, since article 130 of the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States provides that ministers of religion shall have neither a passive vote nor the right to form associations for political purposes.

**MONACO**

The Government of Monaco declares that it does not interpret the provisions of article 2, paragraphs 1 and 2, and articles 3 and 25 as constituting an impediment to the constitutional rules on the devolution of the Crown, according to which succession to the Throne shall take place within the direct legitimate line of the Reigning Prince, in order of birth, with priority being given to male descendants within the same degree of relationship, or of those concerning the exercise of the functions of the Regency.

The Princely Government declares that the implementation of the principle set forth in article 13 shall not affect the texts in force on the entry and stay of foreigners in the Principality or of those on the expulsion of foreigners from Monegasque territory.

The Princely Government interprets article 14, paragraph 5, as embodying a general principle to which the law can introduce limited exceptions. This is particularly true with respect to certain offences that, in the first and last instances, are under the jurisdiction of the police court, and with respect to offences of a criminal nature. Furthermore, verdicts in the last instance can be appealed before the Court of Judicial Review, which shall rule on their legality.

The Princely Government declares that it considers article 19 to be compatible with the existing system of monopoly and authorization applicable to radio and television corporations.

The Princely Government, recalling that the exercise of the rights and freedoms set forth in articles 21 and 22 entails duties and responsibilities, declares that it interprets these articles as not prohibiting the application of requirements, conditions, restrictions or penalties which are prescribed by law and which are necessary in a democratic society to national security, territorial integrity or public safety, the defence of order and the prevention or crime, the protection of health or morals, and the protection of the reputation of others, or in order to prevent the disclosure of confidential information or to guarantee the authority and impartiality of the judiciary.

The Princely Government formulates a reservation concerning article 25, which shall not impede the application of article 25 of the Constitution and of Order No. 1730 of 7 May 1935 on public employment.

Article 26, together with article 2, paragraph 1, and article 25, is interpreted as not excluding the distinction in treatment between Monegasque and foreign nationals permitted under article 1, paragraph 2, of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, taking into account the distinctions established in articles 25 and 32 of the Monegasque Constitution.

**MONGOLIA**

[See chapter IV.3.]

**NETHERLANDS**

**Article 10**

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands subscribes to the principle set out in paragraph 1 of this article, but it takes the view that ideas about the treatment of prisoners are so liable to change that it does not wish to be bound by the obligations set out in paragraph 2 and paragraph 3 (second sentence) of this article.

"Article 12, paragraph 1"

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands regards the Netherlands and the Netherlands Antilles as separate territories of a State for the purpose of this provision.

"Article 12, paragraphs 2 and 4"

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands regards the Netherlands and the Netherlands Antilles as separate countries for the purpose of these provisions.

"Article 14, paragraphs 3 (d)"

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands reserves the statutory option of removing a person charged with a criminal offence from the court room in the interests of the proper conduct of the proceedings.

"Article 14, paragraph 5"

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands reserves the statutory power of the Supreme Court of the Netherlands to have sole jurisdiction to try certain categories of"
persons charged with serious offences committed in the discharge of a public office.

"Article 14, paragraph 7

"The Government of New Zealand reserves the right to implement such paragraph in accordance with such understanding.

"Norway"

Subject to reservations to article 10, paragraph 2 (b) and paragraph 3 "with regard to the obligation to keep accused juvenile persons and juvenile offenders segregated from adults" and to article 14, paragraphs 5 and 7 and to article 20, paragraph 1.

[The Government of Norway declares that] the entry into force of an amendment to the Criminal Procedure Act, which introduces the right to have a conviction reviewed by a higher court in all cases, the reservation made by the Kingdom of Norway with respect to article 14, paragraph 5 of the Covenant shall continue to apply only in the following exceptional circumstances:

1. "Riksfret" (Court of Impeachment)

According to article 86 of the Norwegian Constitution, a special court shall be convened in criminal cases against members of the Government, the Storting (Parliament) or the Supreme Court, with no right of appeal.

Conviction by an appellate court

2. In cases where the defendant has been acquitted in the first instance, but convicted by an appellate court, the conviction may not be appealed on grounds of error in the assessment of evidence in relation to the issue of guilt. If the appellate court convicting the defendant is the Supreme Court, the conviction may not be appealed whatsoever.

"Pakistan"

Reservation:

"The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan reserves its right to attach appropriate reservations, make declarations and state its understanding in respect of various provisions of the Covenant at the time of ratification."

"Qatar"

The State of Qatar does not consider itself bound by the following provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights for the below mentioned reasons:

1. Article 3 with regard to provisions related to the inheritance of power, for it contravenes the provisions of article 8 of the Constitution.

2. Article 23.4, for it contravenes the Islamic Sharia.

1. The State of Qatar shall interpret the term "punishment" in Article 7 of the Covenant in accordance with the applicable legislation of Qatar and the Islamic Sharia.

2. The State of Qatar shall interpret Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Covenant based on the understanding that it does not contravene the Islamic Sharia. The State of Qatar reserves the right to implement such paragraph in accordance with such understanding.

3. The State of Qatar shall interpret that the term "trade unions" and all related matters, as mentioned in Article 22 of the Covenant, are in line with the Labor Law and national legislation. The State of Qatar reserves the right to implement such article in accordance with such understanding.

4. The State of Qatar shall interpret Article 23, paragraph 2, of the Covenant in a manner that does not contravene the Islamic Sharia. The State of Qatar reserves the right to implement such paragraph in accordance with such understanding.
5. The State of Qatar shall interpret Article 27 of the Covenant that professing and practicing one's own religion require that they do not violate the rules of public order and public morals, the protection of public safety and public health, or the rights of and basic freedoms of others.

**REPUBLIC OF KOREA**

The Government of the Republic of Korea [declares] that the provisions of [...]. article 22 [...]. of the Covenant shall be so applied as to be in conformity with the provisions of the local laws including the Constitution of the Republic of Korea.

**ROMANIA**

Upon ratification: The Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania declares that the provisions of article 48, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights are at variance with the principle that all States have the right to become parties to multilateral treaties governing matters of general interest. Upon ratification: (a) The State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the provisions of article 48 (1) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights are inconsistent with the principle that multilateral international treaties whose purposes concern the international community as a whole must be open to universal participation; (b) The State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the maintenance in a state of dependence of certain territories referred to in article 1 (3) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights is inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations and the instruments adopted by the Organization on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, including the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, adopted unanimously by the United Nations General Assembly in its resolution 2625 (XXV) of 1970, which solemnly proclaims the duty of States to promote the realization of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in order to bring a speedy end to colonialism.

**RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 26 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and of paragraph 1 of article 48 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, under which a number of States cannot become parties to these Covenants, are of a discriminatory nature and considers that the Covenants, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, should be open for participation by all States concerned without any discrimination or limitation.

**SAMOA**

Declarations:

"The term "forced or compulsory labour" as appears in article 8 paragraph 3 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 1966 shall be interpreted as being compatible with that expressed in article 8 (2) (a) (b) (c) (d) of the Constitution of the Independent State of Samoa 1960, which stipulates that the "term forced or compulsory labour" shall include, (a) any work required to be done in consequence of a sentence of a Court; or (b) any service of a military character or, in the case of conscientious objectors, service exacted instead of compulsory military service; or (c) any service exacted in case of an emergency or calamity threatening life or well-being of the community; or (d) any work or service which is required by Samoan custom or which forms part of normal civic obligations.

The Government of the Independent State of Samoa considers that article 10 paragraphs 2 and 3, which provides that juvenile offenders shall be segregated from adults and accorded treatment appropriate to their age and legal status refers solely to the legal measures incorporated in the system for the protection of minors, which is addressed by the Young Offenders Act 2007 (Samoa)."

**SLOVAKIA**

... **SWITZERLAND**

... (b) Reservation concerning article 12, paragraph 1: The right to liberty of movement and freedom to choose one's residence is applicable, subject to the federal laws on aliens, which provide that residence and establishment permits shall be valid only for the canton which issues them.

... (f) Reservation concerning article 20: Switzerland reserves the right not to apply further measures to ban propaganda for war, which is prohibited by article 20, paragraph 1.

... (g) Reservation concerning article 25, subparagraph (b): The present provision shall be applied without prejudice to the cantonal and communal laws, which provide for or permit elections within assemblies to be held by a means other than secret ballot.

... Reservation concerning article 26: The equality of all persons before the law and their entitlement without any discrimination to the equal protection of the law shall be guaranteed only in connection with other rights contained in the present Covenant.

**SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC**

[See chapter IV.3.]

**THAILAND**

"The Government of Thailand declares that:

1. The term "self-determination" as appears in article 1, paragraph 1, of the Covenant shall be interpreted as being compatible with that expressed in the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, adopted by the World Conference on Human Rights on 25 June 1993.

2. [Withdrawn]

3. [Withdrawn]

4. With respect to article 20 of the Covenant, the term "war" appearing in paragraph 1 is understood by Thailand to mean war in contravention of international law."

**TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO**

(i) The Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago reserves the right not to apply in full the provision of paragraph 2 of article 4 of the Covenant since section 7 (3) of its Constitution enables Parliament to enact legislation even though it is inconsistent with sections (4) and (5) of the said Constitution;

(ii) Where at any time there is a lack of suitable prison facilities, the Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago reserves the right not to apply article 10 (2) (b) and 10 (3) so far as those provisions require juveniles who are detained to be accommodated separately from adults;

(iii) The Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago reserves the right not to apply paragraph 2 of article 12 in view of the statutory
provisions requiring persons intending to travel abroad to furnish tax clearance certificates;

(iv) The Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago reserves the right not to apply paragraph 5 of article 14 in view of the fact that section 43 of its Supreme Court of Judicature Act No. 12 of 1962 does not confer on a person convicted on indictment an unqualified right of appeal and that in particular cases, appeal to the Court of Appeal can only be done with the leave of the Court of Appeal itself or of the Privy Council;

(v) While the Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago accepts the principle of compensation for wrongful imprisonment, it is not possible at this time to implement such a principle in accordance with paragraph 6 of article 14 of the Covenant;

(vi) With reference to the last sentence of paragraph 1 of article 15.1ff, subsequent to the commission of the offence, provision is made by law for the imposition of a lighter penalty, the offender shall benefit thereby, the Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago deems this provision to apply exclusively to cases in progress. Consequently, a person who has already been convicted by a final decision shall not benefit from any provision made by law, subsequent to that decision, for the imposition of a lighter penalty.

(vii) The Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago reserves the right to impose lawful and reasonable restrictions with respect to the right to assembly under article 21 of the Covenant;

(viii) The Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago reserves the right not to apply the provision of article 26 of the Covenant in so far as it applies to the holding of property in Trinidad and Tobago under the Aliens Landholding Act of Trinidad and Tobago.

TURKEY

The Republic of Turkey declares that; it will implement its obligations under the Covenant in accordance to the obligations under the Charter of the United Nations (especially Article 1 and 2 thereof). The Republic of Turkey declares that it will implement the provisions of this Covenant only to the States with which it has diplomatic relations.

The Republic of Turkey declares that this Convention is ratified exclusively with regard to the national territory where the Constitution and the legal and administrative order of the Republic of Turkey are applied.

The Republic of Turkey reserves the right to interpret and apply the provisions of Article 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights in accordance with the related provisions and rules of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey and the Treaty of Lausanne of 24 July 1923 and its Appendices.

UKRAINE

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 26 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and of paragraph 1 of article 48 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, under which a number of States cannot become parties to these Covenants, are of a discriminatory nature and considers that the Covenants, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, should be open for participation by all States concerned without any discrimination or limitation.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"First, the Government of the United Kingdom declare their understanding that, by virtue of Article 103 of the Charter of the United Nations, in the event of any conflict between their obligations under Article 1 of the Covenant and their obligations under the Charter (in particular, under Articles 1, 2 and 73 thereof) their obligations under the Charter shall prevail.

"Secondly, the Government of the United Kingdom declare that:

(a) In relation to Article 14 of the Covenant, they must reserve the right not to apply, or to not apply in full, the guarantee of free legal assistance contained in subparagraph (d) of paragraph 3 in so far as the shortage of legal practitioners and other considerations render the application of this guarantee in British Honduras, Fiji and St. Helena impossible;

(b) In relation to Article 23 of the Covenant, they must reserve the right not to apply the first sentence of paragraph 4 in so far as it concerns any inequality which may arise from the operation of the law of domicile;

(c) In relation to Article 26 of the Covenant, they must reserve the right not to apply;

(i) Sub-paragraph (b) in so far as it may require the establishment of an elected legislature in Hong Kong and the introduction of equal suffrage, as between different electoral rolls, for elections in Fiji; and

(ii) Sub-paragraph (e) so far as it applies to jury service in the Isle of Man and to the employment of married women in the Civil Service of Northern Ireland, Fiji, and Hong Kong.

"Lastly, the Government of the United Kingdom declare that the provisions of the Covenant shall not apply to Southern Rhodesia unless and until they inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations that they are in a position to ensure that the obligations imposed by the Covenant in respect of that territory can be fully implemented.

"Firstly the Government of the United Kingdom maintain their declaration in respect of article 1 made at the time of signature of the Covenant.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right to apply to members of and persons serving with the armed forces of the Crown and to persons lawfully detained in penal establishments of whatever character such laws and procedures as they may from time to time deem to be necessary for the preservation of service and custodial discipline and their acceptance of the provisions of the Covenant is subject to such restrictions as may for these purposes from time to time be authorised by law.

"Where at any time there is a lack of suitable prison facilities or where the mixing of adults and juveniles is deemed to be mutually beneficial, the Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right not to apply article 10 (2) (b) and 10 (3), so far as those provisions require juveniles who are detained to be accommodated separately from adults, and not to apply article 10 (2) (a) in Gibraltar, Montserrat and the Turks and Caicos Islands in so far as it requires segregation of accused and convicted persons.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right to interpret the provisions of article 12 (1) relating to the territory of a State as applying separately to each of the territories comprising the United Kingdom and its dependencies.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right to continue to apply such immigration legislation governing entry into, stay in and departure from the United Kingdom as they may deem necessary from time to time and, accordingly, their acceptance of article 12 (4) and of the other provisions of the Covenant is subject to the provisions of any such legislation as regards any such persons not at the time having the right under the law of the United Kingdom to enter and remain in the United
Kingdom. The United Kingdom also reserves a similar right in regard to each of its dependent territories.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right not to apply article 13 in Hong Kong in so far as it conflicts with the right of review of a decision to deport an alien and a right to be represented for this purpose before the competent authority.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right not to apply or not to apply in full the guarantee of free legal assistance in sub-paragraph (d) of paragraph 3 of article 14 in so far as the shortage of legal practitioners renders the application of this guarantee impossible in the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, the Falkland Islands, the Gilbert Islands, the Pitcairn Islands Group, St. Helena and Dependencies and Tuvalu.

"The Government of the United Kingdom interpret article 20 consistently with the rights conferred by articles 19 and 21 of the Covenant and having legislated in matters of practical concern in the interests of public order (ordre public) reserve the right not to introduce any further legislation. The United Kingdom also reserve a similar right in regard to each of its dependent territories.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right to postpone the application of paragraph 3 of article 23 in regard to a small number of customary marriages in the Solomon Islands.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right to enact such nationality legislation as they may deem necessary from time to time to regulate the acquisition and possession of citizenship under such legislation to those having sufficient connection with the United Kingdom or any of its dependent territories and accordingly their acceptance of article 24 (3) and of the other provisions of the Covenant is subject to the provisions of any such legislation.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right not to apply sub-paragraph (b) of article 25 in so far as it may require the establishment of an elected Executive or Legislative Council in Hong Kong [ ... ].

"Lastly, the Government of the United Kingdom declare that the provisions of the Covenant shall not apply to Southern Rhodesia unless and until they inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations that they are in a position to ensure that the obligations imposed by the Covenant in respect of that territory can be fully implemented."

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

"(1) That article 20 does not authorize or require legislation or other action by the United States that would restrict the right of free speech and association protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States.

"(2) That the United States reserves the right, subject to its Constitutional constraints, to impose a capital punishment on any person (other than a pregnant woman) duly convicted under existing or future laws permitting the imposition of capital punishment, including such punishment for crimes committed by persons below eighteen years of age.

"(3) That the United States considers itself bound by article 7 to the extent that 'cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment' means the cruel and unusual treatment or punishment prohibited by the Fifth, Eighth, and/or Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

"(4) That because U.S. law generally applies to an offender the penalty in force at the time the offence was committed, the United States does not adhere to the third clause of paragraph 1 of article 15.

"(5) That the policy and practice of the United States is generally in compliance with and supportive of the Covenant's provisions regarding treatment of juveniles in the criminal justice system. Nevertheless, the United States reserves the right, in exceptional circumstances, to treat juveniles as adults, notwithstanding paragraphs 2 (b) and 3 of article 10 and paragraph 4 of article 14. The United States further reserves to these provisions with respect to States with respect to individuals who volunteer for military service prior to age 18."

"(1) That the Constitution and laws of the United States guarantee all persons equal protection of the law and provide extensive protections against discrimination. The United States understands distinctions based upon race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, poverty, birth or any other status - as those terms are used in article 20, paragraph 1 and article 26 - to be permitted when such distinctions are, at minimum, rationally related to a legitimate governmental objective. The United States further understands the prohibition in paragraph 1 of article 4 upon discrimination, in time of public emergency, based 'solely' on the status of race, colour, sex, language, religion or social origin, not to bar distinctions that may have a disproportionate effect upon persons of a particular status.

"(2) That the United States understands the right to compensation referred to in articles 9 (5) and 14 (6) to require the provision of effective and enforceable mechanisms by which a victim of an unlawful arrest or detention or a miscarriage of justice may seek and, where justified, obtain compensation from either the responsible individual or the appropriate governmental entity. Enforcement to compensation is subject to the reasonable requirements of domestic law.

"(3) That the United States understands the reference to 'exceptional circumstances' in paragraph 2 (a) of article 10 to permit the imprisonment of an accused person with convicted persons where appropriate in light of an individual's overall dangerousness, and to permit accused persons to waive their right to segregation from convicted persons. The United States further understands that paragraph 3 of article 10 does not diminish the goals of punishment, deterrence, and incapacitation as additional legitimate purposes for a penitentiary system.

"(4) That the United States understands that subparagraphs 3 (b) and (d) of article 14 do not require the provision of a criminal defendant's counsel of choice when the defendant is provided with court-appointed counsel on grounds of indigence, when the defendant is financially able to retain alternative counsel, or when imprisonment is not imposed. The United States further understands that paragraph 3 (c) does not prohibit a requirement that the defendant make a showing that any witness whose attendance he seeks to compel is necessary for his defense. The United States understands the prohibition upon double jeopardy in paragraph 7 to apply only when the judgment of acquittal has been rendered by a court of the same governmental unit, whether the Federal Government or a constituent unit, as is seeking a new trial for the same cause.

"(5) That the United States understands that this Covenant shall be implemented by the Federal Government to the extent that it exercises legislative and judicial jurisdiction over the matters covered therein and otherwise by the state and local governments; to the extent that state and local governments exercise jurisdiction over such matters, the Federal Government shall take measures appropriate to the Federal system to the end that the competent authorities of the state or local governments may take appropriate measures for the fulfillment of the Covenant.

"(1) That the United States declares that the provisions of articles 1 through 27 of the Covenant are not self-executing.

"(2) That it is the view of the United States that States Party to the Covenant should wherever possible refrain from imposing any restrictions or limitations on the exercise of the rights recognized and protected by the Covenant, even when such restrictions
and limitations are permissible under the terms of the Covenant. For the United States, article 5, paragraph 2, which provides that fundamental human rights existing in any State Party may not be diminished on the pretext that the Covenant recognizes them to a lesser extent, has particular relevance to article 19, paragraph 3 which would permit certain restrictions on the freedom of expression. The United States declares that it will continue to adhere to the requirements and constraints of its Constitution in respect to all such restrictions and limitations.
"(3) That the United States declares that the right referred to in article 47 may be exercised only in accordance with international law."  

**VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)**

Article 60, paragraph 5, of the Constitution of the Republic of Venezuela establishes that: "No person shall be convicted in criminal trial unless he has first been personally notified of the charges and heard in the manner prescribed by law. Persons accused of an offence against the res publica may be tried in absentia, with the guarantees and in the manner prescribed by law". Venezuela is making this reservation because article 14, paragraph 3 (d), of the Covenant makes no provision for persons accused of an offence against the res publica to be tried in absentia.

**VIET NAM**

[See chapter IV.3.]

**YEMEN**

[See chapter IV.3.]

### Objections

(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

**AUSTRALIA**

"The Government of Australia considers that the reservation with respect to article 18 of the Covenant is a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Australia recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty is not permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

Furthermore, the Government of Australia considers that the Republic of Maldives, through this reservation, is purporting to make the application of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights subject to the provisions of constitutional law in force in the Republic of Maldives. As a result, it is unclear to what extent the Republic of Maldives considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of the Republic of Maldives to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Australia considers that the reservation with respect to article 18 of the Covenant is subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation, pursuant to Article 27 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform a treaty.

Furthermore, the Government of Australia recalls that according to article 4 (2) of the Covenant, no derogation of article 18 is permitted.

For the above reasons, the Government of Australia objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Republic of Maldives to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and expresses the hope that the Republic of Maldives will soon be able to withdraw its reservation in light of the ongoing process of a revision of the Maldivian Constitution.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Australia and the Republic of Maldives."  

"The Government of Australia has examined the reservation made by The Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and now hereby objects to the same for and on behalf of Australia:

The Government of Australia considers that the reservations by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan are incompatible with the object and purpose of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (Covenant).

The Government of Australia recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty is not permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

Furthermore, the Government of Australia considers that The Islamic Republic of Pakistan, through its reservations, is purporting to make the application of the Covenant subject to the provisions of general domestic law in force in The Islamic Republic of Pakistan. As a result, it is unclear to what extent The Islamic Republic of Pakistan considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of The Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Australia considers that the reservations to the Covenant are subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation, pursuant to Article 27 of the Vienna Convention of the Lwäof Treaties, according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform a treaty.

Furthermore, the Government of Australia recalls that according to article 4 (2) of the Covenant, no derogation of article 18 is permitted.

For the above reasons, the Government of Australia objects to the aforesaid reservations made by The Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the Covenant and expresses the hope that the Islamic Republic of Pakistan will withdraw its reservations.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Australia and The Islamic Republic of Pakistan."
AUSTRIA

"The Government of Austria has carefully examined the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Maldives on 19 September 2006 in respect of Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Government of Austria is of the opinion that reservations which consist in a general reference to a system of norms (like the constitution of the legal order of the reserving State) without specifying the contents thereof leave it uncertain to which extent that State accepts to be bound by the obligations under the treaty. Moreover, those norms may be subject to changes. The reservation made by the Republic of Maldives is therefore not sufficiently precise to make it possible to determine the restrictions that are introduced into the agreement. The Government of Austria is therefore of the opinion that the reservation is capable of contravening the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Austria therefore regards the above-mentioned reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Austria and the Republic of Maldives."

"The Government of Austria has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic to Article 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights at the time of its ratification.

In the view of Austria a reservation should clearly define for the other States Parties to the Covenant the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Covenant. A reservation which consists of a general reference to constitutional provisions without specifying its implications does not do so. The Government of Austria therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Austria and the Lao People’s Democratic Republic."

"The Government of Austria has examined the reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon ratification of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).

The Government of Austria considers that in aiming to exclude the application of those provisions of the Covenant which are deemed incompatible with the Constitution of Pakistan, Sharia laws and certain national laws, the Islamic Republic of Pakistan has made reservations of general and indefinite scope. These reservations do not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Covenant the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Covenant.

The Government of Austria therefore considers the reservations of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to Articles 3, 6, 7, 18 and 19; further to Articles 12, 13 and 25 incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant and objects to them.

Austria further considers that the Committee provided for in Article 40 of the Covenant has a pivotal role in the implementation of the Covenant. The exclusion of the competence of the Committee is not provided for in the Covenant and in Austria’s views incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. Austria therefore objects to this reservation.

These objections shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Austria and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan."

BELGIUM

[The Belgian Government] wishes to observe that the sphere of application of article 11 is particularly restricted. In fact, article 11 prohibits imprisonment only when there is no reason for resorting to it other than the fact that the debtor is unable to fulfil a contractual obligation. Imprisonment is not incompatible with article 11 when there are other reasons for imposing this penalty, for example when the debtor, by acting in bad faith or through fraudulent manoeuvres, has placed himself in the position of being unable to fulfil his obligations. This interpretation of article 11 can be confirmed by reference to the travaux préparatoires (see document A/2929 of 1 July 1955).

After studying the explanations provided by the Congo concerning its reservation, [the Belgian Government] has provisionally concluded that this reservation is unnecessary. It is its understanding that the Congolese legislation authorizes imprisonment for debt when other means of enforcement have failed when the amount due exceeds 20,000 CFA francs and when the debtor, between 18 and 60 years of age, makes himself insolvent in bad faith. The latter condition is sufficient to show that there is no contradiction between the Congolese legislation and the object and purpose of the Covenant.

By virtue of article 4, paragraph 2, of the aforementioned Covenant, article 11 is excluded from the scope of application of the rule which states that in the event of an exceptional public emergency, the States Parties to the Covenant may, in certain conditions, take measures derogating from their obligations under the Covenant. Article 11 is one of the articles containing a provision from which no derogation is permitted in any circumstances. Any derogation from article 11 would destroy its effects and would therefore be in contradiction with the letter and the spirit of the Covenant.

Consequently, and without prejudice to its firm belief that Congolese law is in complete conformity with the provisions of article 11 of the Covenant, [the Belgian Government] fears that the reservation made by the Congo may, by reason of its very principle, constitute a precedent which might have considerable effects at the international level.

[The Belgian Government] therefore hopes that this reservation will be withdrawn and, as a precautionary measure, wishes to raise an objection to that reservation.

The Government of Belgium wishes to raise an objection to the reservation made by the United States of America regarding article 6, paragraph 5, of the Covenant, which prohibits the imposition of the sentence of death for crimes committed by persons below 18 years of age.

The Government of Belgium considers the reservation to be incompatible with the provisions and intent of article 6 of the Covenant which, as is made clear by article 4, paragraph 2, of the Covenant, establishes minimum measures to protect the right to life.

The expression of this objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between Belgium and the United States of America.

Belgium has carefully examined the reservations made by Pakistan upon accession on 23 June 2010 to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The vague and general nature of the reservations made by Pakistan with respect to Articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19 and 25 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights may contribute to undermining the bases of international human rights treaties.

The reservations make the implementation of the Covenant’s provisions contingent upon their compatibility with the Islamic Sharia and/or legislation in force in Pakistan. This creates uncertainty as to which of its obligations under the Covenant Pakistan intends to observe and raises doubts as to Pakistan’s respect for the object and purpose of the Covenant.

As to the reservation made with respect to Article 40, Belgium emphasizes that the object and purpose of the Covenant are not only to confer rights upon individuals,
thereby imposing corresponding obligations on States, but also to establish an effective mechanism for monitoring obligations under the Covenant.

It is in the common interest for all parties to respect the treaties to which they have acceded and for States to be willing to enact such legislative amendments as may be necessary in order to fulfil their treaty obligations.

Belgium also notes that the reservations concern a fundamental provision of the Covenant. Consequently, Belgium considers the reservations to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

Belgium notes that under customary international law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty is not permitted (article 19 (c)). Furthermore, under Article 27 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform a treaty.

Consequently, Belgium objects to the reservations formulated by Pakistan with respect to Articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19, 25 and 40 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of Belgium and Pakistan.

**CANADA**

"The Government of Canada has carefully examined the reservation made by the Government of the Maldives upon acceding to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, in accordance with which the "application of the principles set out in Article 18 of the Covenant shall be without prejudice to the Constitution of the Republic of Maldives". The Government of Canada considers that a reservation which consists of a general reference to national law constitutes, in reality, a reservation with a general, indeterminate scope, such that it makes it impossible to identify the modifications to obligations under the Covenant, which it purports to introduce and which does not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Covenant.

The Government of Canada notes that the reservation made by the Government of the Maldives which addresses one of the most essential provisions of the Covenant, to which no derogation is allowed according to Article 4 of the Covenant, is in contradiction with the object and purpose of the Covenant. The Government of Canada therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Maldives.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Covenant between Canada and the Maldives.6

"The Government of Canada has carefully examined the reservations made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon ratification of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which declare that:

the provisions of Articles 3, 6, 7, 18 and 19 shall be so applied to the extent that they are not repugnant to the Provisions of the Constitution of Pakistan and the Sharia laws";

"the provisions of Article 12 shall be so applied as to be in conformity with the Provisions of the Constitution of Pakistan";

"With respect to Article 13, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan reserves its right to apply its law relating to foreigners";

"the provisions of Article 25 shall be so applied to the extent that they are not repugnant to the Provisions of the Constitution of Pakistan"; and the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan "does not recognize the competence of the Committee provided for in Article 40 of the Covenant".

The Government of Canada considers that reservations which consist of a general reference to national law or to the prescriptions of the Islamic Sharia constitute, in reality, reservations with a general, indeterminate scope. This makes it impossible to identify the modifications to obligations under the Covenant that each reservation purports to introduce and impossible for the other States Parties to the Covenant to know the extent to which Pakistan has accepted the obligations of the Covenant, an uncertainty which is unacceptable, especially in the context of treaties related to human rights.

The Government of Canada further considers that the competence of the Committee to receive, study and comment on the reports submitted by States Parties as provided for in Article 40 of the Covenant is essential to the implementation of the Covenant. Through its function and its activity, the Human Rights Committee plays an essential role in monitoring the fulfillment of the obligations of the States Parties to the Convention. Participation in the reporting mechanism outlined in Article 40, which is aimed at encouraging more effective implementation by States Parties of their treaty obligations, is standard practice of States Parties to the Covenant.

The Government of Canada notes that the reservations made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, addressing many of the most essential provisions of the Covenant, and aiming to exclude the obligations under those provisions, are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant, and thus inadmissible under Article 19(c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. In addition, Articles 6, 7 and 18 of the Covenant are among the provisions from which no derogation is allowed, according to Article 4 of the Covenant. The Government of Canada therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Covenant between Canada and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan."

**CYPRUS**

".....the Government of the Republic of Cyprus has examined the declaration made by the Government of the Republic of Turkey to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (New York, 16 December 1966) on 23 September 2003, in respect of the implementation of the provisions of the Convention only to the States Parties which it recognizes and with which it has diplomatic relations.

In the view of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus, this declaration amounts to a reservation. This reservation creates uncertainty as to the States Parties in respect of which Turkey is undertaking the obligations in the Covenant, and raises doubt as to the commitment of Turkey to the object and purpose of the said Covenant. The Government of the Republic of Cyprus therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Turkey to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This reservation or the objection to it shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Cyprus and the Republic of Turkey."

**CZECH REPUBLIC**

"The Government of the Czech Republic has carefully examined the contents of the reservation made by the Republic of Maldives upon accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted on 16 December 1966, in respect of Article 18 thereof.

The Government of the Czech Republic is of the opinion that the aforementioned reservation is in contradiction with the general principle of treaty
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interpretation according to which a State party to a treaty may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform according to the obligations set out by the treaty. Furthermore, the reservation consists of a general reservation in the Constitution without specifying its content and as such does not clearly define to other Parties to the Covenant the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Covenant.

The Government of the Czech Republic recalls that it is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. According to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Czech Republic therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Republic of Maldives to the Covenant. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Czech Republic and the Republic of Maldives, without the Republic of Maldives benefiting from its reservation.

"The Czech Republic believes that the reservations of Pakistan made to Articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19, 25 and 40 of the Covenant, if put into practice, would result in weakening of the relevant human rights, which is contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant. Furthermore, Pakistan supports these reservations by references to its Constitution, which make the applications of these essential obligations of the Covenant unenforceable, and/or national law in force in Pakistan, which raise doubts as to what extent the Islamic Republic of Pakistan considers itself bound by the obligations of the treaty and concern as to the commitment of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. According to Article 28 paragraph 2 of the Convention and according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Czech Republic, therefore, objects to the aforesaid reservations made by Pakistan to the Covenant. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Czech Republic and Pakistan. The Covenant enters into force in its entirety between the Czech Republic and Pakistan, without Pakistan benefiting from its reservation."

**DENMARK**

"Having examined the contents of the reservations made by the United States of America, Denmark would like to recall article 4, para 2 of the Covenant according to which no derogation from fundamental articles, *inter alia* 6 and 7, may be made by a State Party even in time of public emergency which threatens the life of the nation.

In the opinion of Denmark, reservation (2) of the United States with respect to capital punishment for crimes committed by persons below eighteen years of age as well as reservation (3) with respect to article 7 constitute general derogations from articles 6 and 7, while according to article 4, para 2 of the Covenant such derogations are not permitted.

Therefore, and taking into account that articles 6 and 7 are protecting two of the most basic rights contained in the Covenant, the Government of Denmark regards the said reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant, and consequently Denmark objects to the reservations.

These objections do not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between Denmark and the United States.

"The Government of Denmark has examined the contents of the reservations made by the Government of Botswana to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The reservations refer to legislation in force in Botswana as regards the scope of application of two core provisions of the Covenant, Articles 7 and 12 para.3. The Government of Denmark considers that the reservations raise doubts as to the commitment of Botswana to fulfill her obligations under the Covenant and are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

For these reasons, the Government of Denmark objects to these reservations made by the Government of Botswana.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant in its entirety between Botswana and Denmark without Botswana benefiting from the reservations."

"The Government of the Kingdom of Denmark has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon ratification of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Government of Denmark considers that the reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19 and 25 of the Covenant, which make the applications of these essential obligations under the Covenant subject to Sharia and/or constitutional and/or national law in force in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, raise doubts as to what extent the Islamic Republic of Pakistan puts into practice the Covenant.

For these reasons, the Government of Denmark objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the Covenant. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and Denmark."

"The Government of the Kingdom of Denmark has also examined the reservation made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan with respect to Article 40 of the Covenant.

The Government of Denmark considers that the supervisory machinery established under the Covenant, including the system of periodic reporting to the Human Rights Committee is an essential part of the treaty.

Accordingly a reservation to the effect that a State Party does not recognize the competence of the Human Rights Committee to review and comment State reports must be considered contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Denmark wishes to recall that, according to customary international law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant shall not be permitted.

Consequently, the Government of Denmark considers the said reservations as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant and accordingly inadmissible and without effect under international law.

The Government of Denmark therefore objects to the aforementioned reservation made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. This shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant in its entirety between the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and Denmark.

The Government of Denmark recommends the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to reconsider its reservations to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights."
ESTONIA

"The Government of Estonia has carefully examined the reservation made by the Republic of Maldives to Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Government of Estonia considers the reservation to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant as with this reservation the application of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights is made subject to the provisions of constitutional law. The Government of Estonia is of the view that the reservation makes it unclear to what extent the Republic of Maldives considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of the Republic of Maldives to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Estonia therefore objects to the reservation made by the Republic of Maldives to Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and expresses the hope that the Republic of Maldives will soon be able to withdraw its reservation in light of the ongoing process of the revision of the Maldivian Constitution.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights between Estonia and the Republic of Maldives."

"The Government of the Republic of Estonia has carefully examined the reservations made on 23 June 2010 by Pakistan to articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19, 25 and 40 of the Covenant.

Regarding Articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19, 25, the Government of the Republic of Estonia considers these reservations to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant as with these reservations the application of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights is made subject to the provisions of constitutional law. The Government of Estonia is of the view that the reservation which consists of a general reference to a national law without specifying its content does not clearly indicate to what extent the Islamic Republic of Pakistan considers itself bound by the obligations contained in the relevant Articles of the Covenant and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

Furthermore, the reservation made by Islamic Republic of Pakistan to Article 40 of the Covenant is in the view of the Government of the Republic of Estonia contrary to the aim of the Covenant as this Article sets out the commitments of States towards the Human Rights Committee. The reporting mechanism is one of the core elements of the implementation of the Covenant.

Therefore, the Government of the Republic of Estonia objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

Nevertheless, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights between the Republic of Estonia and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan."

FINLAND

"... It is recalled that under international treaty law, the name assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified, does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. Understanding (1) pertaining to articles 2, 4 and 26 of the Covenant is therefore considered to constitute in substance a reservation to the Covenant, directed at some of its most essential provisions, namely those concerning the prohibition of discrimination. In the view of the Government of Finland, a reservation of this kind is contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant, as specified in article 19(c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

As regards reservation (2) concerning article 6 of the Covenant, it is recalled that according to article 4(2), no restrictions of articles 6 and 7 of the Covenant are allowed for. In the view of the Government of Finland, the right to life is of fundamental importance in the Covenant and the said reservation therefore is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

As regards reservation (3), it is in the view of the Government of Finland subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of internal law as justification for failure to perform a treaty.

For the above reasons the Government of Finland objects to reservations made by the United States to articles 2, 4 and 26 [cf. Understanding (1)], to article 6 [cf. Reservation (2)] and to article 7 [cf. Reservation (3)]. However, the Government of Finland does not consider that this objection constitutes an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between Finland and the United States of America.

"The Government of Finland notes that according to the interpretative declarations the application of certain articles of the Covenant is in a general way subjected to national law. The Government of Finland considers these interpretative declarations as reservations of a general kind.

The Government of Finland is of the view that such general reservations raise doubts as to the commitment of Kuwait to the object and purpose of the Covenant and would recall that a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant shall not be permitted. As regards the reservation made to article 25 (b), the Government of Finland wishes to refer to its objection to the reservation made by Kuwait to article 7 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

It is the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Finland is further of the view that general reservations of the kind made by the Government of Kuwait, which do not clearly specify the extent of the derogation from the provisions of the covenant, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Kuwait to the [said Covenant] which are considered to be inadmissible.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Covenant between Kuwait and Finland."

The Government of Finland has examined the declarations and reservation made by the Republic of Turkey to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Government of Finland notes that the Republic of Turkey reserves the right to interpret and apply the provisions of Article 27 of the Covenant in accordance with the related provisions and rules of the Constitution. The Government of the Republic of Turkey and the Treaty of Lausanne of 24 July 1923 and its Appendices.

The Government of Finland emphasises the great importance of the rights of minorities provided for in Article 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The reference to the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey is of a general nature and does not clearly specify the object of the reservation. The Government of Finland therefore wishes to declare that it assumes that the Government of the Republic of Turkey will ensure the implementation of the rights of minorities recognised in the Covenant and will do its utmost to bring its national legislation into compliance with the obligations under the Covenant with a view to withdrawing the reservation. This declaration does not
preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Turkey and Finland."

"The Government of Finland has carefully examined the contents of the declaration made by the Government of Mauritania on Article 18 and part I of Article 23 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Government of Finland notes that a reservation which consists of a general reference to religious or other national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define to other parties to the Covenant the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Convention and creates serious doubts as to the commitment of the receiving State to fulfill its obligations under the Convention. Such reservations are, furthermore, subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its domestic law as justification for a failure to perform its treaty obligations.

The Government of Finland notes that the reservations made by the Government of Mauritania, addressing some of the most essential provisions of the Covenant, and aiming to exclude the obligations under those provisions, are in contradiction with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the above-mentioned declaration made by the Government of Mauritania to the Covenant. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Islamic Republic of Mauritania and the Republic of Finland. The Covenant will thus become operative between the two states without the Islamic Republic of Mauritania benefiting from its declarations."

"The Government of Finland has examined the reservation made by the Republic of Maldives to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Government of Finland notes that the Republic of Maldives reserves the right to interpret and apply the provisions of Article 18 of the Covenant in accordance with the related provisions and rules of the Constitution of the Republic of Maldives.

The Government of Finland notes that a reservation which consists of a general reference to national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define to other Parties to the Covenant the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Covenant and creates serious doubts as to the commitment of the receiving State to fulfill its obligations under the Covenant. Such reservations are, furthermore, subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its domestic law as justification for a failure to perform its treaty obligations.

Furthermore, the Government of Finland emphasises the great importance of the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion which is provided for in Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Government of Finland therefore wishes to declare that it assumes that the Government of the Republic of Maldives will ensure the implementation of the rights of freedom of thought, conscience and religion recognized in the Covenant and will do its utmost to bring its national legislation into compliance with the obligations under the Covenant with a view to withdrawing the reservation.

This declaration does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Maldives and Finland. The Covenant will thus become operative between the two states without the Republic of Maldives benefiting from its reservation."

"The Government of Finland welcomes the ratification by the Lao People’s Democratic Republic of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Government of Finland has carefully examined the content of the reservations relating to Articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19, 25 and 40 of the Convention made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon ratification.

The Government of Finland notes that the Islamic Republic of Pakistan reserves the right to apply the provisions of Article 3, 6, 7, 18 and 19 to the extent that they are not repugnant to the provisions of the Constitution of Pakistan and the Sharia laws, the provisions of Article 12 so as to be in conformity with the provisions of the Constitution of Pakistan, and the provisions of Article 25 to the extent that they are not repugnant to the provisions of the Constitution of Pakistan, and that, as regards the provisions of Article 13, the Islamic Republic of Pakistan reserves the right to apply its law relating to foreigners.

The Government of Finland notes that a reservation which consists of a general reference to national law without specifying its content does not clearly define to other Parties to the Covenant the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Covenant and creates serious doubts as to the commitment of the receiving State to fulfill its obligations under the Covenant. Such reservations are, furthermore, subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its domestic law as justification for a failure to perform its treaty obligations.

Furthermore, the Government of Finland notes that the Islamic Republic of Pakistan declares that it does not recognize the competence of the Human Rights Committee provided for in Article 40 of the Covenant. The reporting mechanism established under Article 40 is an essential feature of the system of human rights protection created by the Covenant and an integral undertaking of States Parties to the Covenant.

All of the above reservations seek to restrict essential obligations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan under the Covenant and raise serious doubts as to the commitment of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the object and
purpose of the Covenant. The Government of Finland wishes to recall that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and customary international law, a reservation contrary to the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan in respect of Articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19, 25 and 40 of the Covenant. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two states without the Islamic Republic of Pakistan benefiting from its reservations.

**FRANCE**

The Government of the Republic takes objection to the reservation entered by the Government of the Republic of India to Article 3 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, as this reservation is contrary to the object and purpose of the Treaty and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaty.

At the time of the ratification of the said Covenant, the United States of America expressed a reservation relating to article 6, paragraph 5, of the Covenant, which prohibits the imposition of the death penalty for crimes committed by persons below 18 years of age. France considers that this United States reservation is not valid, inasmuch as it is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Such objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between France and the United States.

The Government of the French Republic has studied Botswana’s reservations to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The purpose of the two reservations is to limit Botswana’s commitment to articles 7 and 12, paragraph 3, of the Covenant to the extent to which these provisions are compatible with sections 7 and 14 of the Constitution of Botswana.

The Government of the French Republic considers that the first reservation casts doubt upon Botswana’s commitment and might nullify article 7 of the Covenant which prohibits in general terms torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Consequently, the Government of the French Republic objects to the Government of Botswana’s reservation to article 7 of the Covenant.

“"The Government of the French Republic has examined the declarations formulated by the Government of Mauritania upon acceding to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted on 16 December 1966, in accordance with which the Government of Mauritania, on one hand, while accepting the provisions set out in article 18 concerning freedom of thought, conscience and religion, declares that their application shall be without prejudice to the Islamic sharia and, on the other, interprets the provisions of article 23, paragraph 4, on the rights and responsibilities of spouses as to marriage as not affecting in any way the prescriptions of the Islamic sharia. By making the application of article 18 and the interpretation of article 23, paragraph 4, of the Covenant subject to the prescriptions of the Islamic sharia, the Government of Mauritania is, in reality, formulating reservations with a general, indeterminate scope, such that they make it impossible to identify the obligations under the Covenant, which they purport to introduce. The Government of the French Republic considers that the reservations thus formulated are likely to deprive the provisions of the Covenant of any effect and are contrary to the object and purpose thereof. It therefore enters an objection to these reservations. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between France and Mauritania."

The Government of the French Republic has reviewed the reservation made by the Republic of Maldives at the time of its accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 16 December 1966 to the effect that the Republic of Maldives intends to apply the Convention, the principles relating to freedom of thought, conscience and religion set out in article 18 of the Covenant, only to a limited extent.

The Government of the Republic considers that by subordinating the application of provisions of the Covenant to the domestic law of the United States, the Government of the United States is depriving this key body under the Covenant of its main function. As such, the Government of the French Republic considers this reservation to be contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the French Republic therefore objects to the reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan benefiting from its reservations.

**GERMANY**

[See under "Objections" in chapter IV.3.]

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany objects to the reservation (i) by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago. In the opinion of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, it follows from the text and the history of the Covenant that the said reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant."

[See under "Objections" in chapter IV.3.]

"The Federal Republic of Germany interprets the declaration to mean that the Republic of Korea does not intend to restrict its obligations under article 22 by referring to its domestic legal system."

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany objects to the United States’ reservation, referring to article 6, paragraph 5 of the Covenant, which prohibits capital punishment for crimes committed by persons below..."
eighteen years of age. The reservation referring to this provision is incompatible with the text as well as the object and purpose of article 6, which, as made clear by paragraph 2 of article 4, lays down the minimum standard for the protection of the right to life. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany interprets the United States' "reservation" with regard to article 7 of the Covenant as a reference to article 2 of the Covenant, thus not in any way affecting the obligations of the United States of America as a state party to the Covenant."

[See under "Objections" in chapter IV.3.]

The Government of the Republic of Turkey has declared that it will implement the provisions of the Covenant only to the states with which it has diplomatic relations. Moreover, the Government of the Republic of Turkey has declared that it ratifies the Covenant exclusively with regard to the national territory where the Constitution and the legal and administrative order of the Republic of Turkey are applied. Furthermore, the Government of the Republic of Turkey has reserved the right to interpret and apply the provisions of Article 27 of the Covenant in accordance with the related provisions and decisions of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey and the Treaty of Lausanne of 24 July 1923 and its Appendixes.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany would like to recall that it is in the common interest of all states that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected and applied to their object and purpose by all parties, and that states are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is therefore concerned about declarations and reservations such as those made and expressed by the Republic of Turkey with respect to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

However, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany believes these declarations do not aim to limit the Covenant's scope in relation to those states with which Turkey has established bonds under the Covenant, and that they do not aim to impose any other restrictions that are not provided for by the Covenant. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany attaches great importance to the rights guaranteed by Article 27 of the Covenant. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany understands the reservation expressed by the Government of the Republic of Turkey to mean that the rights guaranteed by Article 27 of the Covenant will also be granted to all minorities not mentioned in the provisions and rules referred to in the reservation."

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the declaration made by the Government of Mauritania on 17 November 2004 in respect of Articles 18 and 23 (4) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the opinion that the limitations set out therein leave it unclear to which extent Mauritania considers itself bound by the obligations resulting from the Covenant. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore regards the above-mentioned declaration as a reservation and as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservations as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Republic of Maldives."

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan on 23 June 2010 to Articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19 and 25 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the opinion that these reservations subject the applications of Articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19 and 25 of the Covenant to a system of domestic norms without specifying the contents thereof, leaving it uncertain to which extent the Islamic Republic of Pakistan accepts to be bound by the obligations under the Covenant and raising serious doubts as to its commitment to fulfil its obligations under the Covenant. These reservations therefore are considered incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant and consequently impermissible under Art. 19 c of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

By refusing to recognize the competence of the Committee provided for in Article 40 of the Covenant the Republic of Pakistan calls into question the complete reporting mechanism which is a central procedural element of the Covenant system. This specific reservation against Article 40 therefore is considered to be contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant as well.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservations as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan."

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the reservations and statements made by the State of Qatar with regard to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 16 December 1966.

The reservations to Article 3 and to Article 23.4 as well as statements 1 to 4 make the application of specific provisions of the Covenant subject to the Islamic Sharia or national legislation. Statements 1 to 4 are thus of their nature also reservations.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the opinion that by making the application of Articles 3, 7, 18.2, 22, 23.2 and 23.4 of the Covenant subject to the Islamic Sharia or national law, the State of Qatar has submitted reservations which raise doubts concerning the extent to which it intends to fulfil its obligations under the Covenant. The above-mentioned reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant and are
accordingly not permitted under Article 19 sub-paragraph (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 23 May 1969. The Federal Republic of Germany thus objects to these reservations.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Federal Republic of Germany and the State of Qatar.

GREECE

"The Government of Greece has examined the declarations made by the Republic of Turkey upon ratifying the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Republic of Turkey declares that it will implement the provisions of the Covenant only to the States with which it has diplomatic relations.

In the view of the Government of Greece, this declaration in fact amounts to a reservation. This reservation is incompatible with the principle that inter-State reciprocity has no place in the context of human rights treaties, which concern the endowment of individuals with rights. It is therefore contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Greece objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Republic of Turkey.

In the view of the Government of Greece, this declaration in fact amounts to a reservation. This reservation is contrary to the letter and the spirit of article 2 (i) of the Covenant. Indeed, a State Party must respect and ensure the rights laid down in the Covenant to anyone within the power or effective control of that State Party, even if not situated within the territory of such State Party. Accordingly, this reservation is contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

For these reasons, the Government of Greece objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Republic of Turkey to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Hellenic Republic and the Republic of Turkey. The Covenant, therefore, enters into force between the two States without the Republic of Turkey benefiting from these reservations."

"The Government of the Hellenic Republic have examined the reservations made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania upon accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (New York, 16 December 1966) in respect of articles 18 and 23 paragraph 4 thereof.

The Government of the Hellenic Republic consider that these declarations, seeking to limit the scope of the aforementioned provisions on a unilateral basis, amount in fact to reservations.

The Government of the Hellenic Republic furthermore consider that, although these reservations refer to specific provisions of the Covenant, they are of a general character, as they do not clearly define the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations deriving from the Covenant.

For these reasons, the Government of the Hellenic Republic object to the abovementioned reservations made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Greece and Mauritania."

"The Government of the Hellenic Republic considers that the Articles 3, 6 and 7 of the Covenant are of fundamental importance and that the reservations formulated by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to those Articles, containing a general reference to the Provisions of the Constitution of Pakistan and the Sharia laws without specifying the extent of the derogation there from, are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

Furthermore, the Government of the Hellenic Republic considers that the reservation formulated with respect to Article 40 of the Covenant, is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant, which seeks, inter alia, to establish an effective monitoring mechanism for the obligations undertaken by the States Parties.

For this reason the Government of the Hellenic Republic objects to the abovementioned reservations formulated by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Greece and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan."

HUNGARY

"The Government of the Republic of Hungary has examined the reservation made by the Republic of Maldives on 19 September 2006 upon accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 16 December 1966. The reservation states that the application of the principles set out in Article 18 of the Covenant shall be without prejudice to the Constitution of the Republic of Maldives, the public order of the State Party.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary is of the opinion that the reservation to Article 18 will unavoidably, result in a legal situation in respect of the Republic of Maldives, which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

Namely the reservation makes it unclear to what extent the Republic of Maldives considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant thus raising concerns as to its commitment to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

According to Article 19 point (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 1969, a State may formulate a reservation unless it is incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservation. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Hungary and the Republic of Maldives."

"With regard to the reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan:

The Government of the Republic of Hungary has examined the reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted on 16 December 1966, in respect of Articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19, 25 and 40 thereof.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary is of the opinion that the reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan with regard to Articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, and 19 are in contradiction with the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a State party to a treaty may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform according to the obligations set out by the treaty. Furthermore, the reservations consist of a general reference to the provisions of the Constitution, the Sharia laws, and/or Pakistani internal law relating to foreigners without specifying their content and as such do not clearly define to other Parties to the Covenant the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Covenant.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary recalls that it is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States
are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. According to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan with regard to Articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18 and 19 of the Covenant. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Hungary and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan."

**IRELAND**

"The Government of Ireland have examined the reservations made by the Government of the Republic of Botswana to Article 7 and to Article 12, paragraph 3 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. These reservations invoke provisions of the internal law of the Republic of Botswana. The Government of Ireland are of the view that such reservations may cast doubts on the commitment of the reserving State to fulfil its obligations under the Covenant. The Government of Ireland are of the view that such reservations may undermine the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of Ireland therefore object to the reservations made by the Government of the Republic of Botswana to Article 7 and Article 12, paragraph 3 of the Covenant. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Ireland and the Republic of Botswana."

"The Government of Ireland notes that the Republic of Maldives subjects application of Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights to the Constitution of the Republic of Maldives. The Government of Ireland is of the view that a reservation which consists of a general reference to the Constitution or domestic laws of the reserving State and which does not clearly specify the extent of the derogation from the provision of the Covenant may cast doubts on the commitment of the reserving State to fulfil its obligations under the Covenant. The Government of Ireland is furthermore of the view that such a reservation may undermine the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of Ireland therefore object to the reservations made by the Republic of Maldives to Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Ireland and the Republic of Maldives."

"The Government of Ireland has examined the reservations made on 23 June 2010 by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon ratification of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Government of Ireland notes that the Islamic Republic of Pakistan subjects Articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19 and 25 to the Constitution of Pakistan, its domestic law and/or Sharia law. The Government of Ireland is of the view that a reservation which consists of a general reference to the Constitution or the domestic law of the reserving State or to national religious laws may cast doubts on the commitment of the reserving State to fulfil its obligations under the Covenant. The Government of Ireland is of the view that such general reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant and may undermine the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of Ireland therefore object to the reservation by Pakistan to Article 40 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The reporting mechanism is an integral undertaking of all States Parties to the Covenant.

The Government of Ireland therefore objects to the reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to Articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19, 25 and 40 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Ireland and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan."

**ITALY**

"The Government of Italy has examined the reservations to art. 6 paragraph 5 which the United States of America included in its instrument of ratification. In the opinion of Italy reservations to the provisions contained in art. 6 are not permitted, as specified in art.4, para. 2, of the Covenant. Therefore this reservation is null and void since it is incompatible with the object and the purpose of art. 6 of the Covenant. Furthermore in the interpretation of the Government of Italy, the reservation to art. 7 of the Covenant does not affect obligations assumed by States that are parties to the Covenant on the basis of article 2 of the same Covenant. These objections do not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between Italy and the United States."

"The Government of Italy has examined the reservations made on 23 June 2010 by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon ratification of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Government of Italy has noted that the reservations to Articles 3, 6, 7, 18, 19, 12, 13 and 25 makes the constitutive provisions of International Covenant subject to the national law of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan (the Constitution, its domestic law and/or Sharia laws).

In the view of the Government of Italy a reservation should clearly define for the other States Parties to the Covenant the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Covenant. A reservation which consists of a general reference to national provisions without specifying its implications makes it
unclear to what extent the Islamic Republic of Pakistan considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Italy is of the view that such general reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant and may undermine the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of Italy recalls that customary international law as codified by the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, and in particular Article 19 (c), sets out that reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty are not permissible.

The Government of Italy, therefore, objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to Articles 3, 6, 7, 18, 19, 12, 13 and 25 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Italy and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.”

LATVIA

"The Government of the Republic of Latvia has carefully examined the declaration made by Mauritania to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights upon accession.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia considers that the declaration contains general reference to reservations of the Islamic Shariah, making the provisions of the International Covenant subject to the prescriptions of the Islamic Shariah.

Thus, the Government of the Republic of Latvia is of the opinion that the declaration is in fact a unilateral act deemed to limit the scope of application of the International Covenant and therefore, it shall be regarded as a reservation.

Moreover, the Government of the Republic of Latvia noted that the reservation does not make it clear to what extent Mauritania considers itself bound by the provisions of the International Covenant and whether the way of implementation of the provisions of the International Covenant is in line with the object and purpose of the International Covenant.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by Mauritania to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the International Covenant between the Republic of Latvia and Mauritania. Thus, the International Covenant will become operative without Mauritania benefiting from its reservation.”

NETHERLANDS

"In the opinion of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands it follows from the text and the history of the Covenant that [reservation (i) by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago] is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore considers the reservation unacceptable and formally raises an objection to it."

[See under "Objections" in chapter IV.3.]

"F. Reservation by Australia regarding articles 2 and 50

The reservation that article 2, paragraphs 2 and 3, and article 50 shall be given effect consistently with and subject to the provisions in article 2, paragraph 2, is acceptable to the Kingdom on the understanding that it will in no way impair Australia's basic obligation under international law, as laid down in article 2, paragraph 1, to
respect and to ensure to all individuals within its territory and subject to its jurisdiction the rights recognized in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

II. Reservation by Australia regarding article 10

The Kingdom finds it difficult, for the same reasons as mentioned in its commentary on the reservation regarding article 10, to accept the declaration by Australia that it reserves the right not to seek amendment of laws now in force in Australia relating to the rights of persons who have been convicted of serious criminal offences. The Kingdom expresses the hope it will be possible to gain a more detailed insight in the laws now in force in Australia, in order to facilitate a definitive opinion on the extent of the reservation.

[Same objection as the one made by Belgium.]

[See under "Objections" in chapter IV.3.]

"In the opinion of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands it follows from the text and the history of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that the reservations with respect to articles 14, paragraphs 5 and 7 and 22 of the Covenant made by the Government of the Republic of Korea are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore considers the reservation unacceptable and formally raises objection to it. This objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of this Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Republic of Korea."

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations with respect to capital punishment for crimes committed by persons below eighteen years of age, since it follows from the text and history of the Covenant that the said reservation is incompatible with the text, the object and purpose of article 6 of the Covenant, which according to article 4 lays down the minimum standard for the protection of the right to life.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservation with respect to article 7 of the Covenant, which according to article 4 lays down the minimum standard for the protection of the right to life.

The Kingdom finds it difficult, for the same reasons as mentioned in its commentary on the reservation regarding article 10, to accept the declaration by Australia that it reserves the right not to seek amendment of laws now in force in Australia relating to the rights of persons who have been convicted of serious criminal offences. The Kingdom expresses the hope it will be possible to gain a more detailed insight in the laws now in force in Australia, in order to facilitate a definitive opinion on the extent of the reservation.

[Same objection as the one made by Belgium.]

[See under "Objections" in chapter IV.3.]

"In the opinion of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands it follows from the text and the history of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that the reservations with respect to articles 14, paragraphs 5 and 7 and 22 of the Covenant made by the Government of the Republic of Korea are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore considers the reservation unacceptable and formally raises objection to it. This objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of this Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Republic of Korea."

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations with respect to capital punishment for crimes committed by persons below eighteen years of age, since it follows from the text and history of the Covenant that the said reservation is incompatible with the text, the object and purpose of article 6 of the Covenant, which according to article 4 lays down the minimum standard for the protection of the right to life.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservation with respect to article 7 of the Covenant, which according to article 4 lays down the minimum standard for the protection of the right to life.

The Kingdom finds it difficult, for the same reasons as mentioned in its commentary on the reservation regarding article 10, to accept the declaration by Australia that it reserves the right not to seek amendment of laws now in force in Australia relating to the rights of persons who have been convicted of serious criminal offences. The Kingdom expresses the hope it will be possible to gain a more detailed insight in the laws now in force in Australia, in order to facilitate a definitive opinion on the extent of the reservation.

[Same objection as the one made by Belgium.]

[See under "Objections" in chapter IV.3.]

"In the opinion of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands it follows from the text and the history of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that the reservations with respect to articles 14, paragraphs 5 and 7 and 22 of the Covenant made by the Government of the Republic of Korea are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore considers the reservation unacceptable and formally raises objection to it. This objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of this Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Republic of Korea."

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations with respect to capital punishment for crimes committed by persons below eighteen years of age, since it follows from the text and history of the Covenant that the said reservation is incompatible with the text, the object and purpose of article 6 of the Covenant, which according to article 4 lays down the minimum standard for the protection of the right to life.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Kingdom of Thailand."

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Government of Botswana upon signature of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and confirmed upon ratification, regarding articles 7 and 12, paragraph 3, of the Covenant. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands notes that the said articles of the Covenant are being made subject to a general reservation referring to the contents of existing legislation in Botswana.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands is of the view that, in the absence of further clarification, these reservations raise doubts as to the commitment of Botswana as to the object and purpose of the Covenant and would like to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation which is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all Parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Botswana to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Botswana."

"The Government of the Netherlands has examined the reservation made by Mauritania to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The application of the Articles 18 and 23 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights has been subject to religious considerations. This makes it unclear to what extent Mauritania considers itself bound by the obligations of the treaty and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of Mauritania to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

It is of the common interest of States that all parties respect treaties to which they have chosen to become parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. According to customary international law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation which is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted (Art. 19 c).

The Government of the Netherlands therefore objects to the reservation made by Mauritania to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Mauritania and the Kingdom of the Netherlands, without Mauritania benefiting from its reservation."

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Since the reservations were made after the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations were too late and therefore inconsistent with article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Furthermore, the reservation with respect to articles 3, 18 and 23 of the Covenant is a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant."
The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that with this reservation the application of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights is made subject to the Islamic Shariah. This makes it unclear to what extent the Kingdom of Bahrain considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to custom international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty is not permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to all of the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain since they were made after accession, and specifically objects to the content of the reservation on articles 3, 18 and 23 made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Kingdom of Bahrain.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservation made by the Republic of Maldives to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservation with respect to article 18 of the Covenant is a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

Furthermore, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that with this reservation the application of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights is made subject to the provisions of constitutional law in force in the Republic of Maldives. This makes it unclear to what extent the Republic of Maldives considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of the Republic of Maldives to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty is not permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic to Article 22 of the Covenant.

This object does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Lao People’s Democratic Republic.”

NORWAY

“1. In the view of the Government of Norway, the reservation (2) concerning capital punishment for crimes committed by persons below eighteen years of age is according to the text and history of the Covenant incompatible with the object and purpose of article 6 of the Covenant. According to article 4 (2), no derogations from article 6 may be made, not even in times of public emergency. For these reasons the Government of Norway objects to this reservation.

2. In the view of the Government of Norway, the reservation (3) concerning article 7 of the Covenant is according to the text and interpretation of this article incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. According to article 4 (2), article 7 is a non-derogable provision, even in times of public emergency. For these reasons, the Government of Norway objects to this reservation.

The Government of Norway does not consider this objection to constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between Norway and the United States of America.”

In the view of the Government of Norway, a statement by which a State Party purports to limit its responsibilities by invoking general principles of internal law may create doubts about the commitment of the reserving State to the objective and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. Under well-established treaty law, a State is not permitted to invoke internal law as justification for its failure to perform its treaty obligations. Furthermore, the Government of Norway finds the reservations made to article 8, paragraph 1 (d) and article 9 as being problematic in view of the object and purpose of the Covenant. For these reasons, the Government of Norway objects to the said reservations made by the Government of Kuwait.

The Government of Norway does not consider this objection to preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of Norway and the State of Kuwait.”

The Government of Norway has examined the contents of the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Botswana upon ratification of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The reservation’s reference to the national Constitution without further description of its contents, exempts the other States Parties to the Covenant from the possibility of assessing the effects of the reservation. In addition, as the reservation concerns two of the core provisions of the Covenant, it is the position of the Government of Norway that the reservation is contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant. Norway therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of Botswana.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Covenant between the Kingdom of Norway and the Republic of Botswana. The Covenant makes it unclear to what extent the Lao People’s Democratic Republic considers itself bound by the obligations under Article 22 of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that such a reservation must be regarded as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant and would recall that, according to Article 19 (e) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic to Article 22 of the Covenant.

This object does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Lao People’s Democratic Republic.”
thus becomes operative between Norway and Botswana without Botswana benefiting from the said reservation.”

“The Government of Norway has examined the reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon ratification of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Government of Norway considers that the reservations with regard to articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19, 25 and 40 of the Covenant are so extensive as to be contrary to its object and purpose. The Government of Norway therefore objects to the reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of Norway and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. The Covenant thus becomes operative between the Kingdom of Norway and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan without the Islamic Republic of Pakistan benefiting from the aforesaid reservations.”

PAKISTAN

“The Government of Islamic Republic of Pakistan objects to the declaration made by the Republic of India in respect of certain provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The right of Self-determination as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and as embodied in the Covenants applies to all peoples under foreign occupation and alien domination. Therefore, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan cannot consider as valid any interpretation of the right of self-determination which is contrary to the clear language of the provisions in question. Moreover, the said reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenants. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and India without India benefiting from its reservations.”

POLAND

“The Government of the Republic of Poland has examined the Declaration made by Mauritania upon accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, done in New York on 16 December 1966, hereinafter called the Covenant, in respect of Articles 18 and 23 (4). The Government of the Republic of Poland considers that the Declaration made Mauritania - which constitutes derogation from a reservation - is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant which guarantees every person equal enjoyment of the rights set forth in the Covenant. The Government of the Republic of Poland therefore considers that, according to the customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, done at Vienna on 23 May 1969, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted (Article 19 c). Furthermore, the Government of the Republic of Poland considers that the Declaration made by Mauritania is not precise enough to define for the other States Parties the extent to which Mauritania has accepted the obligation of the Covenant. The Government of the Republic of Poland therefore objects to Declaration made by Mauritania. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Poland and Mauritania.”

“In the view of the Government of the Republic of Poland, if put into practice, the reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, especially when taking into account their unspecified extent and the vast area of rights they affect, will considerably limit the ability to benefit from the rights guaranteed by the Covenant. Consequently, the Government of the Republic of Poland considers these reservations as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant, which is to guarantee equal rights to everyone without any discrimination. In consequence, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, which is a treaty and customary norm, these reservations shall not be permitted.

In order to justify its will to exclude the legal consequences of certain provisions of the Covenant, the Islamic Republic of Pakistan raised in its reservations the inconsistency of these provisions with its domestic legislation. The Government of the Republic of Poland recalls that, according to Article 27 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, the State Party to an international agreement may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform a treaty. On the contrary, it should be deemed a rule that a State Party adjusts its internal law to the treaty which it decides to be bound by. On these grounds, the reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan with regard to Articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19 and 25 of the Covenant shall not be permitted.

The Islamic Republic of Pakistan refers in its reservations to the Sharia laws and to its domestic legislation as possibly affecting the application of the Covenant. Nonetheless it does not specify the exact content of these laws and legislation. As a result, it is impossible to clearly define the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Covenant. Thus, the reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan with regard to Articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19 and 25 of the Covenant shall not be permitted.

Furthermore, the Government of the Republic of Poland considers that reservations aimed at limitation or exclusion of the application of treaty norms stipulating non-derogable rights are in opposition with the purpose of this treaty. On these grounds, the reservations made with regard to Articles 6 and 7 of the Covenant are impermissible.

The Government of the Republic of Poland objects also to the reservation made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan with regard to Article 23 (2) of the Covenant, considering it as impermissible as it undermines the basis of the United Nations mechanism of monitoring of the respect of human rights. The Government of the Republic of Poland considers the reporting obligations of States Parties to the Covenant to be of utmost importance for the effectiveness of the UN system of the protection of human rights and as such – not of optional nature. Therefore, the Government of the Republic of Poland objects to the reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights opened for signature at New York on 19 December 1966, with regard to Articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19, 25 and 40 of the Covenant. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Poland and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.”

“The Government of the Republic of Poland has reviewed the reservations made by the State of Qatar along with the ratification document to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, done in New York on December 16, 1966, with regard to Article 3 and Article 23 (4), as well as the statements which the State of Qatar made with regard to Article 7, Article 18 (2), Article 22, Article 23 (2) and Article 27 of the Covenant.

The Government of the Republic of Poland is of the view that the application of the reservations and
statements made by the State of Qatar will introduce too wide restrictions in the implementation of the provisions of the Covenant as regards the essential spheres of social life (among others equality between women and men in the exercise of their civil and political rights, freedom to marry, rights of a woman of marriageable age to marry, prohibition of inhuman or degrading punishment, freedom of religion and the right to form and to join trade unions). Accordingly, the Government of the Republic of Poland considers these reservations and statements to be inconsistent with the object and purpose of the Covenant, which aims to create conditions that guarantee any person enjoyment of civil and political rights, and as such, to be unacceptable under Article 19(c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

In its reservations, the State of Qatar has referred to the incompatibility of the provisions of the Covenant with its internal law (the Constitution) and Islamic law as justification for its intention to exclude the legal effects of certain provisions of the Covenant.

The Government of the Republic of Poland notes that pursuant to Article 27 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a State Party to a treaty may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform a treaty. Conversely, the domestic law should, as a rule, be brought into line with the provisions of a treaty by which a given state is bound.

In addition, while referring in its statements to Islamic law, national labor law and national legislation, as well as to the rights and fundamental freedoms of others, the State of Qatar does not indicate the specific content thereof that may apply to the implementation of the Covenant, which renders it impossible to determine the exact scope of application of the provisions of the Covenant in relation to the State of Qatar.

In view of the above, the Government of the Republic of Poland objects to the reservations of the State of Qatar with regard to Article 3 and Article 23(4), as well as to the statements of this State with regard to Article 7, Article 18(2), Article 22, Article 23(2) and Article 27 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, done in New York on 16 December 1966.

This objection does not hinder entrance into force of the Covenant in the relations between the Republic of Poland and the State of Qatar."

PORTUGAL

[See under "Objections" in chapter IV.3.]

"The Government of Portugal considers that the reservation made by the United States of America referring to article 6, paragraph 5 of the Covenant which prohibits capital punishment for crimes committed by persons below eighteen years of age is in compatible with article 6 which, as made clear by paragraph 2 of article 4, lays down the minimum standard for the protection of the right to life.

The Government of Portugal also considers that the reservation with regard to article 7 in which a State limits its responsibilities under the Covenant by invoking general principles of National Law may create doubts on the commitment of the Reserving State to the object and purpose of the Covenant and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of International Law.

The Government of Portugal therefore objects to the reservations made by the Government of the Republic of Botswana to article 7 of the Covenant. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Portuguese Republic and the Republic of Botswana."

"The Government of Portugal considers that reservations by which a State limits its responsibilities under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) by invoking certain provisions of national law in general terms may create doubts as to the commitment of the reserving State to the object and purpose of the convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international law.

It is in the common interest of all States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Portugal therefore objects to the reservation by Turkey to the ICCPR. This objection shall not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between Portugal and Turkey."

"Portugal considers that the declaration concerning both Article 18 and Article 23, paragraph 4 is a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Covenant on a unilateral basis and that is not authorised by the Covenant.

This reservation creates doubts as to the commitment of the reserving State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contributes to undermining the basis of international law.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic, therefore, objects to the above reservation made by the Mauritanian Government to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Portugal and Mauritania."

"The Government of the Portuguese Republic has carefully examined the reservation made by the Republic of Maldives to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).

According to the reservation, the application of the principles set out in Article 18 of the Covenant shall be without prejudice to the Constitution of the Republic of Maldives. Portugal considers that this article is a fundamental provision of the Covenant and the reservation makes it unclear to what extent the Republic of Maldives considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant, raises concerns as to its commitment to the object and purpose of the Covenant and, moreover,
The Government of the Portuguese Republic has examined the reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon ratification of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, New York, 16 December 1966.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic considers that the reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to Articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19 and 25 are reservations that seek to subject the application of the Covenant to its Constitution, its domestic law or and Sharia Law, thus invalidating the scope of the Covenant on an unilateral basis and contributing to undermining the basis of International Law.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic considers that reservations by which a State limits its responsibilities under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights by invoking its Constitution, its domestic law or and Sharia Law raise serious doubts as to the commitment of the reserving State to the object and purpose of the Covenant, as the reservations are likely to deprive the provisions of the Covenant of their effect and are contrary to the object and purpose thereof.

It is in the common interest of all the States that Treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the Treaties.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic furthermore notes that the Islamic Republic of Pakistan does not recognize the competence of the Committee provided for in Article 40 of the Covenant.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic is of the view that the reporting mechanism is a procedural requirement of the Covenant, an integral undertaking of its States Parties and that the reservation is likely to undermine the international human rights treaty body system. Thus, the reservation to article 40 is contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to Articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19, 25 and 40 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, New York, 16 December 1966.

However, these objections shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Portuguese Republic and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

SLOVAKIA 7,15,32

“[The] Islamic Republic of Pakistan declares that the provisions of Articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19, 25 and 40 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 16 December 1966, according to which:

It is in the common interest of States that all parties respect treaties to which they have chosen to become party, as to their object and purpose, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

This position does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between the Slovak Republic and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan."
The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that this reservation, by referring to domestic law, affects one of the fundamental rights enshrined in the Covenant (prohibition of torture, right to physical integrity), from which no derogation is permitted under article 4, paragraph 2, of the Covenant. The Government of Spain also considers that the presentation of a reservation referring to domestic legislation, in the absence of further clarifications, raises doubts as to the degree of commitment assumed by the Republic of Botswana in becoming a party to the Covenant.

Accordingly, the Government of the Kingdom of Spain objects to the above-mentioned reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Botswana to article 7 of the Covenant between the Kingdom of Spain and the Republic of Botswana.

"The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has reviewed the reservation made by the Republic of Maldives on 19 September 2006, at the time of its accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 16 December 1966.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE KINGDOM OF SPAIN observes that the broad formulation of the reservation, which makes the application of article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights conditional on its conformity with the Constitution of Maldives without specifying the content thereof, renders it impossible to ascertain to what extent the Republic of Maldives has accepted the obligations arising from that provision of the Covenant and, in consequence, raises doubts about its commitment to the object and purpose of the treaty.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers the reservation of the Republic of Maldives to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain recalls that, under customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty are not permitted.

Accordingly, the Government of Spain objects to the reservation made by the Republic of Maldives to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection does not prevent the entry into force of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights between the Kingdom of Spain and the Republic of Maldives."

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has examined the reservations made by Pakistan upon ratification of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, concerning articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19, 25 and 40 of the said Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that the above-mentioned reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant, since they are intended to exempt Pakistan from its commitment to respect and guarantee certain rights essential for the fulfillment of the object and purpose of the Covenant, such as equality between men and women; the right to life and restrictions on the imposition of the death penalty; the prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment; freedom of thought, conscience and religion; freedom of expression; liberty of movement and freedom in choice of residence; the right to take part in public affairs, the right to vote and to be elected and the right to have access to public service on terms of equality, or to limit the said commitment in an undefined manner.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain also considers that the reservation whereby Pakistan declares that it does not recognize the competence of the Human Rights Committee provided for in article 40 of the Covenant is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

Furthermore, the Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that the above-mentioned reservations made by Pakistan, subordinating the application of certain articles of the Covenant to their conformity with Sharia law or to their conformity with the Constitution of Pakistan, or to both, to which general reference is made without specifying their content, in no way excludes the legal effects of the obligations arising from the relevant provisions of the Covenant.

Accordingly, the Government of the Kingdom of Spain objects to the reservations made by Pakistan to articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19, 25 and 40 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection does not prevent the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of Spain and Pakistan.

**SWEDEN**

"... In this context the Government recalls that under international treaty law the name assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified, does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. Thus, the Government considers that some of the understandings made by the United States in substance constitute reservations to the Covenant.

A reservation by which a State modifies or excludes the application of the most fundamental provisions of the Covenant, or limits its responsibilities under that treaty by invoking general principles of national law, may cast doubts upon the commitment of the reserving State to the object and purpose of the Covenant. The reservations made by the United States of America include both reservations to essential and non-derogable provisions, and general references to national legislation. Reservations of this nature contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. All States Parties share a common interest in the respect for the object and purpose of the treaty to which they have chosen to become parties.

Sweden therefore objects to the reservations made by the United States to:
- article 2: cf. Understanding (1);
- article 4: cf. Understanding (1);
- article 6: cf. Reservation (2);
- article 7: cf. Reservation (3);
- article 15: cf. Reservation (4);
- article 24: cf. Understanding (1).

This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between Sweden and the United States of America."

The Government of Sweden notes that the interpretative declarations regarding article 2, paragraph 1, article 3 and 23 imply that central provisions of the Covenant are being made subject to a general reservation referring to the contents of national law. The Government of Sweden further notes that the reservation concerning article 25 (b) is contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Sweden is of the view that these interpretative declarations and this reservation raise doubts as to the commitment of Kuwait to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties, and that states are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid interpretative declarations and reservation made by the Government of Kuwait upon accession to the [said Covenant].
This objection does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Covenant between Kuwait and Sweden.

The Government of Sweden has examined the reservation made by Botswana upon signature of the 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and confirmed upon ratification, regarding articles 7 and 12 (3) of the Covenant.

The Government of Sweden notes that the said articles of the Covenant are being made subject to a general reservation referring to the contents of existing legislation in Botswana.

The Government of Sweden is of the view that, in the absence of further clarification, this reservation raises doubts as to the commitment of Botswana to the object and purpose of the Covenant and would like to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Botswana to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Botswana and Sweden. The Covenant enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without Botswana benefiting from its reservation."

The Government of Sweden has examined the declarations and reservation made by the Republic of Turkey upon ratifying the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Republic of Turkey declares that it will implement the provisions of the Covenant only to the State parties with which it has diplomatic relations. This statement in fact amounts, in the view of the Government of Sweden, to a reservation. The reservation of the Republic of Turkey makes it unclear to what extent the Republic of Turkey considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant. In absence of further clarification, therefore, the reservation raises doubt as to the commitment of the Republic of Turkey to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Republic of Turkey furthermore declares that the Covenant is ratified exclusively with regard to the national territory where the Constitution and the legal and administrative order of the Republic of Turkey are applied. This statement also amounts, in the view of the Government of Sweden, to a reservation. It should be recalled that the duty to respect and ensure the rights recognized in the Covenant is mandatory upon State parties in relation to all individuals under their jurisdiction. A limitation to the national territory is contrary to the obligations of State parties in this regard and is therefore incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Sweden notes that the interpretation and application of article 27 of the Covenant is being made subject to a general reservation referring to the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey and the Treaty of Lausanne of 24 July 1923 and its Appendixes. The general reference to the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey, which, in the absence of further clarification, does not clearly specify the extent of the Republic of Turkey's derogation from the provisions in question, raises serious doubts as to the commitment of the Republic of Turkey to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Sweden furthermore wishes to recall that the rights of persons belonging to minorities in accordace with article 27 of the Covenant are to be respected without discrimination. As has been laid down by the Human Rights Committee in its General comment 23 on Article 27 of the Covenant, the existence of a minority does not depend upon a decision by the state but requires to be established by objective criteria. The subjugation of the application of article 27 to the rules and provisions of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey and the Treaty of Lausanne and its Appendixes is, therefore, in the view of the Government of Sweden, incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

According to established customary law as codified by the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of all States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Republic of Turkey to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Turkey and Sweden. The Covenant enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without the Republic of Turkey benefiting from its reservations.

The Government of Sweden has examined the declarations made by the Government of Mauritania upon accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, regarding Article 18 and paragraph 4 of Article 23.

The Government of Sweden would like to recall that the designation assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. The Government of Sweden considers that this declaration made by the Government of Mauritania in substance constitutes a reservation.

The reservations make general references to the Islamic Sharia. The Government of Sweden is of the view that the reservations which do not clearly specify the extent of Mauritania's derogation from the provisions in question raises serious doubts as to the commitment of Mauritania to the object and purpose of the Covenant. In addition, article 18 of the Covenant is among the provisions from which no derogation is allowed, according to article 4 of the Covenant.

The Government of Sweden wishes to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that all parties respect treaties to which they have chosen to become parties as to their object and purpose, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Mauritania to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and considers the reservation null and void. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Mauritania and Sweden. The Covenant enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without Mauritania benefiting from its reservation."

"...the Government of Sweden has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Maldives on 19 September 2006 to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Government of Sweden notes that the Maldives gives precedence to its Constitution over the application of article 18 of the Covenant. The Government of Sweden
is of the view that this reservation, which does not clearly specify the extent of the Maldives’ derogation from the provision in question, raises serious doubt as to the commitment of the Maldives to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

According to international customary law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of all States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties, are respected by all parties to their object and purpose by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Republic of Maldives to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and considers the reservation null and void. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Maldives and Sweden. The Covenant enters into force in its entirety between the Maldives and Sweden, without the Maldives benefiting from its reservation.

"The Government of Sweden is of the view that these reservations raise serious doubt as to the commitment of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the object and purpose of the Covenant, as the reservations are likely to deprive the provisions of the Covenant of their effect and are contrary to the object and purpose thereof.

The Government of Sweden furthermore notes that the Islamic Republic of Pakistan does not recognize the competence of the Committee provided for in article 40 of the Covenant. The Government of Sweden is of the view that the reporting mechanism is a procedural requirement of the Covenant, an integral undertaking of its States Parties and that the reservation is likely to undermine the international human rights treaty body system. Thus, the reservation to article 40 is contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

According to international customary law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of all States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and considers the reservations null and void.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Pakistan and Sweden. The Covenant enters into force in its entirety between Pakistan and Sweden, without Pakistan benefiting from these reservations."

**SWITZERLAND**

Concerning the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 16 December 1966:

"The Swiss Federal Council has examined the reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon its accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 16 December 1966, with regard to articles 3, 6, 7, 18 and 19 of the Covenant.

The reservations refer to the articles, which refer to the provisions of domestic law and Islamic Sharia law, do not specify their scope and raise doubts about the ability of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to honour its obligations as a party to the Covenant. Furthermore, the Swiss Federal Council emphasizes that the third sentence of article 6, paragraph 1; article 7; and article 18, paragraph 2, constitute jus cogens and therefore enjoy absolute protection.

A general reservation to article 40, a key provision of the Covenant, raises serious doubts as to the compatibility of such a reservation with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

Article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 23 May 1969 prohibits any reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty.

Consequently, the Swiss Federal Council objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 16 December 1966.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Switzerland and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan."

**UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND**

"The Government of the United Kingdom have noted the statement formulated by the Government of the Republic of Korea on accession, under the title "Reservations". They are not however able to take a position on these purported reservations in the absence of a sufficient indication of their intended effect, in accordance with the terms of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. The practice on the part of the Parties to the Covenant.

Pending receipt of such indication, the Government of the United Kingdom reserve their rights under the Covenant in their entirety."

"The Government of the United Kingdom have examined the Declaration made by the Government of Mauritania to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (done at New York on 16 December 1966) on 17 November 2004 in respect of Articles 18 and 23 (4).

The Government of the United Kingdom consider that the Government of Mauritania’s declaration that the Mauritanian Government, while accepting the provisions set out in article 18 concerning freedom of thought, conscience and religion, declares that their application shall be without prejudice to the Islamic Shariah...

The Mauritanian Government interprets the provisions of article 23, paragraph 4, on the rights and responsibilities of spouses as to marriage as not affecting in any way the prescriptions of the Islamic Shariah is a reservation which seeks to limit the scope of the Covenant on a unilateral basis. The Government of the United Kingdom note that the Mauritanian reservation specifies particular provisions of the Convention Articles to which the reservation is addressed. Nevertheless this reservation does not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Mauritania.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Mauritania."
so. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the reservation made by the Government of the Maldives.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the United Kingdom and the Maldives."

“The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland has examined the reservations made by the Government of Pakistan to the [International] Covenant [on Civil and Political Rights] on 23 June 2010, which read:

1. [The] Islamic Republic of Pakistan declares that the provisions of Articles 3, 6, 7, 18 and 19 shall be so applied to the extent that they are not repugnant to the Provisions of the Constitution of Pakistan and the Sharia laws.

2. The Islamic Republic of Pakistan declares that the provisions of Articles 12 shall be so applied as to be in conformity with the Provisions of the Constitution of Pakistan.

3. With respect to Article 13, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan reserves its right to apply its law relating to foreigners.

4. [The] Islamic Republic of Pakistan declares that the provisions of Articles 25 shall be so applied to the extent that they are not repugnant to the Provisions of the Constitution of Pakistan.

5. The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan hereby declares that it does not recognize the competence of the Committee provided for in Article 40 of the Covenant.

In the view of the United Kingdom a reservation should clearly define for the other States Parties to the Covenant the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Covenant. Reservations which consist of a general reference to a constitutional provision, law or system of laws without specifying their contents do not do so.

In addition, the United Kingdom considers that the reporting mechanism enshrined in Article 40 is an essential procedural requirement of the Covenant, and an integral undertaking of States Parties to the Covenant.

The Government of the United Kingdom therefore objects to the reservations made by the Government of Pakistan.

The United Kingdom will re-consider its position in light of any modifications or withdrawals of the reservations made by the Government of Pakistan to the Covenant.”

**United States of America**

“The Government of the United States of America objects to Pakistan’s reservations to the ICCPR. Pakistan has reserved to Articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19, and 25 of the Covenant, which address the equal right of men and women to the full enjoyment of civil and political rights, the right to life, protections from torture and other cruel inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, freedom of movement, expulsion of aliens, the freedoms of thought, conscious and religion, the freedom of expression, and the right to take part in political affairs. Pakistan has also reserved to Article 40, which provides for a process whereby States Parties submit periodic reports on their implementation of the Covenant when so requested by the Human Rights Committee (HRC). These reservations raise serious concerns because they both obscure the extent to which Pakistan intends to modify its substantive obligations under the Covenant and also foreclose the ability of other Parties to evaluate Pakistan’s implementation through periodic reporting. As a result, the United States considers the totality of Pakistan’s reservations to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between the United States and Pakistan, and the aforementioned articles shall apply between our two states, except to the extent of Pakistan’s reservations.”

**Uruguay**

The Government of the Eastern Republic of Uruguay objects to the reservation made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan with respect to article 40 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection does not prevent the entry into force of the Covenant between the Eastern Republic of Uruguay and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

*Declarations recognizing the competence of the Human Rights Committee under article 41*43

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

**Algeria**

[The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Algeria] recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

**Argentina**

The instrument contains a declaration under article 41 of the Covenant by which the Government of Argentina recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee established by virtue of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

**Australia**

"The Government of Australia declares that it recognizes, for and on behalf of Australia, the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the aforesaid Convention."

**Austria**

[The Government of the Republic of Austria] declares under article 41 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that Austria recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.
BELARUS
The Republic of Belarus declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee on Human Rights under Article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

BELGIUM
The Kingdom of Belgium declares that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Kingdom of Belgium declares, under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee established under article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party, provided that such State Party has, not less than twelve months prior to the submission by it of a communication relating to Belgium, made a declaration under article 41 recognizing the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications relating to itself.

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA
"The Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina in accordance with article 41 of the said Covenant, recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

BULGARIA
"The Republic of Bulgaria declares that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party which has made a declaration recognizing in regard to itself the competence of the Committee claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

CANADA
"The Government of Canada declares, under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 41 of the said Covenant to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party, provided that such State Party has, not less than twelve months prior to the submission by it of a communication relating to Canada, made a declaration under article 41 recognizing the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications relating to itself."

CHILE
As from the date of this instrument, the Government of Chile recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee established under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, in accordance with article 41 thereof, with regard to all actions which may have been initiated since 11 March 1990.

CONGO
Pursuant to article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Congolese Government recognizes, with effect from today's date, the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the above-mentioned Covenant.

CROATIA
The Government of the Republic of Croatia declares under article 41 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that the Republic of Croatia recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 41 to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

CZECH REPUBLIC?

DENMARK
"[The Government of Denmark] recognizes, in accordance with article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, opened for signature in New York on December 19, 1966, the competence of the Committee referred to in article 41 to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

ECUADOR
The Government of Ecuador recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the aforementioned Covenant, as provided for in paragraph 1 (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) and (h) of that article.

This recognition of competence is effective for an indefinite period and is subject to the provisions of article 41, paragraph 2, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

FINLAND
"Finland declares, under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the said Covenant to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party, provided that such State Party has, not less than twelve months prior to the submission by it of a communication relating to Finland, made a declaration under article 41 recognizing the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications relating to itself."

GAMBIA
"The Government of the Gambia hereby declares that the Gambia recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the present Covenant."

GERMANY10.44

GERMANY10.44

The Federal Republic of Germany now recognizes for an unlimited period the competence of the Human Rights Committee under Article 41(1) of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that at State
Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

GHANA

“The Government of the Republic of Ghana recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and examine communications in which a Party claims that another Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the present Covenant, signed by Ghana on 11 November 2010, and for which the instrument of ratification was deposited by Ghana on 11 November 2010.

GUINEA-BISSAU

Recognize the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications from another State Party, which result from decisions, acts, omissions, developments or events occurring after the date on which Guinea-Bissau becomes officially recognized as Party to the said Covenant and shall not apply to decisions, acts, omissions, developments or events occurring before that date.”

HUNGARY

The Hungarian People's Republic [...] recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

ICELAND

"The Government of Iceland [...] recognizes in accordance with article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

IRELAND

"The Government of Ireland hereby declare that in accordance with article 41 they recognise the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the Covenant.

ITALY

The Italian Republic recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee, elected in accordance with article 28 of the Covenant, to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State party claims that another State party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

LIECHTENSTEIN

“The Principality of Liechtenstein declares under article 41 of the Covenant to recognize the competence of the Human Rights Committee, to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State party claims that another State party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.”

LUXEMBOURG

The Government of Luxembourg recognizes, in accordance with article 41, the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State party claims that another State party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.”

MALTA

"The Government of Malta declares that under article 41 of this Covenant it recognises the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party, provided that such other State Party has, not less than twelve months prior to the submission by it of a communication relating to Malta, made a declaration under article 41 recognising the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications relating to itself.”

NETHERLANDS

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands declares under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.”

NEW ZEALAND

"The Government of New Zealand declares under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that it recognises the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications from another State Party which has similarly declared under article 41 its recognition of the Committee's competence in respect to itself except where the declaration by such a state party was made less than twelve months prior to the submission by it of a complaint relating to New Zealand.”

NORWAY

"Norway recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the Covenant, to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.”

PERU

Peru recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, in accordance with article 41 of the said Covenant.

PHILIPPINES

“"The Philippine Government, in accordance with article 41 of the said Covenant, recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee set up in the
aforesaid Covenant, to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

**POLAND**

"The Republic of Poland recognizes, in accordance with article 41, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

**REPUBLIC OF KOREA**

[The Government of the Republic of Korea] recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee under article 41 of the Covenant.

**RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that, pursuant to article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party, in respect of situations and events occurring after the adoption of the present declaration, provided that the State Party in question has, not less than 12 months prior to the submission by it of such a communication, recognized in regard to itself the competence of the Committee, established in article 41, in so far as obligations have been assumed under the Covenant by the USSR and by the State concerned.

**SAN MARINO**

“The Republic of San Marino declares, in accordance with article 41 of the Covenant, that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State party claims that another State party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

**SENEGAL**

The Government of Senegal declares, under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the said Covenant to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party, provided that such State Party has, not less than twelve months prior to the submission by it of a communication relating to Senegal, made a declaration under article 41 recognizing the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications relating to itself.

**SLOVAKIA**

**SLOVENIA**

"[The] Republic of Slovenia, in accordance with article 41 of the said Covenant, recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

**SOUTH AFRICA**

“The Republic of South Africa declares that it recognises, for the purposes of article 41 of the Covenant, the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under present the Covenant.”

**SPAIN**

The Government of Spain declares that, under the provisions of article 41 of the [Covenant], it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

**SRI LANKA**

"The Government of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka declares under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant, from another State Party which has similarly declared under article 41 its recognition of the Committee's competence in respect to itself."

**SWEDEN**

"Sweden recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

**SWITZERLAND**

Switzerland declares, pursuant to article 41, that it shall recognize, for a period of five years, the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and to consider communications to the effect that a State party claims that another State party is not fulfilling its obligations under the present Covenant.

The Swiss Government declares, pursuant to article 41 (1) of the [said Covenant], that it shall recognize for a further period of five years, as from 18 September 1997, the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the present Covenant.

"... the Swiss Federal Council declares, pursuant to article 41 (1) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 16 December 1966, that it recognizes for a further period of five years, beginning on 16 April 2010, the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications from States parties concerning non-compliance by other States parties with the obligations arising under the Covenant."

**TUNISIA**

The Government of the Republic of Tunisia declares that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee established under article 28 of the [said Covenant], to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that the Republic of Tunisia is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.
The State Party submitting such communications to the Committee must have made a declaration recognizing in regard to itself the competence of the Committee under article 41 of the [said Covenant].

UKRAINE
In accordance with article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Ukraine recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that any State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
"The Government of the United Kingdom declare under article 41 of this Covenant that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party, provided that such other State Party has, not less than twelve months prior to the submission by it of a communication relating to the United Kingdom made a declaration under article 41 recognizing the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications relating to itself." (*The text between brackets was received at the Secretariat on 27 January 1993.*)

Notifications under Article 4 (3) of the Covenant (Derogations)
(Taking into account the important number of these declarations, and in order not to increase excessively the number of pages of the present publication, the text of the notifications has in some cases, exceptionally, been abridged. Unless otherwise indicated, when the notification concerns an extension, the said extension affects those articles of the Covenant originally derogated from, and was decided for the same reasons. The date on the right hand, above the notification, is the date of receipt.)

ALGERIA
In view of public disturbances and the threat of deterioration of the situation [...] a state of siege has been proclaimed, beginning at midnight in the night of 4/5 June 1991, for a period of four months throughout Algerian territory. The Government of Algeria subsequently specified that these disturbances had been fomented with a view of preventing the general elections to be held on 27 June 1991 and to challenge the ongoing democratic process; and that in view of the insurrectional situation which threatened the stability of the institutions, the security of the people and their property, and the normal operation of the public services, it had been necessary to derogate from the provisions of articles 9 (3), 12 (1), 17, 19 (2) and 21 of the Covenant.
The said state of siege was terminated throughout Algeria on 29 September 1991. (Dated 13 February 1992)
In view of the serious threats to public order and the safety of individuals over the past few weeks, the growth of such threats during the month of February 1992 and the dangers of aggravation of the situation, the President of the High State Council, [...] has issued Presidential decree No. 92-44 of 9 February 1992, decreeing a state of emergency, throughout the national territory, with effect from 9 February 1992 at 2000 hours for a duration of twelve months, in accordance with articles 67, 74 and 76 of the Algerian Constitution. [The Government of Algeria has specified that the articles of the Covenant which are derogated from are articles 9(3), 12, 17 and 21]. The establishment of the state of emergency, which is aimed essentially at restoring public order, protecting the safety of individuals and public services, does not interfere with the democratic process inasmuch as the exercise of fundamental rights and freedoms continues to be guaranteed.

The state of emergency may, however, be lifted ahead of schedule, once the situation which prompted its establishment has been resolved and normal conditions of life in the nation have been restored...
...by Presidential Ordinance No. 11-01 of 23 February 2011, the Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria has lifted the state of emergency.
[The] [said Ordinance [...] repealed Legislative Decree No. 93-02 of 6 February 1993 extending the duration of the state of emergency established by Presidential Decree No. 92-44 of 9 February 1992...

ARGENTINA
(Dated 7 June 1989)
Proclamation of the state of siege throughout the national territory for a period of 30 days in response to events [attacks and looting of retail shops, vandalism, use of firearms] whose seriousness jeopardizes the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms by the entire community. (Derogation from articles 9 and 21.)
(Dated 11 July 1989)
Termination of the state of siege as from 27 June 1989 throughout the national territory. (Dated 21 December 2001)
By decree No. 1678/2001 of 19 December 2001, proclamation of a State of siege for 30 days in the territory of Argentina.
(Dated 23 December 2001)
By Decrees Nos. 16, 18 and 20/2001 of 21 December 2001, declaration of a 10-day siege in the provinces of Buenos Aires, Entre Rios and San Juan.
(Dated 4 January 2002)
Cessation, as from 31 December 2001, of martial law
that had been imposed in the provinces of Buenos Aires, Entre Rios and San Juan.

(Dated 18 January 2002)

Communications concerning the state of siege declared by Decree No. 1678/2001 and the lifting of the state of siege by Decree No. 1689/2001; and the state of siege declared by Decrees Nos. 16/2002, 18/2001 and 20/2001 and the cessation of the state of siege. [For the text of the communication, see depository notification C.N.179.2002.TREATIES-3 of 27 February 2002.]

ARMENIA

... in connection with the Decree of the President of the Republic of Armenia on Declaration of the State of Emergency in conformity with Article 55 paragraph 14 and Article 117 paragraph 6 of the Constitution of the Republic of Armenia, dated 1 March 2008, and pursuant to Article 4 paragraph 3 of the Covenant, availed itself of the right of derogation from or limitation of application of the following provisions of the Covenant: Article 12 paragraph 1; Article 17 paragraph 1; Article 19 paragraphs 1-2; Article 21; Article 22 paragraph 1.

The above decree extends the state of emergency to the city of Yerevan for a period of 20 days in order to prevent the threat of danger to the constitutional order in the Republic of Armenia and protect the rights and legal interests of the population, following the mass disorders, resulting in human losses, personal injury and considerable material damage, which took place in Yerevan on 1 March 2008.

Amendments in NH-35-N Decree of 1 March 2008

Guided by point 14 of Article 55 and point 6 of Article 117 of the Constitution of the Republic of Armenia, I decreed:

• 1. To declare null and void points 6 and 7 of paragraph 4 of the NH-35-N Decree of the President of the Republic of Armenia on Declaration of State of Emergency of 1 March 2008.

• 2. The decree comes into force from the moment of its announcement.

PREMIER OF THE REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA
R. KOCHARIAN

AZERBAIJAN

Proclamation of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days as from 6 a.m. on 3 April 1993 until 6 a.m. on 3 June 1993 in the territory of the Azerbaijani Republic. The Government of the Azerbaijani Republic declared that the measures were taken as a result of the escalating aggression by the armed forces of Armenia threatening the very existence of the Azerbaijani State.

(Derogation from articles 9, 12, 19, 21 and 22.)

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 60 days as from 2 August 1993.

Lifting of the state of emergency proclaimed on 2 April 1993 as from 22 September 1993.

(Dated 5 October 1994)

Proclamation of a 60 day state of emergency in Baku by Decree of the President of 4 October 1994 with effect from 2300 hours on 2 October 1994 to 2300 hours on 2 February 1995.

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days, as from 2400 hours on 2 February 1995.

The above decree extends the state of emergency to the cities of Baku and Gyandzha.

First notification:

By Decree by the President of the Republic dated 2 February 1995, extension of the state of emergency in Baku, for a period of 60 days, as from 2300 hours on 2 February 1995.

Second notification:

By Decree by the President of the Republic dated 2 February 1995 on the extension of the state of emergency in the town of Gyandzha, for a period of 60 days, as from 2400 hours on 9 February 1995.

The extension of the state of emergency in Baku and Gyandzha has been declared, as indicated by the Government of Azerbaijan, bearing in mind the need to maintain social order, to protect the rights and freedoms of citizens and to restore legality and law and order and in view of the incomplete elimination of the causes that served as the basis for the imposition in October 1994 of the state of emergency in the cities of Baku and Gyandzha.

It is recalled that the provisions from which it has been derogated are articles 9, 12, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant.

(Dated 8 April 1995)

Extension of the state of emergency in Baku fora period of 60 days, by Decree of the President of the Republic dated 2 April 1995 as from 2000 hours on 3 April 1995. The extension of the state of emergency in Baku has been declared, as indicated by the Government of Azerbaijan, due to an attempted coup d'état which took place on 13-17 March 1995 in the city of Baku and to the fact that notwithstanding the suppression of the rebellion, criminal elements in the city of Baku are continuing activities inconsistent with the will of the people and endeavouring to disrupt public order. The Government of Azerbaijan also confirmed that the extension was decided in order to protect the constitutional order of the country, to maintain public order in the city of Baku, to protect the rights and freedoms of citizens and to restore legality and law and order.

(Dated 17 April 1995)

Termination, as from 11 April 1995, on the basis of a decision of the Milli Mejlis (Parliament) of the Azerbaijani Republic dated 11 April 1995, of the State of emergency in the city of Gyanja declared on 11 October 1994.

BAHRAIN

"... His Majesty King Hamad bin Issa Al Khalifa, King of the Kingdom of Bahrain, issued a Royal Decree 39 for
the year 2011 on 08 May 2011, lifting the State of National Safety, effective 01 June 2011." By Royal Decree No. 18 of 2011, the Kingdom of Bahrain declared a State of National Safety on 15 March 2011, for a period of three months in order to address and overcome the threat to the security, economy and society of Bahrain and its people. Bahrain invoked its right under article 4 of the Covenant to take measures derogating from Articles 9, 12, 13, 17, 21 and 22 of the Covenant. By Royal Decree No. 59 of 2011, the State of National Safety, declared by Royal Decree No. 18 of 2011, was lifted with effect from 1 June 2011, and that accordingly the derogations from the Covenant terminated from the same date.

**BOLIVIA (PLURINATIONAL STATE OF)**

By Supreme Decree No. 29705 of 12 September 2008, the Government of the Plurinational State of Bolivia declared a state of emergency throughout the territorial jurisdiction of the Department of Pando in response to crimes against humanity which caused the deaths of citizens, the violent seizure of public and private institutions, the destruction of State property, road damage and roadblocks, and public disorder that generated public unrest and insecurity and caused massive disturbance in the Department of Pando in accordance with the provisions of Article 111 of its Political Constitution.

By Supreme Decree No. 29809 of 22 November 2008, the Government of the Plurinational State of Bolivia lifted the state of emergency in the Department of Pando declared by Supreme Decree No. 29705 of 12 September 2008.

**BURKINA FASO**

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Burkina Faso a notification dated 17 April 2019, made under Article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the declaration, by Decree No. 2018-1200/PRES of 31 December 2018, of a state of emergency in 14 provinces in the country, with effect from 1 January 2019, and its extension for a period of six months, from 13 January to 12 July 2019, pursuant to Act No. 001-2019/AN of 11 January 2019. (See C.N.148.2019.TREATIES-IV-4 of 29 April 2019 for the text of the notification.)

**CHILE**

[Chile] has been under a state of siege for reasons of internal defence since 11 March 1976; the state of siege was legally proclaimed by Legislative Decree No. 1.369. The proclamation was made in accordance with the constitutional provisions concerning state of siege, which have been in force since 1925, in view of the inescapable duty of the government authorities to preserve public order and the fact that there continue to exist in Chile extremist seditious groups whose aim is to overthrow the established Government.

As a consequence of the proclamation of the state of siege, the rights referred to in Articles 9, 12, 13, 19 and 25 (b) of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights have been restricted in Chile.

(Dated 16 September 1986)

By Decree No. 1.037, the Government of Chile declared a state of siege throughout the national territory from 8 September to 6 December 1986, for as long as circumstances warrant. The notification specifies that Chile has been subjected to a wave of terrorist aggression of alarming proportions, that an alarming number of attacks have taken the lives of a significant number of citizens and armed forces personnel, and huge stockpiles of weapons were discovered in terrorists’ hands, and that for the first time in the history of the Republic, a terrorist attack was launched on H.E. the President of the Republic.

The notification specifies that the rights set forth in articles 9, 12, 13 and 19 of the Covenant would be derogated from.

(Dated 28 October 1986)

By Supreme Decree No. 173 of 19 August 1984, the state of siege, declared by Supreme Decree No. 29809 of 22 November 2008, the Government of the Plurinational State of Bolivia lifted the state of emergency in the Department of Pando declared by Supreme Decree No. 29705 of 12 September 2008.

**COLOMBIA**

The Government, by Decree 2131 of 1976, declared that public order had been disturbed and that all of the national territory was in a state of siege, the requirements of the Constitution having been fulfilled, and that in the face of serious events that disturbed the public peace, it had become necessary to adopt extraordinary measures within the framework of the legal regime provided for in the National Constitution for such situations (art. 121 of the National Constitution). The events disturbing the public peace that led the President of the Republic to take that decision are a matter of public knowledge. Under the state of siege (art. 121 of the National Constitution) the Government is empowered to suspend, for the duration of the state of siege, those provisions that are incompatible with the maintenance and restoration of public order.

On many occasions the President of the Republic has informed the country of his desire to terminate the state of siege when the necessary circumstances prevail.

It should be observed that, during the state of siege in Colombia, the institutional order has remained unchanged, with the Congress and all public bodies functioning normally. Civil liberties were fully respected during the most recent elections, both the election of the President of the Republic and the election of members of elective bodies.

By Decree No. 1674 of 9 June 1982, the state of siege was terminated on 20 June of 1982.

(Dated 30 March 1984)

The Government of Colombia had declared a breach of the peace and a state of siege in the territory of the Departments of Caquetá, Huila, Meta and Cauca in response to the activities in those Departments of armed groups which were seeking to undermine the constitutional system by means of repeated public disturbances.

Further to Decree No. 613, Decrees Nos. 666, 667, 668, 669 and 670 had been enacted on 21 March 1984 to restrict certain freedoms and to take other measures aimed
at restoring public order. (For the provisions which were derogated from, see in fine notification of 8 June 1984 hereinafter.)

(Dated 7 May 1984)

The Government of Colombia indicated that it had, through Decree No. 1038 of 1 May 1984, declared a state of siege in the territory of the Republic of Colombia owing to the assassination in April of the Minister of Justice and to recent disturbances of the public order that occurred in the cities of Bogotá, Cali, Barranquilla, Medellín, Acevedo (Department of Huila), Corinto (Department of Caucá), Sucre and Jordon Bajo (Department of Santander), Giraldó (Department of Antioquia) and Miraflores (Comisaría of Guaviare).

Pursuant to the above-mentioned Decree No. 1038, the Government had issued Decrees Nos. 1039 and 1040 of 1 May 1984 and Decree No. 1042 of 2 May 1984, restricting certain freedoms and enacting other measures to restore public order. The Government of Colombia, in a subsequent communication dated 23 November 1984, indicated that the decrees affected the rights referred to in articles 12 and 21 of the Covenant.

(Dated 11 December 1984)

Termination of derogation from article 21.

(Dated 9 August 1991)

Termination as of 7 July 1991 of the state of siege and of the measures adopted on 1 and 2 May 1984, which were still in force through the national territory.

(Dated 16 July 1992)

By Legislative Decree No. 1155 of 10 July 1992, which was to remain in force until 16 July 1992, the Government of Colombia declared a state of emergency throughout the national territory. The state of emergency was proclaimed in order to preserve public order by preventing the cartels responsible for the most serious assaults on public order from evading justice. The prospect of a torrent of releases on parole of persons, many of which “awaiting trial for a wide variety of terrorist activities. ... in addition to the acts perpetrated by the drug-trafficking cartels which might have taken place under the provisions of a newly promulgated Code of Penal Procedure”, in disregard of the applicability of special legislation, was causing “serious disturbances of public order”.

The provisions of the Pact which were derogated from are articles 12, 17, 21 and 22.

(Dated 10 November 1992)

By legislative Decree No. 1793 of 8 November 1992 which was to remain in force until 6 February 1993, the Government of Colombia declared a state of emergency throughout the national territory for a period of 90 days. The state of emergency was due to the fact that “in recent weeks, the public order situation in the country ... has grown significantly worse because of terrorist activities by gorilla organizations and organized crime ... Those criminal groups have also managed to obstruct and evade judicial action because the criminal justice is unable to use military forces as a judicial police organ to gather the necessary evidence”.

The provisions of the Pact which were derogated from are articles 12, 17, 21 and 22.

(Dated 5 March 1993)

In accordance with Legislative Decree No. 261, extension for a period of 90 days from 5 February 1993 until 7 May 1993 of the state of emergency in effect throughout the national territory. The extension was made necessary due to a continuation of the public order disturbances described above. The provisions of the Pact which were derogated from are articles 12, 17, 21 and 22.

(Dated 6 May 1994)

By legislative Decree No. 874 of 1 May 1994 which is to remain in force until 10 May 1994, declaration of the state of emergency throughout the national territory for the following reasons:

Since November 1993, there has been a significant increase in the number of investigations carried out by the Procurator-General's Office. It has become necessary to take steps to ensure that the efforts made by the Procurator-General's Office to conclude on-going investigations are not hampered through improper solutions such as obstructing an agreement, requesting the postponement of formal proceedings, etc.

The large number of cases in which prior circumstances have prevented characterisation within the stipulated time-limit constitutes an unforeseen situation which is generating social insecurity, public anxiety, a lack of trust in the administration of justice and strengthening of the criminal and guerilla warfare organizations committed to disrupting law and order and destabilizing the institutions of government.

In view of the foregoing, measures must be adopted to ensure that the difficulties that have arisen do not affect institutional stability, national security and civil harmony, a judicial emergency must be declared and consequently, transition measures must be adopted in the area of administration and penal procedure.

(Dated 27 May 1994)

Termination of the state of civil unrest and extension of the applicability of the provisions relating to the judicial emergency. Pursuant to the Decree No. 874 of 1 May 1994 and in exercise of the powers conferred on the Government under article 213 of the Political Constitution, the Government enacted Legislative Decree No. 875 of 1 May 1994, “by means of which a judicial emergency has been declared and measures have been adopted with regard to penal procedure”. Because of the declaration of judicial emergency, it was decided to suspend for two months, in respect of cases involving offences under the jurisdiction of regional and National Court judges, the time-limits established for obtaining release on bail.

By means of Decree No. 951 of 10 May 1994, measures were adopted to strengthen the functioning of the justice system.

The Government of Colombia has specified that the provision from which it has derogated is article 9 (3) of the Covenant.

(Dated 3 November 1995)

By Decree No. 1900 of 2 November 1995, declaration of a State of internal disturbance throughout the national territory for a period of ninety (90) days. The state of internal disturbance by the National Government is justified by the fact that acts of violence attributed to criminal and terrorist organizations have occurred in different regions of the country and are seriously and manifestly disturbing public order.

(Dated 21 March 1996)

By Legislative Decree No. 1901 of 2 November, the Government limits or restricts fundamental rights or freedoms laid down in the [said] Covenant.

By Decree No. 205 of 29 January 1996, the state of internal disturbance was extended for 90 calendar days, starting on 31 January 1996.

The Government of Colombia has specified that the provision from which it has derogated are articles 17 and 21 of the Covenant.

(Dated 21 March 1996)

Pursuant to paragraph 3 of Decree No. 0717 of 18 April 1996, the guarantee set forth in article 12 of the Covenant was to be restricted.

The measure was adopted in connection with Decree No. 1900 of 2 November 1995 whereby the state of internal disturbance was declared throughout the national territory (see notification of 7 November 1995 above).

(Dated 18 June 1996)

By Decree No. 777 of 29 April 1996, the state of internal disturbance (proclaimed by Decree No. 1900 of 2 November 1995) was extended for a further period of 90 calendar days, starting on 30 April 1996.

By Decree No. 900 of 22 May 1996, measures were adopted to control the activities of criminal and terrorist organizations in special public-order zones. The
provisions of the Pact which were derogated from are articles 9 (1) and 12.
(Dated 30 July 1996)

By Decree No. 1303 of 25 July 1996, lifting of the state of internal disturbance (proclaimed by Decree No. 1900 of 2 November 1995) and extension of some of the measures instituted by means of Decree No. 1901 of 2 November 1995, Decree No. 208 of 29 January 1996 and Decree No. 777 of 29 April 1996.

(Dated 12 August 2002)

Transmission of Decree No. 1837 dated 11 August 2002, which declared a state of internal disturbance throughout the national territory, and Decree No. 1838 dated 11 August 2002, which introduced a special tax to meet the necessary expenditure under the country’s General Budget to maintain democratic security.

(Dated 8 November 2002)

Transmission of Decree No. 2555 dated 8 November 2002, which extended the state of internal disturbance declared by Decree 1837 of 11 August 2002 for ninety (90) calendar days, as from 9 November 2002.

(Dated 12 February 2003)

Transmission Decree 245 of 5 February 2003, concerning the second extension of the declaration of internal disturbance decreed on 5 February 2003 throughout the national territory.

..., by Legislative Decree No. 3929 of 9 October 2008, a nationwide state of internal disturbance has been declared for 90 days.

Pursuant to the provision of article 16 of Law No. 137 of 1994 and in keeping with article 4, paragraph 3, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, I [ ...] inform you of the issuance of Decree No. 2799 of 2010, “which partially amends Decrees Nos. 2693 and 2694 of 2010”.

By means of this measure, a special category of goods excluded from sales tax is temporarily created, with the aim of benefiting those people affected by the situation that led to the declaration of a social emergency...

ECUADOR

The Government declared the extension of the state of emergency as from 20 to 25 October 1982 by Executive Decree No. 1252 of 20 October 1982 and derogation from article 12 (1) owing to serious disorders brought about by the suppression of subsidies, and termination of the state of emergency by Executive Decree No. 1274 of 27 October 1982.

Derogation from articles 9 (1) and (2); 12 (1) and (3); 17; 19 (2) and 21 in the provinces of Napo and Esmeraldas by Executive Decree No. 2511 of 16 March 1984 owing to destruction and sabotage in these areas.

Termination of the state of emergency by Executive Decree No. 2537 of 27 March 1984.

(Dated 14 March 1986)

Declaración del estado de emergencia en las provincias de Pichincha y Manabí due to the acts of subversion and armed uprising by a high-ranking officer no longer on active service, backed by extremist groups; thereby derogations from articles 12, 21 and 22, it being understood that no Ecuadorian may be exiled or deported outside the capitals of the provinces or to a region other than the one in which he lives.

(Dated 18 March 1986)

End of State of emergency as from 17 March 1986.

(Dated 28 October 1987)

Declaration of a state of national emergency throughout the national territory, effective as of 28 October 1987. [Derogation from articles 9 (1) and (2); 12 (1) and (2); 19 (2); and 21.]

The notification states that this measure was made necessary as a result of an illegal call for a national strike which would lead to acts of vandalism, offences against persons and property, and would disrupt the peace of the State and the proper exercise of the civic rights of Ecuadorians.

Termination of the state of emergency throughout the national territory as from 0 hour on 29 October 1987. (Dated 1 June 1988)

Declaración de un estado de emergencia nacional en todo el territorio del Estado, efectiva a las 0 horas del 29 de octubre de 1987. [Derogación de las Artículo 9 (1) y (2); 12 (1) y (2); 19 (2)]

The notification states that this measure is the necessary legal response to the 24-hour strike called for by the United Workers Front, which would result in acts of vandalism, violation of the security of persons and attacks on public and private property.

(Dated 2 June 1988)

Termination of the state of emergency throughout the national territory as from 1 June 1988.

(Dated 12 January 1999) Declaration of a state of emergency in Guayas province, indicating that the measures were prompted by the serious internal disturbance resulting from the massive crime wave in Guayas Province. Subsequently, the Government of Ecuador specified that the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 12 (1) and 17 (1) of the Covenant.

(Dated 15 March 1999)

Decree No. 681 by the President of the Republic dated 9 March 1999 by which a state of national emergency was declared and the entire territory of the Republic established as a security zone, as from 9 March 1999.

(Dated 22 March 1999)

Decree No. 717 by the President of the Republic dated 18 March 1999 by which the state of national emergency declared by Decree No. 681 dated 9 March 1999, was lifted as from 18 March 1999.

(Dated 27 August 1999)

Decree No. 1041 of 5 July 1999 by the President of the Republic, establishing a state of emergency in Ecuador in respect of public and private transport system throughout the country during the month of July 1999;

Decree No. 1070 of 13 July 1999 by the President of the Republic, lifting the state of national emergency and rescinding Decree No. 1070. Subsequently, the Government of Ecuador specified that the provisions from which it had derogated were articles 17 (1), 12 (1), 21 and 22 of the Covenant.

(Dated 9 December 1999)

Establishment of the State of Emergency in the Guayas Province by Decree No. 1557 of 30 November 1999 by the President of the Republic indicating that the measure was taken in response to the serious internal disturbance which produced a massive crime wave that continues to affect that province. The Decree states that “since the state of emergency declared in the Guayas Province in January 1999 (see notification of 14 January 1999), was ended there has been an increase in criminal activity which as made it clear that extraordinary measures must once again be taken..., it is necessary to activate the serious repercussions of the criminal activity in Guayas Province in order to prevent any change in the normal pattern of criminal life...”.

Subsequently, on 28 January 2000, the Government of Ecuador specified that the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 12 (1) and 17 (1) of the Covenant.

(Dated 6 January 2000)

On 5 January 2000, by Executive Decree, the President declared a state of national emergency establishing the entire territory of the Republic as a security zone. This measure was motivated by the serious internal unrest caused by the economic crisis which Ecuador is experiencing.

Subsequently, the Government of Ecuador specified that the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 12 (1), 17 (1), 21 and 22 (1).
On 21 February 2001, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Ecuador a notification dated 16 February 2001, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting the text of Executive Decree No. 1228 by the President of the Republic dated 9 February 2001, by which a state of national emergency was declared and the entire territory of the Republic was established as a security zone, as from 2 February 2001. The said Decree stipulates that this measure was adopted to overcome the adverse consequences of the economic crisis affecting Ecuador, which has created a situation of serious internal unrest.

The Government of Ecuador specified that the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant.

On 21 February 2001, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Ecuador a notification dated 16 February 2001, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting the text of Executive Decree No. 1228 by the President of the Republic dated 9 February 2001, by which the state of national emergency, declared by Decree No. 1214 of 2 February 2001, was lifted as from 9 March 2001.

Sir,

In accordance with article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, of which Ecuador is a State Party, and on behalf of the national Government, I am writing to notify you of the declarations of national emergency this year declared by Dr. Gustavo Noboa Bejarano, President of the Republic, in accordance with the provisions of articles 180 and 181 of the Ecuadorian Constitution in force, and when they were lifted. The details of these declarations follow:

Executive Decree No. 2404 of 26 February 2002 (Official Register No. 525): A state of emergency is declared in Sucumbios and Orellana provinces. The reason for this measure is the serious situation arising out of problems of the Colombian conflict on the frontiers;

Executive Decree No. 2421 of 4 March 2002: The state of emergency in Sucumbios and Orellana provinces is declared over, and accordingly Executive Decree 2404 of 22 February 2002 is abrogated;

Executive Decree No. 2492 of 22 March 2002: State of emergency in Esmeraldas, Guayas Los Ríos, Manabi and El Oro provinces. The reason for this measure is the severe storm on the Ecuadorian coast. The state of emergency was declared on 22 March and the provision embodied in article 182, paragraph 2, of the Ecuadorian Constitution to the effect that "a decree of a state of emergency shall remain in force for up to a maximum of 60 days";

Executive Decree No. 2625 of 7 May 2002 (Official Register No. 575 of 14 May 2002): State of national emergency in respect of land transport. (This state of emergency has not been lifted but, will last until 7 July, unless the President declares that it is lifted in advance.)

Accept, Sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

On 18 August 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Ecuador a notification made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, notifying of the declaration of a state of emergency in Sucumbios and Orellana Provinces, decreed by the President of the Republic on 17 August 2005, in accordance with the provisions of articles 180 and 181 of the Ecuadorian Constitution in force.

The Government of Ecuador specified that this measure was motivated by the serious internal unrest caused by crime waves in the aforementioned provinces. The declaration of emergency was made by means of Executive Decree No. 426 of 17 August 2005. Moreover, the articles of the Covenant which were derogated from were not indicated.

On 22 August 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Ecuador notifications made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, notifying of the declaration of a state of emergency in the Canton of Chone, Manabi Province, decreed by the Constitutional President of the Republic on 19 August 2005, in accordance with articles 180 and 181 of the Political Constitution of Ecuador.

The Government of Ecuador specified that this measure was taken in response to serious internal unrest, which has led to a crime wave and to widespread looting in the aforementioned canton. The declaration of emergency was made by means of Executive Decree No. 430 of 19 August 2005. Moreover, the Government of Ecuador specified that during the state of emergency the rights established in article 23, paragraphs 9, 12, 13, 14 and 19, and article 23 of the Political Constitution of the Republic were suspended.

Declaration of a state of emergency in a number of Ecuadorian provinces, issued on 21 March through Executive Decree No. 1269 which was suspended on 7 April 2006 through Executive Decree No. 1329.

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Ecuador a notification dated 3 June 2016, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the declaration of a state of emergency in the provinces of Esmeraldas, Manabi, Santa Elena, Santo Domingo de los Tsáchilas, Los Ríos and Guayas for a period of 60 days from 17 April 2016 through Executive Decree no. 1001.

(See C.N.455.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 11 January 2017 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Ecuador a notification dated 11 July 2016 (and subsequently a notification dated 5 December 2016), made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency in the provinces of Esmeraldas, Manabi, Santa Elena, Santo Domingo de los Tsáchilas, Los Ríos and Guayas for a period of 30 days from 16 June 2016 by Executive Decree no. 1101.

(See C.N.981.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 11 January 2017 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Ecuador a notification dated 25 July 2016 (and subsequently a notification dated 26 August 2016), made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the declaration of a state of emergency in the provinces of Esmeraldas and Manabi Province, decreed by the Constitutional President of the Republic on 19 August 2005, in accordance with articles 180 and 181 of the Political Constitution of Ecuador.

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Ecuador a notification dated 5 December 2016, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the declaration of a state of emergency in the provinces of Esmeraldas and Manabi for a period of 60 days from 14 October 2016 by Executive Decree no. 1215.

(See C.N.983.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 16 January 2017 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Ecuador a notification dated 17 January 2017 and subsequently a notification dated 3 February 2017, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the renewal of the state of emergency in the province of Morona Santiago for a period of thirty days, beginning 12 January 2017, by Executive Decree no. 1294.

(See C.N.63.2017.TREATIES-IV.4 of 2 March 2017 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Ecuador a notification dated 21 December 2016 and subsequently a notification dated 3 February 2017, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the declaration of a state of emergency in the province of
Morona Santiago for a period of thirty days, beginning 14 December 2016, by Executive Decree no. 1276.
(See C.N.988.2016.TREATIES-IV-4 of 2 March 2017 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Ecuador a notification dated 20 January 2017 and subsequently a notification dated 15 March 2017, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the declaration of a state of emergency in the provinces of Manabí and Esmeraldas for a period of sixty days, beginning 12 January 2017, by Executive Decree no. 1295.
(See C.N.163.2017.TREATIES-IV-4 of 31 March 2017 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Ecuador a notification dated 15 March 2017 and subsequently a notification dated 1 June 2017, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the declaration of a state of emergency throughout the national territory for as long as necessary to respond to the eruption of Mount Cotopaxi, but not longer than sixty days, beginning 15 August 2015, by Executive Decree no. 755.
(See C.N.315.2017.TREATIES-IV-4 of 15 June 2017 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Ecuador a notification dated 15 March 2017 and subsequently a notification dated 1 June 2017, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the declaration of a state of emergency in the cantons of Manabí and Esmeraldas for a period of thirty days, beginning 13 March 2017, by Executive Decree no. 1338.
(See C.N.310.2017.TREATIES-IV-4 of 13 June 2017 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Ecuador a notification dated 2 May 2017 and subsequently a notification dated 1 June 2017, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the declaration of a state of emergency in the provinces of Manabí and Esmeraldas for a period of sixty days, beginning 13 April 2017, by Executive Decree no. 1364.
(See C.N.313.2017.TREATIES-IV-4 of 13 June 2017 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Ecuador a notification dated 29 December 2017 and subsequently a notification dated 3 January 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the declaration of a state of emergency in the cantons of San Lorenzo and Eloy Alfaro in the province of Esmeraldas by Executive Decree No. 296 of 27 January 2018 for a period of 60 days.
(See C.N.34.2018.TREATIES-IV-4 of 13 February 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Ecuador a notification dated 3 April 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the declaration of a state of emergency in the canton of San Lorenzo, particularly in the localities of Mataje, El Pan and La Cadena, and in the canton of Eloy Alfaro in the province of Esmeraldas by Executive Decree No. 381 of 27 April 2018 for a period of 60 days.
(See C.N.224.2018.TREATIES-IV-4 of 30 April 2018 for the text of the notification.)

EL SALVADOR

(Dated 3 November 1983)

The Government has declared an extension for a period of 30 days of the suspension of constitutional guarantees by Legislative Decree No. 329 dated 28 October 1983. The constitutional guarantees have been suspended in accordance with article 175 of the Political Constitution because of disruption of public order. In a complimentary notification dated 23 January 1984 and received on 24 January 1984, the Government of El Salvador specified the following:

1) The provisions of the Covenant from which it is derogated are articles 12 and 19 by Decree No. 329 of 28 August 1983, and article 17 (in respect of interference with correspondence);

2) The constitutional guarantees were first suspended by Decree No. 155 dated 6 March 1980, with further extensions of the suspension for a total of 24 months. Decree No. 155 was modified by Decree No. 999 dated 24 February 1982, which expired on 24 March 1984. By Decree No. 1087 dated 20 April 1982, the Revolutionary Government Junta again suspended the constitutional guarantees. By Legislative Decree No. 7 dated 20 May 1982, the Constituent Assembly extended the suspension for an additional period of 30 days. The said Legislative Decree No. 7 was itself extended several times until the adoption of the above-mentioned Decree No. 329 dated 28 October 1983, which took effect on that date.

3) The reasons for the adoption of the initial suspension decree (No. 155 of 6 March 1980) were the same as for the adoption of the subsequent decrees.

(Dated 14 June 1984)

By Legislative Decree No. 28 of 27 January 1984, previous measures were amended to the effect that political parties would be permitted to conduct electoral campaigns, and were thus authorized to engage in partisan campaigning and electoral propaganda activities. The said Decree was extended for successive 30-day periods until the promulgation of Decree No. 97 of 17 May 1984, which rescinded the high risk of new change which had allowed political parties to conduct electoral campaigns.

The provisions of the Covenant from which it is derogated are articles 12, 19, 17 (in respect of interference with correspondence) and 21 and 22. As regards article 22, the suspension refers to the right of association in general, but does not affect the right to join professional associations (the right to form and join trade unions).

(Dated 31 July 1985)

[...] the Government of El Salvador has for successive periods extended martial law by the following legislative decrees:


The provisions of the Covenant that are thus suspended are those of articles 12, 19 (in respect of interference with correspondence) and 17 (2).

The notification specifies that the reasons for the suspension of constitutional guarantees continue to be those originally indicated, namely: the need to maintain a
climate of peace and tranquility, which had been disturbed through the commission of acts designed to create a state of instability and social unrest which affected the economy and the public peace by persons seeking to obstruct the process of structural change, thus seriously disrupting public order.

(Dated 13 November 1989)

Suspension for a period of 30 days as from 12 November 1990 of various constitutional guarantees. (Derogation from articles 12, 17, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant.)

The notification indicates that this measure became necessary owing the use of terror and violence by the Frente Farabundo Marti to obtain the political authority, in complete disregard of previous elections.

FRANCE

On 15 November 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of France a notification signed by the Permanent Representative dated 15 November 2005, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, declaring a state of emergency had been established pursuant to the Decree dated 8 November 2005.

On 12 January 2006, the Secretary-General received from the Government of France a notification declaring the termination of the state of emergency established pursuant to the Decree dated 8 November 2005, with effect from 4 January 2006.

On 25 November 2015, the Secretary-General received from the Government of France a notification signed by the Permanent Representative dated 23 November 2015, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, declaring a state of emergency had been established pursuant to Decree No. 2015-1475 of 14 November 2015:

New York, 23 November 2015

Your Excellency,

On 13 November 2015, large-scale terrorist attacks took place in the Paris region. Taking into account information from the intelligence services and the international context, the terrorist threat in France is of a lasting nature.

The French Government has decided, by Decree No. 2015-1475 of 14 November 2015, to apply Act No. 55-385 of 3 April 1955 on the state of emergency, declaring a state of emergency had been established pursuant to Decrees No. 2015-1475 and No. 2015-1478 of 14 November 2015 and No. 2015-1493 and No. 2015-1494 of 18 November 2015 have defined a number of measures that may be taken by the administrative authorities.

The extension of the state of emergency for three months, with effect from 26 November 2015, was authorized by Act No. 2015-1501 of 20 November 2015. This Act also amends certain of the measures provided for by the Act of 3 April 1955 in order to adapt its content to the current context.

The texts of the decrees and acts mentioned above are attached to this letter.

Such measures appeared necessary to prevent the commission of further terrorist attacks.

Some of these measures, prescribed by the decrees of 14 November 2015 and 18 November 2015 and by the Act of 20 November 2015, may involve a derogation from the obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and particularly its articles 9, 12 and 17. I would therefore kindly request you to consider that this letter constitutes a notification for the purposes of article 4 of the Covenant.

Accept, Your Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

(Signed) François Delattre

(See C.N.703.2015.TREATIES-IV.4 of 31 December 2015 for the text of the above-mentioned notification.)

On 26 February 2016, the Secretary-General received from the Government of France a notification signed by the Permanent Representative dated 25 February 2016, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, declaring the extension of the state of emergency pursuant to Decree No. 2016-162 of 19 February 2016.

(See C.N.538.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 29 July 2016 for the text of the above-mentioned notification.)

On 22 July 2016, the Secretary-General received from the Government of France a notification signed by the Permanent Representative dated 22 July 2016, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, declaring the extension of the state of emergency pursuant to Decree No. 2016-987 of 21 July 2016.

(See C.N.565.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 1 August 2016 for the text of the notification.)

On 21 December 2016, the Secretary-General received from the Government of France a notification signed by the Permanent Representative dated 21 December 2016, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, declaring the extension of the state of emergency pursuant to Decree No. 2016-1767 of 19 December 2016.

On 14 July 2017, the Secretary-General received from the Government of France a notification signed by the Permanent Representative dated 12 July 2017, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, declaring the extension of the state of emergency pursuant to Act No. 2017-1154 of 11 July 2017.

(See C.N.408.2017.TREATIES-IV.4 of 21 July 2017 for the text of the notification.)

On 20 July 2018, the Secretary-General received from the Government of France a notification signed by the Permanent Representative dated 20 July 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, concerning the end of the state of emergency established through Act No. 2015-1475 of 14 November 2015.

(See C.N.337.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 20 July 2018 for the text of the notification.)

GEORGIA

Excellency,

In conformity with Article 4 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and Article 15 of the Law on the State of Emergency of Georgia, I have to inform you that the President of Georgia on February 26, 2006 has issued the Decree No. 173 on State of Emergency in the Khevlachauri district which has been approved by the Parliament of Georgia on February 28, 2006. The Decree is aimed at preventing further spread throughout Georgia of the H5N1 virus (bird flu) that has been recently detected in the district in question. The restrictions imposed upon by the Decree are fully in line with provisions of Article 21, paragraphs 2 and 3 (on the restrictions related to property rights) and Article 22, paragraph 3 (on the restrictions related to the freedom of movement) and Article 46 (on the restrictions related to constitutional rights and freedoms) of the Constitution of Georgia and respective provisions of the Law on the State of Georgia.

You will be informed in due course when the above Decree is abolished.

Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

(Signed) Gela Bezhuashvili

(Dated 23 March 2006)

In conformity with Article 4 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and Article 15 of the Law of the State of Emergency of Georgia, I have to inform you that the President of Georgia on March 15, 2006 has issued the Decree No.199 on Abolishment of the State of Emergency in the Khevlachauri district, which has been approved by the Parliament of Georgia on March 16, 2006.
According to the above Decree, the Presidential Decree No. 173 of February 26, 2006 "On State of Emergency in the Khelvachauri district" has been declared null and void.

In conformity with Article 4 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights I would like to inform you that the President of Georgia on November 7, 2007 has issued the Order #621 on "the Decration of the State of Emergency on the entire territory of Georgia"and Decree N.1 "On the measures to be undertaken in connection with the declaration of the state of emergency on the entire territory of Georgia"which will be approved by the Parliament of Georgia within next 48 hours. Introduction of the state of emergency became necessary because of the extreme deterioration of the situation in Tbilisi as a result of the attempted coup d'état and massive disobedience and violent resistance to the law enforcement authorities. Due to the state of emergency, pursuant to Article 73, paragraph 1, subparagraph 'h', and Article 46 paragraph 1 of the Constitution of Georgia and Article 2, paragraph 1 of the Law of Georgia on the State of Emergency, right to receive and disseminate information (Article 24 of the Constitution of Georgia), freedom to assembly and association (Article 46 of the Constitution of Georgia), right to strike (Article 33) are restricted for the duration of the state of emergency. You will be informed in due course when the above Order and Decree are abolished.

GUATEMALA

(Dated 20 November 1998)
By Decree No. 1-98 of 31 October 1998, declaration of the state of public disaster throughout the national territory for a period of thirty (30) days, in order to resolve the hazardous situation caused by Hurricane Mitch and to mitigate its effects.

(Dated 26 July 2001)
By Government Decree No. 2-2001, extension of the state of emergency established by Government Decree No. 1-2001, for an additional 30 days throughout the national territory.

The Government Decree No. 1-2001 was not supplied to the Secretary-General. Moreover, the articles of the Covenant which were derogated from were not indicated.

(Dated 2 August 2001)
By Government Decree No. 3-2001, establishment of a state of emergency for a period of 30 days in the Department of Totonicapán with immediate effect. The articles of the Covenant which were derogated from were not indicated.

(Dated 6 August 2001)
State of emergency declared by Decree No. 3-2001 has been rescinded by Government Decree No. 4-2001 with immediate effect.

On 14 October 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Guatemala a notification made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, notifying of a derogation from obligations under the Covenant.

The decision was adopted by the Congress of Guatemala on 6 October 2005 in Legislative Decree No. 70-2005, and it entered into force on 10 October 2005. The Decree recognizes a state of national disaster in the affected areas for a period of 30 days.

The Government of Guatemala specified that it has derogated from the provisions relating to the right of liberty of movement and the right of freedom of action, except for the right of persons not to be harassed for their opinion or for facts which do not violate the law. Moreover, the articles of the Covenant which were derogated from were not indicated.

On 5 September 2006, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Guatemala a notification made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, notifying of a declaration of a state of emergency in the municipalities of Concepción Tutuapa, Ixchiguán, San Miguel Ixtahuacán, Tajumulco and Tejuela, in the Department of San Marcos of the Republic of Guatemala.

The State of emergency was declared by Governmental Decree No. 1-2006 of 28 August 2006. On 18 September 2006, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Guatemala a communication informing him of Government Decree No. 2-2006 of 31 August 2006, which repeals article 4, paragraph (d), of Government Decree No. 1-2006, which was sent earlier.

By Government Decrees Nos. 5-2006 and 6-2006, the President of the Republic declared a state of emergency in some municipalities in the Departments of San Marcos, Huehuetenango and Quetzaltenango. The state of emergency remained in effect for eight days from the date indicated in the decrees, i.e., 17 November 2006.

(Dated 7 May 2008)
... by Government Decree No. 1-2008 of 7 May 2008, a state of emergency has been declared throughout the territory of the Republic of Guatemala.

Government Decree No. 1-2008, which entered into force immediately, will remain in effect for 15 days and will be applicable throughout the national territory.

Accordingly, the rights and freedoms guaranteed under articles 9, 19, 21, 22 (para. 1) and 22 (para. 2) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights has been restricted.

On 12 May 2008, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Guatemala a letter dated 8 May 2008 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Guatemala providing information on the state of emergency declared in the Republic of Guatemala by Government Decree No. 1-2008.

In compliance with article 4, paragraph 3 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Government of Guatemala wishes to inform the Secretary-General that the state of emergency established by Government Decree No. 1-2008 expired on 22 May 2008. Accordingly, the rights and guarantees suspended by this Decree have been restored.

... by Government Decree No. 3-2008 the President of the Republic has decreed a state of emergency in the municipality of San Juan Sacatepéquez in the Department of Guatemala. The state of emergency will remain in effect for a period of 15 days from 22 June 2008.

On 14 October 2008, the Government of Guatemala notified the Secretary-General that by Decree No. 07-2008 various measures were adopted to suspend certain rights in the Municipality of Coatepeque in the Department of Quetzaltenango. The Decree remained in force for 15 days as of 5 October 2008.

(Dated 24 April 2009)
... by Governmental Decree No. 5-2009, a state of emergency was declared in the municipality of Huehuetenango, Department of Huehuetenango, for a period of 15 days.

On 25 April 2009, the President of the Republic of Guatemala repealed, by Government Decree 6-2009, the state of emergency in the Municipality of Huehuetenango, Department of Huehuetenango, that had been declared by Government Decree No. 3-2009.

(Dated 6 May 2009)
... by Government Decree No. 7-2009, a public health emergency has been declared throughout the national territory, with a view to preventing and mitigating the effects of the influenza A (H1N1) epidemic.

Government Decree No. 7-2009, which was declared for a period of thirty (30) days, limits the rights and freedoms contained in articles 12, 19 and 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.


... by Government Decree No. 14-2009 of 22 December 2009, the President of the Republic declared a state of emergency in the Department of San Marcos. The
Decree entered into force immediately for a period of fifteen (15) days during which the exercise of the rights and freedoms guaranteed under articles 9, 12, 19 and 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights has been restricted.

by Government Decrees Nos. 01-2010 of 5 January 2010 and 02-2010 of 20 January 2010, the President of the Republic extended the state of emergency in the Department of San Marcos declared by Government Decree 14-2009 of 22 December 2009, each for a period of fifteen (15) days.

... by Government Decree No. 08-2010 of 18 March 2010, the President of the Republic extended the state of emergency in the Department of San Marcos for a period of fifteen (15) days.

... by Government Decree No. 4-2010 of 5 February 2010, the President of the Republic extended the state of emergency (Decree 14-2009 of 22 December 2009) in the Department of San Marcos for a period of fifteen (15) days.

... by Government Decree No. 6-2010 of 19 February 2010, the President of the Republic extended the state of emergency (Decree 14-2009 of 22 December 2009) in the Department of San Marcos for a period of fifteen (15) days.

... by Government Decrees Nos. 9-2010 of 7 April 2010 and No. 11-2010 of 16 April 2010, the President of the Republic extended the state of emergency (Decree 14-2009 of 22 December 2009) in the Department of San Marcos for a period of fifteen (15) days respectively.

... by Government Decrees No. 09-2010 of 7 April 2010 and No. 11-2010 of 16 April 2010, the President of the Republic extended the state of emergency (Decree 08-2009 of 18 March 2010) in the Department of San Marcos for a period of fifteen (15) days respectively.

... by Government Decree No. 13-2010 of 17 May 2010, the President of the Republic declared a state of emergency in the Department of San Marcos for a period of fifteen (15) days. The Decree restricted the exercise of the rights and freedoms referred to in articles 9, 12, 19 and 21 of the Covenant. The state of emergency concluded 15 days after it was declared.

... by Government Decree No. 14-2010, owing to the eruption of the Pacaya volcano, the President of the Republic declared a disaster emergency in the territory of the Departments of Escuintla, Sacatepéquez and Guatemala for a period of 30 days, partially restricting the rights and freedoms referred to in articles 12 and 21 of the Covenant.

... by Government Decree No. 15-2010 of 29 May 2010, owing to the natural disaster caused by tropical storm Agatha and the continuous rain affecting the country, the President of the Republic declared a national disaster emergency for a period of 30 days. On 25 June 2010, by Government Decree No. 16-2010, the disaster emergency was extended for a further 30 days in the Departments of Escuintla, Sacatepéquez and Guatemala owing to the continuance of the circumstances that led to the issuance of Government Decrees Nos. 14-2010 and 15-2010.

In each case, measures were adopted that partially restrict the content of articles 12 and 21 of the International Covenant.

... by Government Decree 17-2010 of 22 July 2010, the President of the Republic extended for a further 30 days the disaster emergency proclaimed by Government Decree 14-2010.

... by Government Decree No. 6-2010 of 19 February 2010 extended the state of emergency in the Department of San Marcos, Guatemala. The Government Decree entered into force immediately and has been issued for a period of fifteen (15) days in the Department of San Marcos, Guatemala. The exercise of the rights and freedoms established in articles 12, 19, paragraph 2 and 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights has been partially restricted.

In a note received on 28 June 2010, the Government of Guatemala informed the Secretary-General that the State of public emergency declared by Government Decree 11-2010 of 16 April 2010 in the Department of San Marcos ended 15 days after its declaration.

... by Government Decree No. 23-2010 of 19 December 2010, the President of the Republic of Guatemala declared a state of siege in the Department of Alta Verapaz for a period of 30 days from the entry into force of the Decree in response to the need to regain control of the region where drugs traffickers have a strong presence, and where a series of violent events have taken place. Measures were adopted restricting the full application of articles 9, 12 and 21 of the Covenant.

... by Government Decree 01-2011, the state of siege is being extended because the conditions that led to the issuance of Government Decree No. 23-2010 [...] still persist.

... by Government Decree No. 4-2011 in the Council of Ministers, the President of the Republic of Guatemala declared a state of emergency in the Department of Petén for a period of thirty (30) days, beginning on the date of the entry into force of the aforesaid Decree. Accordingly, the exercise of the rights and freedoms established in articles 9, 12 and 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights have been restricted, as necessary.

... by government decree No. 5-2011, the state of emergency declared by Government Decree 4-2011 is extended for an additional period of 30 days in the Department of Petén. Measures restricting the application of articles 9, 12 and 21 of the Covenant remain in effect.

... by Government Decree No. 6-2011, the President of Guatemala extended for an additional 30 days the state of emergency in the Department of Petén declared by Government Decree No. 4-2011 and extended by Government Decree No. 5-2011. Measures restricting the application of articles 9, 12 and 21 of the Covenant remain in effect.

... by Government Decree No. 7-2011, the President of the Republic of Guatemala, in the Council of Ministers, declared a state of emergency in the Department of Petén for 30 days as of 14 August 2011. The exercise of the rights and freedoms set out in articles 9, 12 and 21 of the Covenant have been restricted.

In a note received on 6 September 2011, the Government of Guatemala informed the Secretary-General that the state of public emergency declared by Government Decree 6-2011, dated 14 July 2011, ended on 17 August 2011.

... by Government Decree 9-2011, the Vice-President of the Republic of Guatemala, acting in the Council of Ministers and on the authority of the President of the Republic, declared a state of public emergency in the Department of Santa Rosa for a period of thirty (30) days as from the date of the entry into force of that Decree. In that connection, measures restricting the application of articles 9, 12 and 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights were taken.

... on 14 August 2011, the President of the Republic of Guatemala, in the Council of Ministers, through Government Decree No. 7-2011, declared a state of emergency in the Department of Petén, Guatemala, for a period of thirty (30) days.

Because of the continuance of the conditions that led to the declaration of the above-mentioned state of emergency, by Government Decree No. 8-2011, dated 13 September, 2011, the President of the Republic of Guatemala again extended the state of emergency for an additional 30 days in the Department of Petén, Guatemala.

On 15 October 2011, the President of the Republic of Guatemala declared in the Council of Ministers, by Government decree No. 10-2011, a state of emergency throughout the national territory, to run for thirty days
starting from the date of entry into force of that decree. Measures have been adopted to derogate as necessary from the provisions of articles 9, 12 and 21 of the aforementioned International Covenant.

On 1 May 2012, the President of the Republic of Guatemala, in the Council of Ministers, declared a state of emergency in the town of Santa Cruz Barillas, Department of Huehuetenango, by Government Decree No. 1-2012.

Government Decree No. 1-2012 entered into force immediately for a period of thirty (30) days in the town of Santa Cruz Barillas, Department of Huehuetenango, Guatemala. It restricted the exercise of the rights referred to in articles 9, 12 and 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, with regard to lawful detention, freedom of movement and the right of assembly and demonstration, as well as the right to bear arms.

However, as the circumstances that led to that decree no longer exist, on 18 May 2012 the state of emergency in the town of Santa Cruz Barillas, Department of Huehuetenango, was lifted by Government Decree No. 2-2012.

On 7 November 2012, the President of the Republic of Guatemala, in the Council of Ministers, declared a state of disaster in the Guatemalan departments of Retalhuleu, Quetzaltenango, Sololá, Quiché, Totonicapán, San Marcos and Huehuetenango through Government Decree No. 3-2012. Subsequently, the President of the Republic, in the Council of Ministers, expanded the state of disaster declared through Government Decree No. 3-2012 to include the department of Suchitepéquez.

The relevant measures have been decreed for a period of fifteen (15) days and restrict the implementation of article 12 of the above-mentioned Covenant with regard to liberty of movement.

As the conditions that gave rise to the aforementioned declaration of a state of disaster still persist, the President of the Republic of Guatemala has further extended, through Government Decree No. 5-2012 of 7 December 2012, the state of disaster in the Guatemalan departments of Retalhuleu, Quetzaltenango, Sololá, Quiché, Totonicapán, San Marcos, Huehuetenango and Suchitepéquez through Government Decrees Nos. 3-2012 and 4-2012.

Because the conditions that gave rise to the aforementioned declaration of a state of disaster still persist, the President of the Republic of Guatemala has further extended, through Government Decree No. 5-2012 of 7 December 2012, the state of disaster in the Guatemalan departments of Retalhuleu, Quetzaltenango, Sololá, Quiché, Totonicapán, San Marcos, Huehuetenango and Suchitepéquez, for a period of thirty additional days.

On 7 November 2012, the President of the Republic of Guatemala, in the Council of Ministers, declared a state of disaster in the Guatemalan departments of Retalhuleu, Quetzaltenango, Sololá, Quiché, Totonicapán, San Marcos and Huehuetenango and Suchitepéquez, through Government Decree No. 7-2012.

Because the conditions that gave rise to the aforementioned declaration of a state of disaster still persist, the President of the Republic of Guatemala has further extended, through Government Decree No. 1-2013 of 7 January 2013, the state of disaster in the Guatemalan departments of Retalhuleu, Quetzaltenango, Sololá, Quiché, Totonicapán, San Marcos, Huehuetenango and Suchitepéquez, for a period of thirty additional days.

On 7 November 2012, the President of the Republic of Guatemala, in the Council of Ministers, declared a state of disaster in the Guatemalan departments of Retalhuleu, Quetzaltenango, Sololá, Quiché, Totonicapán, San Marcos, Huehuetenango and Suchitepéquez, for a period of thirty additional days.

Because the conditions that gave rise to the aforementioned declaration of a state of disaster still persist, the President of the Republic of Guatemala has further extended, through Government Decree No. 2-2013 of 31 January 2013, the state of disaster in the Guatemalan departments of Retalhuleu, Quetzaltenango, Sololá, Quiché, Totonicapán, San Marcos, Huehuetenango and Suchitepéquez, for a period of thirty additional days.

On 21 September 2014, the President of the Republic of Guatemala, in the Council of Ministers, declared a state of alert in the municipality of San Juan Sacatepéquez in the Department of Guatemala through Government Decree No. 6-2014.

The measures have been decreed for a period of fifteen (15) days and restrict the implementation of articles 12 and 21 of the aforementioned Covenant.

On 21 September 2014, the President of the Republic of Guatemala, in the Council of Ministers, declared a state of alert in the municipality of San Juan Sacatepéquez, Department of Guatemala, by Government Decree No. 6-2014.

As the conditions that gave rise to the declaration of this state of alert still prevail, the President of the Republic of Guatemala, by Government Decrees Nos. 8-2014 of 2 October 2014, has extended the state of alert in the municipality of San Juan Sacatepéquez, Department of Guatemala, for an additional 15 days.

I wish to inform you that the state of alert that was implemented in the territory of the municipality of San Juan Sacatepéquez, Department of Guatemala, was lifted by Government Decree No. 11-2014 of 31 October 2014.

... pursuant to article 4 (3) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

On 21 June 2016, as a result of landslides caused by heavy rainfall that damaged roads, housing, schools, health facilities and other infrastructure, Mr. Jimmy Morales Cabrera, President of the Republic of Guatemala, in concert with the Cabinet, issued Government Decree No. 2-2016 declaring a state of emergency in the municipality of Jerez, department of Jutiapa, for 30 days beginning from the date of entry into force of the decree.

On 18 July 2016, the President of the Republic, in concert with the Cabinet, issued Government Decree No. 3-2016 extending the state of emergency for another 30 days, since the circumstances that gave rise to Government Decree No. 2-2016 continued to exist...


... pursuant to article 4 (3) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, that on 21 June 2016, in concert with the Cabinet, Mr. Jimmy Morales Cabrera, President of the Republic of Guatemala, issued Govz. Department No. 2-2016 declaring a state of emergency in the municipality of Jerez, Department of Jutiapa, for 30 days beginning from the date of entry into force of the decree.

The state of emergency was declared as a result of landslides caused by heavy rainfall in the municipality of Jerez, department of Jutiapa, which damaged roads, housing, schools, health facilities and other infrastructure and impaired the provision of essential services, as well as
affecting production activities and human development. Accordingly, the measure is aimed at mitigating the damage, repairing roads and buildings, restoring essential services and minimizing the impact, as well as enabling the necessary measures to be taken, in places where the circumstances so warrant, to avoid or reduce the impact of the disaster and, above all, to protect the life, physical integrity and safety of the affected or at-risk population and to safeguard their property.

In this connection, measures have been taken to restrict the application of article 12 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights with respect to liberty of movement...


... on 19 September 2016, by Government Decree No. 5-2016, published on 20 September 2016 in the Official Gazette, the Government of Guatemala declared a state of emergency throughout Guatemala because of the heavy and constant rainfall affecting the country.

Subsequently, by Government Decree No. 6-2016 of 21 September 2016, published on 22 September 2016, the Government of Guatemala repealed Government Decree No. 5-2016, because of the differing and widespread interpretations among the population about the purposes for which the Decree had been issued...

... further to Note No. J/1/1119 of 27 September 2016 concerning Decree No. 5-2016 published on 20 September 2016 and Decree No. 6-2016 published on 22 September 2016, whereby Guatemala declared and subsequently lifted the national state of emergency.

In this regard and in accordance with article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, I wish to inform you that the Government of Guatemala has decided to revoke the suspension of the following articles under Government Decree No. 6-2016:

1. Article 12: Movement
2. Article 19: Freedom of expression
3. Article 21: Peaceful assembly
4. Article 22: Association...

(See C.N.838.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 9 November 2016.)

... on 22 September 2016, the Government of Guatemala, issued Government Decree No. 7-2016, published in the Official Gazette on 23 September 2016, declaring a state of emergency in the national territory for a period of thirty (30) days, beginning on the date of entry into force of the aforesaid Decree.

The purpose of this Decree is to prevent the population from remaining in, or having access to, certain areas classified as vulnerable or at risk; to take all appropriate measures to mitigate the damage caused or which may be caused by the continuous heavy rainfall in order to prevent further consequences; and, in places where circumstances so warrant, to take the necessary action to alleviate or reduce its impact, thereby protecting the lives, safety and physical integrity of the Guatemalan population...

... further to Note No. J/1/1132 of 30 September 2016 concerning Decree No. 7-2016 published on 23 September 2016, whereby Guatemala declared a national state of emergency.

In this regard and in accordance with article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, I wish to inform you that the Government of Guatemala has decided to take measures with regard to the provisions of article 12 of the Covenant...

(See C.N.839.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 9 November 2016.)

J/1/563

New York, 18 May 2017

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that on 10 May 2017, the Government of Guatemala, through Government Decree No. 2-2017, published on 12 May 2017 in the Official Gazette, declared a state of emergency in the municipalities of Ixchigüén and Tajumulco in the department of San Marcos, for a period of thirty days from the publication of the Decree in the Official Journal.

The state of emergency was decreed because in recent days a number of serious events have occurred in those municipalities that jeopardize the constitutional order, governance and security of the State, affecting individuals and families and endangering the lives, liberty, security, peace and full development of the people.

As a result of the above declaration and for as long as it remains in effect, full exercise of the constitutional rights of freedom of action, lawful arrest, interrogation of detainees or prisoners, freedom of movement, rights of assembly and demonstration and carrying of weapons, contained in articles 5, 6, 9, 26, 33 and paragraph two of article 38 of the Political Constitution of the Republic of Guatemala, as well as articles 12, 21 and 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, shall be suspended.

In this regard, and based on the provisions of article 4, paragraph 3, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, I request your good offices to convey to States parties the notification and attached Government decree for the files of the depositary, as well as for consultation.

Accept, Sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

(Signed) Omar Castañeda Solares
Deputy Permanent Representative / Chargé d’affaires a.i.

(See C.N.290.2017.TREATIES-IV.4 of 24 May 2017)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Guatemala a notification dated 12 June 2017, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency in the municipalities of Ixchiguán and Tajumulco in the Department of San Marcos, for a further thirty days by Government Decree No. 3-2017.

(See C.N.402.2017.TREATIES-IV.4 of 17 July 2017 for the text of the notification.)

ISRAEL

"Since its establishment, the State of Israel has been the victim of continuous threats and attacks on its very existence as well as on the life and property of its citizens.

"These have taken the form of threats of war, of actual armed attacks, and campaigns of terrorism resulting in the murder of and injury to human beings.

"In view of the above, the State of Emergency which was proclaimed in May 1948 has remained in force ever since. This situation constitutes a public emergency within the meaning of article 4 (1) of the Covenant.

"The Government of Israel has therefore found it necessary, in accordance with the said article 4, to take measures to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation, for the defence of the State and for the protection of life and property, including the exercise of powers of arrest and detention.

"In so far as any of these measures are inconsistent with article 9 of the Covenant, Israel thereby derogates from its obligations under that provision."

JAMAICA

On 28 September 2004, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Jamaica a notification dated 28 September 2004, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting a Proclamation declaring a state of emergency in the island. The proclamation shall remain in effect for an initial period of 30 days, unless the Governor-General is advised to repeal it or an extension is granted by the House of Representatives.

In a note received on 22 October 2004, the Government of Jamaica informed the Secretary-General that during the state of emergency, the provisions from
which it may derogate are articles 12, 19, 21 and 22 (2) of the Covenant.

On 27 October 2004, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Jamaica a notification, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting text of sections 26 (4) - (7) of the Constitution by which the proclamation of a state of public emergency issued by the Governor-General on 10 September 2004 terminated on 8 October 2004.

Furthermore, the Government of Jamaica informed the Secretary-General that the possible derogation from the rights guaranteed by Articles 12, 19, 21 and 22 (2) by Jamaica ceased on 8 October 2004.

On 24 August 2007, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Jamaica a notification dated 23 August 2007, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting a proclamation declaring a State of Public Emergency in the Island issued by the Governor on 19 August 2007. The proclamation shall remain in effect for an initial period of 30 days, unless the Governor-General is advised to repeal it.

In a note received on 27 August 2007, the Government of Jamaica informed the Secretary-General that the State of public emergency issued by the Governor on 19 August 2007 has since been lifted effective Friday 24 August.

"... in accordance with Article 4 (3) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights has the honour to inform that on 23rd May 2010, the Governor-General of Jamaica issued a proclamation declaring a State of Public Emergency in the Island.

The State of Public Emergency has been imposed in the parishes of Kingston and St. Andrew as a result of a threat to public safety and shall exist for a period of one month unless extended by the House of Representatives or terminated at an earlier time.

The Proclamation issued by the Governor-General is in strict compliance with the provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and with the Constitution of Jamaica. There may be derogation from the rights guaranteed by Articles 12, 19 and 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. [...]"

The Government of Jamaica hereby requests that the Secretary-General in his capacity as depository of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights inform all Parties to the Covenant on the provision from which it may derogate and the reason for possible derogation.

The Permanent of Jamaica has the further honour to advise that the Government of Jamaica will inform the Secretary-General of measures taken by the authorities aimed at the termination of the State of Public of Emergency. [...]"

"... The Permanent Mission [of Jamaica to the United Nations] wishes to advise that, upon the decision of the House of Representatives for Jamaica, the State of Emergency [declared on 23 May 2010] has been extended by the Government of Jamaica, in accordance with Section 26 (4) (7) of the Constitution, for a further period of twenty-eight (28) days from the date of June 23, 2010 for the parishes of Kingston, St. Andrew, as well as St. Catherine.

During the period of public emergency the Government may derogate from the provisions of Articles 9, 12, 17, 19 and 21 of the Covenant under regulations made pursuant to Emergency Powers Act. [...]"

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Jamaica a notification dated 22 January 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the Covenant, regarding the declaration of a state of emergency in the Parish of St. James for a period of 14 Days. (See C.N. 51.2018.TREATIES-IV-4 of 24 January 2018 for the text of the notification.)

NAMIBIA

(Dated 5 August 1999)

Proclamation No. 23 by the President of the Republic of Namibia, establishing a state of emergency in the Caprivi region for an initial period of thirty (30) days, indicating that the measures were prompted by circumstances arisen in this region causing a public emergency threatening the life of the nation and the constitutional order;

Proclamation No. 24 by the President of the Republic of Namibia, setting out the emergency regulations to the Caprivi region.

Derogation from articles 9 (2) and 9 (3) of the Covenant.

(Dated 10 September 1999)

Proclamation No. 27 by the President of the Republic, revoking the declaration of state of emergency and emergency regulations in the Caprivi region promulgated by Proclamations No. 23 of 2 August 1999 and No. 24 of 3 August 1999.

NEPAL

"... in view of the serious situation arising out of terrorist attacks perpetrated by the Maoists in various districts, killing several security and civilian personnel and attacking the government installations, a state of emergency has been declared in the entire Kingdom effective from 26 November 2001, in accordance with the Article 115 of the Constitution of the Kingdom of Nepal, 2047 (BS). Accordingly, His Majesty the King, on the recommendation of the Council of Ministers, has suspended the right to freedom of opinion and expression (Article 12.2a), freedom to assemble peacefully without arms (12.2b) and to move throughout the Kingdom (12.2d). Press and publication right (13.1), right against preventive detention (Article 15), right to information (Article 16), right to property (Article 17), right to privacy (Article 22) and right to constitutional remedy (Article 23) have also been suspended. However, the right to the remedy of habeas corpus has not been suspended.

The Permanent Representative also would like to inform the Secretary-General that, while suspending the rights and freedoms, His Majesty's Government has fully observed the provision of Article 4, paragraphs 1 and 2 of the above mentioned Covenant. Accordingly, the rights and freedoms as contained in Articles 6, 7, 8 (1), 11, 15, 16 and 18 of the Covenant, which are also guaranteed by the Constitution of the Kingdom of Nepal, remain in effect.

... following the dissolution of the Parliament, which was done in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Constitution of the Kingdom of Nepal - 2047, His Majesty's Government of Nepal has decided to hold the general elections on November 13, 2002 in a free and fair manner. In view of the current security situation in the country prompted by the Maoist insurgency, the Government has also extended the state of emergency by three more months. The Government, however, is committed to lifting the emergency as soon as there is an improvement in the security situation to facilitate free and peaceful general elections.

In spite of these steps, the Government will stay the course in respect to development programs and socio-economic reforms."

(Dated 19 November 2002)

"... With reference to [...] note 0076/2002 dated 22 February 2002 and pursuant to clause 3 of Article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights 1966, [...] [the Government of Nepal] lifted the state of emergency in the country, effective from 20 August 2002."

"The Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of Nepal to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and, pursuant to
Paragraph 3 of Article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966), has the honour to inform him that in view of a grave emergency threatening the sovereignty, integrity and security of the Kingdom of Nepal, His Majesty the King has, in accordance with clause (1) of Article 115 (1) of the Constitution of the Kingdom of Nepal, 1990 (2047), issued an order of a State of Emergency in respect of the whole of the Kingdom of Nepal on 1 February 2005 with immediate effect.

As the situation in the country had reached a point where the survival of multiparty democracy and the nation's sovereignty had been seriously threatened and the people of Nepal had to go through a miserable period of time due to untold sufferings brought about by the rise in terrorist activities throughout the country, and as the governments formed during the past few years had not been serious enough about initiating a dialogue with terrorists, His Majesty as the protector of the Constitution and the symbol of national unity, had no alternative but to declare a state of emergency to meet the exigencies in the country.

On 5 May 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Nepal a notification, dated the same, specifying that the state of emergency was declared since, on 9 and 10 June 1987, there were outbreaks of violence, clashes between demonstrators and units of defence forces, and incitement to violence by individuals and political groups resulting in personal injury and considerable material damage. The measure was taken with a view to restoring law and order and safeguarding the life, the dignity and the property of Panamanian nationals and of foreigners living in Panama.

The articles of the Covenant being derogated from are articles 12, paragraph 1, 17, with regard to the inviolability of correspondence; and Article 22 of the Constitution (right to privacy). 4. Termination of the State of emergency and reinstatement of all constitutional guarantees as at 30 June 1987.

PARAGUAY

[For notifications made by Peru received by the Secretary-General between 22 March 1983 and 12 December 2006, see note 1 under "Peru" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.]

... by Supreme Decree No. 005-2007-PCM, issued on 18 January 2007, a state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; the province of La Convencion, department of Cusco; the province of Satipo, Andamarca district of the province of Concepción, and Santo Domingo de Acobamba district of the province of Huancayo, department of Junin, has been extended for 60 days from 25 January 2007.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 29 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 011-2007-PCM issued on 15 February 2007 together with a corrigendum, the state of emergency in the provinces of Marañon, Huayacambá, Leoncio Prado and Huamalíes, department of Huánuco, the province of Tocache, department of San Martin, and the province of Presidente Hayes, department of Ucayali, has been extended for a period of 60 days. A previous extension was communicated in our note No. 7-1-SG/044 dated 20 October 2006.

During the state of emergency, the rights recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru are suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 026-2007-PCM, issued on 22 March 2007, the state of emergency in the provinces of
Huanta and La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; the province of Tayacaja, Department of Huancavelica; the province of La Convención, Department of Cusco; and the province of Satipo, the Andamarca district of the province of Concepción and the Santo Domingo de Acobamba district of the province of Huancayo, Department of Junín, has been extended for a period of 60 days as from 26 March 2007.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, liberty of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized, respectively, in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, are suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 016-2007-PCM, issued on 2 March 2007, a state of emergency was declared in the department of Arequipa, province of Islay, district of Cocachacra, for a period of 30 days.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are established in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 030-2007-PCM, issued on 31 March 2007, the state of emergency in the department of Arequipa, province of Islay, district of Cocachacra, was extended for a period of 30 days from 1 April 2007.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are established in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 039-2007-PCM issued on 18 April 2007, the state of emergency in the provinces of Marañón, Huacaybamba, Leoncio Prado and Huamalíes, department of Huánuco, the province of Tocaché, department of San Martín, and the province of Padre Abad, department of Ucayali, has been extended for a period of 60 days. A previous extension was communicated in our note No. 7-1-SG/06 of 20 February 2007.

During the state of emergency, the rights to the inviolability of the home, freedom of movement and assembly, and liberty and security of person, which are recognized, respectively, in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 044-2007-PCM issued on 24 May 2007, a state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; the province of Tayacaja, Department of Huancavelica; the province of La Convención, Department of Cusco; and the province of Satipo, the Andamarca and Comas districts of the province of Concepción and the Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariachuana districts of the province of Huancayo, Department of Junín, for a period of 60 days as from 24 July 2007. A previous extension was communicated in Note 7-1-SG/013 of 6 June 2007.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, liberty of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized, respectively, in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, are suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 077-2007-PCM, issued on 30 August 2007, extended the state of emergency in the provinces of Marañón, Huacaybamba, Leoncio Prado and Huamalíes, department of Huánuco, the province of Tocaché, department of San Martín, and the province of Padre Abad, department of Ucayali, has been extended for a period of 60 days as from 31 August 2007.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, liberty of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized, respectively, in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, are suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 099-2007-PCM, issued on 28 December 2007, the state of emergency in the Districts of San Buenaventura and Cholón, Province of Marañón, in the Province of Leoncio Prado and in the District of Monzón, Province of Huamalíes, Department of Huánuco; in the Province of Tocaché, Department of San Martín; in the Province of Padre Abad, Department of Ucayali, has been extended for 60 days as from 29 December 2007.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, liberty of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized, respectively, in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, are suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 146-2007-PCM issued on 25 May 2007, a state of emergency has been declared in the Santa Anita district of the province of Lima, Department of Lima, for a period of seven days.
Ayacucho, the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica, the Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba districts of the province of La Convencion, department of Cusco, the province of Satipo, the Andamarca and Comas districts of the province of Concepcion, department of Ayacucho; the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; the Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba districts of the province of La Convencion, department of Cusco; the province of Satipo; the Andamarca and Comas districts of the province of Concepcion; and the Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca districts of the province of Huanca, department of Junin, has been extended for sixty days, beginning 20 January 2008. A previous extension and declaration were communicated in Note 7-1-SG/09 of 28 March 2007.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of association and liberty and security of the person, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 012-2008-PCM, published on 18 February 2008, a state of emergency has been declared in the Provinces of Huaura, Huaral and Barranca, Department of Lima; in the Provinces of Huarmey, Casma and Santa, Department of Ancash; and in the Province of Virú, Department of La Libertad, for a period of thirty days.

During the state of emergency the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 019-2008-PCM, issued on 6 March 2008, a state of emergency has been declared in Cholón district of the province of Marañón, in Monzón district of the province of Huamalies and in Leocino Prado province, department of Huánuco; in Tocache province, department of San Martin; and Padre Abad province, department of Ucayali, for a period of 60 days.

During the state of emergency the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 019-2008-PCM, issued on 4 May 2008, the state of emergency in Cholón district of the Province of Marañón, in Monzón district of the Province of Huamalies and in Leocino Prado province, department of Huánuco; in Tocache province, Department of San Martin; and the Province of Padre Abad, Department of Ucayali, has been extended for a period of 60 days, beginning 6 May 2008. A previous extension was communicated in Note 7-1-SG/09 of 12 March 2008.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 045-2008-PCM, published on 3 July 2008, the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho, the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica, the Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba districts of the province of La Convencion, department of Cusco; the province of Satipo; the Andamarca and Comas districts of the province of Concepcion; and the Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca districts of the province of Huanca, department of Junin, has been extended for sixty days as from 18 July 2008.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 045-2008-PCM, published on 3 July 2008, the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho, the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica, the Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba districts of the province of La Convencion, department of Cusco; the province of Satipo; the Andamarca and Comas districts of the province of Concepcion; and the Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca districts of the province of Huanca, department of Junin, has been extended for sixty days as from 18 July 2008.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 045-2008-PCM, published on 3 July 2008, the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho, the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica, the Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba districts of the province of La Convencion, department of Cusco; the province of Satipo; the Andamarca and Comas districts of the province of Concepcion; and the Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca districts of the province of Huanca, department of Junin, has been extended for sixty days as from 18 July 2008.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 058-2008-PCM, issued on 18 August 2008, a state of emergency was declared in the Provinces of Bagua and Utcubamba, Department of Amazonas; the Province of Datem del Marañón, Department of Loreto; and the Echarate district of the Province of La Convencion, Department of Cusco, for a period of thirty days as from 19 August 2008.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 058-2008-PCM, issued on 18 August 2008, a state of emergency was declared in the Provinces of Bagua and Utcubamba, Department of Amazonas; the Province of Datem del Marañón, Department of Loreto; and the Echarate district of the Province of La Convencion, Department of Cusco, for a period of thirty days as from 19 August 2008.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 058-2008-PCM, issued on 18 August 2008, a state of emergency was declared in the Provinces of Bagua and Utcubamba, Department of Amazonas; the Province of Datem del Marañón, Department of Loreto; and the Echarate district of the Province of La Convencion, Department of Cusco, for a period of thirty days as from 19 August 2008.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 060-2008-PCM, issued on 28 August 2008, the state of emergency in the Cholón District in Marañón Province, the Monzón District in Huamalies Province, and Leocino Prado Province, all of which are located in the department of Huánuco; in Tocache Province, Department of San Martin; and Padre Abad Province, Department of Ucayali, has been extended for a period of 60 days from 3 September 2008.
During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 061-2008-PCM, which was issued on 28 August 2008, Supreme Decree No. 058-2008-PCM, which established a state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; in the districts of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; in the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; in the districts of Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba in the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; in the province of Satipo; and in the districts of Andamarca and Comas in the province of Concepción and the districts of Santo Domingo de Acóbamba and Pariahuancá in the province of Huancayo, department of Junín.

... by Supreme Decree No. 061-2008-PCM, published on 12 September 2008, the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; in the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; in the districts of Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba in the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; in the province of Satipo; and in the districts of Andamarca and Comas in the province of Concepción and in the province of Huamalíes and the province of Leoncio Prado, department of Huánuco; in the districts of Santo Domingo de Acóbamba and Pariahuancá in the province of Huancayo, department of Junín.

... by Supreme Decree No. 001-2009-PCM, published on 10 January 2009, the state of emergency has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 15 January 2009, in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; in the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; in the districts of Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba in the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; in the province of Satipo; and in the districts of Andamarca and Comas in the province of Concepción and the districts of Santo Domingo de Acóbamba and Pariahuancá in the province of Huancayo, department of Junín.

... by Supreme Decree No. 001-2009-PCM, published on 10 January 2009, the state of emergency has been extended for 60 days, beginning 16 September 2008. During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 063-2008-PCM, issued on 4 November 2008, a state of emergency has been declared, as from 5 November 2008, in the provinces of Tacna, Jorge Basadre, Candarave and Tarata, department of Tacna.

During the state of emergency the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 070-2008-PCM, issued on 4 November 2008, a state of emergency has been declared, as from 5 November 2008, in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; in the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; in the districts of Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba in the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; in the province of Satipo; in the districts of Andamarca and Comas in the province of Concepción and in the districts of Santo Domingo de Acóbamba and Pariahuancá in the province of Huancayo, department of Junín.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 072-2008-PCM, published on 13 November 2008, the state of emergency has been extended for 60 days, beginning 15 November 2008, in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; in the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; in the districts of Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba in the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; in the province of Satipo; in the districts of Andamarca and Comas in the province of Concepción; and in the districts of Santo Domingo de Acóbamba and Pariahuancá in the province of Huancayo, department of Junín.

... by Supreme Decree No. 072-2008-PCM, published on 13 November 2008, the state of emergency has been extended for 60 days, beginning 15 November 2008, in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; in the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; in the districts of Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba in the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; in the province of Satipo; in the districts of Andamarca and Comas in the province of Concepción; and in the districts of Santo Domingo de Acóbamba and Pariahuancá in the province of Huancayo, department of Junín.

... by Supreme Decree No. 072-2008-PCM, published on 13 November 2008, the state of emergency has been extended for 60 days, beginning 15 November 2008, in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; in the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; in the districts of Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba in the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; in the province of Satipo; in the districts of Andamarca and Comas in the province of Concepción; and in the districts of Santo Domingo de Acóbamba and Pariahuancá in the province of Huancayo, department of Junín.

... by Supreme Decree No. 072-2008-PCM, published on 13 November 2008, the state of emergency has been extended for 60 days, beginning 15 November 2008, in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; in the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; in the districts of Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba in the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; in the province of Satipo; in the districts of Andamarca and Comas in the province of Concepción; and in the districts of Santo Domingo de Acóbamba and Pariahuancá in the province of Huancayo, department of Junín.

... by Supreme Decree No. 072-2008-PCM, published on 13 November 2008, the state of emergency has been extended for 60 days, beginning 15 November 2008, in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; in the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; in the districts of Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba in the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; in the province of Satipo; in the districts of Andamarca and Comas in the province of Concepción; and in the districts of Santo Domingo de Acóbamba and Pariahuancá in the province of Huancayo, department of Junín.
of assembly, and liberty and security of person, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 043-2009-PCM, issued on 9 July 2009, a state of emergency has been declared in the department of Ica, the provinces of Carleto and Yauyos of the department of Lima; and the provinces of Castroviñeyna, Huaytará and the districts of Acobamba and Mantu of the province of Huancavelica, for a period of sixty days.

During the state of emergency, the rights of inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of the person recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12, and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 044-2009-PCM, issued on 9 July 2009, the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; the Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba districts of the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; the province of Satipo; the Andamara and Comas districts of the province of Huancayo, department of Junín, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 13 July 2009.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 055-2009-PCM, issued on 3 September 2009, the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; the Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba districts of the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; the province of Satipo; the Andamara and Comas districts of the province of Huancayo, department of Junín, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 11 September 2009.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 041-2009-PCM, issued on 26 June 2009, the state of emergency in the Cholón district of the province of Marañón, the Monzón district of the province of Huamalíes and the province of Leoncio Prado, all of which are located in the department of San Martin; the province of Padre Abad, department of Ucayali, for a period of 60 days with effect from 11 September 2009.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 068-2009-PCM, issued on 30 October 2009, the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; the Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba districts of the province of Marañón, the Monzón district of the province of Huamalíes and the province of Leoncio Prado, all of which are located in the department of San Martin; the province of Padre Abad, department of Ucayali, for a period of 60 days with effect from 11 September 2009.
of La Convención, department of Cusco; the province of Satipo; the Andamarca and Comas districts of the province of Concepción and the Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca districts of the province of Huancayo, department of Junín, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 10 November 2009.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 070-2009-PCM, published on 5 November 2009, the state of emergency in the Cholón district of the province of Marañón, the Monzón district of the province of Huamalíes and the province of Leoncio Prado, all of which are located in the department of Huánuco; the province of Tocache, department of San Martín; and the province of Padre Abad, department of Ucayali, has been extended for 60 days with effect from 10 November 2009.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, have been suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 077-2009-PCM, published on 1 December 2009, a state of emergency was declared in the province of Abancay, department of Apurímac, for a period of 60 days as from 2 November 2009.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, provided for in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f) of the Political Constitution of Peru, and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, have been suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 042-2010-PCM, issued on 31 March 2010 [...], a state of emergency was declared in the provinces of Nazca, Palpa and San Juan de Marcona, department of Ica; the provinces Tambopata and Manú, department of Madre de Dios; and the provinces of Careveli and Camaná, department of Arequipa, for a period of 60 days as from 1 April 2010.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, provided for in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f) of the Political Constitution of Peru, and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 049-2010-PCM, issued on 29 April 2010 (copy attached), the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; the province of Tayacaja, department of Huanacavelica; the Kimberi, Pichari and Wildcabamba districts of the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; the province of Satipo; the Andamarca and Comas districts of the province of Concepción and the Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca districts of the province of Huancayo, department of Junin, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 9 May 2010.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 057-2010-PCM, issued on 18 May 2010, a state of emergency has been declared in the constitutional province of Callao for a period of 60 days, with effect from 19 May 2010.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, liberty of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 055-2010-PCM of 15 May 2010, the public order having been disturbed in the provinces of Marañón, Leoncio Prado and Huamalíes, a state of emergency has been declared in the Cholón district of the province of Marañón, the Monzón district of the province of Huamalíes and the province of Leoncio Prado, all located in the department of Huánuco; in the province of Tocache, department of San Martín; and in the province of Padre Abad, department of Ucayali, for a period of 60 days with effect from 16 May 2010.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, liberty of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 078-2010-PCM, published on 31 July 2010 [...], a state of emergency has been declared in the Echarate district of the province of La Convención, department of Cusco, for a period of 60 days with effect from 1 August 2010.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 087-2010-PCM, issued on 26 August 2010 [...], the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; the province of Tayacaja, department of Huanacavelica; the Kimberi, Pichari and Vilcabamba districts of the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; the province of Satipo; the Andamarca and Comas districts of the province of Concepción; and the Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca districts of the province of Huancayo, department of Junín, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 6 September 2010.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 091-2010-PCM, issued on 11 September 2010 [...], the state of emergency in the Cholón district in Marañón province, the Monzón district in Huamalíes province, department of Leoncio Prado province, all of which are located in the department of Huánuco; Tocache province, department of San Martín; and Padre Abad province department of Ucayali, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 12 September 2010.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 091-2010-PCM, issued on 11 September 2010 [...], the State of emergency in the Cholón district in Marañón province, the Monzón district in Huamalíes province, and Leoncio Prado province, all
of which are located in the department of Huánuco; Tocache province, department of San Martín; and Padre Abad province, department of Ucayali, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 12 September 2010.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended.

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 093-2011-PCM, issued on 4 December 2011, [...] a state of emergency was declared for a period of sixty days, starting on 5 December 2011, in Cajamarca, Celendín, Hualgayoc and Contumazá provinces in the administrative department of Cajamarca.

During the state of emergency, the President has suspended the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, under article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru, and articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended.

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 096-2011-PCM, issued on 15 December 2011, the state of emergency in the provinces of Cajamarca, Celendín, Hualgayoc and Contumazá in the department of Cajamarca, declared in Supreme Decree No. 093-2011-PCM, has been lifted.

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 043-2012-PCM, issued on 10 April 2012, a state of emergency was declared for a period of 60 days, with effect from 11 April 2012, in the district of Echarate, province of La Convención, department of Cusco.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, under article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru, and articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

[...] in reference to Supreme Decree 085-2011-PCM (5 November 2011), by which a state of emergency was declared in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, in the department of Ayacucho; in the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; in the districts of Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba, province of La Convención, department of Cusco; in the province of Satipo; in the districts of Andamarca and Comas, province of Concepción; and in the districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca province of Huancayo, department of Junín, the aforementioned state of emergency was extended by Supreme Decrees 004-2012-PCM (4 January 2012) and 022-2012-PCM (6 March 2012).

In that regard, in accordance with the provisions of article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Permanent Mission of Peru to the United Nations informs the Secretariat of the United Nations that, by Supreme Decree 022-2012-PCM [...] the state of emergency was extended for 60 days, with effect from 6 March 2012.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, set out in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, were suspended.

[...] reference is made to Supreme Decree 078-2011-PCM (12 September 2011) by which a state of emergency was declared in the district of Cholón, province of Marañón; in the district of Monzón, province of Humalies; and in the province of Leoncio Prado, all located in the department of Huánuco; in the province of Tocache, department of San Martin; and in the province of Padre Abad, department of Ucayali. The above-mentioned state of emergency was extended by Supreme Decrees 087-2011-PCM (11 November 2011) and 002-2012-PCM (3 January 2012).

In that regard, in accordance with the provisions of article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Permanent Mission of Peru to the United Nations informs the Secretariat of the United Nations that, by Supreme Decree 023-2012-PCM, a copy of which is attached to the present note, the aforementioned state of emergency was extended for 60 days, with effect from 11 March 2012.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, set out in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended.

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 056-2012-PCM, issued on 28 May 2012, a state of emergency was declared for a period of thirty (30) days, in effect from 29 May 2012, in the province of Espinar, department of Cusco, where the National Police of Peru shall maintain public order.

During the state of emergency, the rights of inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, set out in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended.

[...] in reference to Supreme Decree 085-2011-PCM (5 November 2011), by which a state of emergency was declared in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, in the department of Ayacucho; in the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; in the districts of Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba, province of La Convención, in the department of Cusco; in the province of Satipo; in the districts of Andamarca and Comas, province of Concepción; and in the districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca province of Huancayo, department of Junín, the aforementioned state of emergency was extended by Supreme Decrees 004-2012-PCM (4 January 2012) and 022-2012-PCM (6 March 2012).

In that regard, in accordance with the provisions of article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, by Supreme Decree 060-2012-PCM, the state of emergency was extended for 60 days, in effect from 6 March 2012.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, set out in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended.

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 070-2012-PCM, promulgated on 3 July 2012, a state of emergency was declared for thirty (30) days in the provinces of Cajamarca, Celendín and Hualgayoc in the department of Cajamarca, with the National Police of Peru maintaining public order.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, provided for in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended.

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 078-2011-PCM (12 September 2011) a state of emergency was declared in the Cholón district of the province of Marañón, the Monzón district of the province of Huamalies, and the provinces of Leoncio Prado, all located in the department of Huánuco; the province of Tocache, department of San Martin; and
the province of Padre Abad, department of Ucayali. The aforementioned state of emergency was extended by Supreme Decrees Nos. 087-2011-PCM (11 November 2011), 002-2012-PCM (3 January 2012), 023-2012-PCM (10 March 2012) and 052-2012-PCM.

By Supreme Decree No. 073-2012-PCM, the aforementioned state of emergency was extended for 60 days, with effect from 9 July 2012.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended.

[... by Supreme Decree No. 070-2012-PCM, promulgated on 3 July 2012, a state of emergency was declared for thirty (30) days in the provinces of Cajamarca, Celendin and Hualgayoc, department of Cajamarca.

In this regard, and in compliance with the provisions of article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, by Supreme Decree No. 082-2012-PCM, the aforementioned state of emergency has been extended for a period of sixty days as from 3 August 2012.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, provided for in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended.

[... by Supreme Decree No. 085-2011-PCM (5 November 2011), a state of emergency was declared in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; the Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba districts of the province of La Convencion, department of Cusco; the province of Satipo, the Andamarca and Comas districts of the province of Concepcion; and the Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca districts of the province of Huancayo, department of Junin. The aforementioned state of emergency was extended by Supreme Decrees 004-2012-PCM (4 January 2012), 022-2012-PCM (6 March 2012), 060-2012-PCM (29 May 2012) and 081-2012-PCM (1 August 2012).

In that regard, and in accordance with the provisions of article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Permanent Mission of Peru to the United Nations hereby informs the Secretariat that, by Supreme Decree 098-2012-PCM, a copy of which is attached hereto, the aforementioned state of emergency has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 2 October 2012.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, provided for in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended.

[... by Supreme Decree No. 061-2012-PCM (29 May 2012) by which a state of emergency was declared in the Echarate district of the province of La Convencion, department of Cusco. The above-mentioned state of emergency was extended by Supreme Decree 080-2012-PCM (1 August 2012).

In that regard, and in accordance with the provisions of article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Permanent Mission of Peru to the United Nations hereby informs the Secretariat that, by Supreme Decree 099-2012-PCM, the aforementioned state of emergency has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 8 October 2012.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, provided for in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended.

[... by Supreme Decree 085-2011-PCM (5 November 2011) by which a state of emergency was declared in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; the Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba districts of the province of La Convencion, department of Cusco; the province of Satipo; the Andamarca and Comas districts of the province of Concepcion; and the Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca districts of the province of Huancayo, department of Junin. The aforementioned state of emergency was extended by Supreme Decrees 004-2012-PCM (4 January 2012), 022-2012-PCM (6 March 2012), 060-2012-PCM (29 May 2012) and 081-2012-PCM (1 August 2012).

In that regard, and in accordance with the provisions of article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Permanent Mission of Peru to the United Nations hereby informs the Secretariat that, by Supreme Decree 115-2012-PCM, the aforementioned state of emergency has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 1 December 2012.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, provided for in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f) of the
Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

By Supreme Decree 061-2012-PCM (29 May 2012) by which a state of emergency was declared in the Echarate district of the province of La Convención, department of Cusco. The above-mentioned state of emergency was extended by Supreme Decree 080-2012-PCM (1 August 2012) and Supreme Decree 099-2012-PCM (27 September 2012).

In that regard, and in accordance with the provisions of article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Permanent Mission of Peru to the United Nations hereby informs the Secretariat that, by Supreme Decree 011-2013-PCM, the aforementioned state of emergency has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 7 December 2012.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, provided for in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

In that regard, and in accordance with the provisions of article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Permanent Mission of Peru to the United Nations hereby informs the Secretariat that, by Supreme Decree 011-2013-PCM, the aforementioned state of emergency has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 7 December 2012.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, provided for in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

By Supreme Decree No. 078-2011-PCM (12 September 2011) by which a state of emergency was declared in the Cholón district of the province of Marañón, the Monzón district of the province of Huamalíes and the province of Leoncio Prado, all located in the department of Huánuco; the province of Tocache, department of San Martin; and the province of Padre Abad, department of Ucayali. The above-mentioned state of emergency was extended for 60 days, with effect from 5 January 2013.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, provided for in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.


In that regard, and in accordance with the provisions of article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Permanent Mission of Peru to the United Nations hereby informs the Secretariat that, by Supreme Decree No. 002-2013-PCM, the aforementioned state of emergency was extended for 60 days, with effect from 5 January 2013.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, provided for in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

By Supreme Decree No. 078-2011-PCM (12 September 2011) by which a state of emergency was declared in the Cholón district of the province of Marañón, the Monzón district of the province of Huamalíes and the province of Leoncio Prado, all located in the department of Huánuco; the province of Tocache, department of San Martin; and the province of Padre Abad, department of Ucayali. The above-mentioned state of emergency was extended for 60 days, with effect from 5 January 2013.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, provided for in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

By Supreme Decree No. 085-2011-PCM, issued on 5 November 2011, by which a state of emergency was declared in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Andamarca; the province of Huancavelica; the districts of Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba, province of La Convención, department of Cusco; the province of Satipo; the districts of Andamarca and Comas, province of Concepción; and the districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuana, province of Huancayo, department of Junín. This state of emergency was extended under Supreme Decree 004-2012-PCM, issued on 4 January 2012; Supreme Decree 022-2012-PCM, issued on 6 March 2012; Supreme Decree 060-2012-PCM, issued on 29 May 2012; Supreme Decree 081-2012-PCM, issued on 1 August 2012; Supreme Decree 098-2012-PCM, issued on 27 September 2012; and Supreme Decree 115-2012-PCM, issued on 23 November 2012.

In this regard, under article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Permanent Mission of Peru to the United Nations wishes to note that, pursuant to Supreme Decree 010-2013-PCM, the state of emergency has been extended for 60 days from 30 January 2013.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

By Supreme Decree No. 085-2011-PCM (5 November 2011) by which a state of emergency was declared in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Andamarca; the province of Huancavelica; the districts of Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba districts of the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; the province of Satipo; Andamarca and Comas districts of the province of Concepción, and Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuana districts of the province of Huancayo, department of Junin. The aforementioned state of emergency was extended by Supreme Decree 004-2012PCM (4 January 2012), 022-2012PCM (6 March 2012), 060-2012-PCM (29 May 2012), Supreme Decree 081-2012-PCM (1 August 2012), Supreme Decree 098-2012-PCM (27 September 2012), Supreme Decree 115-2012-PCM (23 November 2012) and Supreme Decree 010-2013-PCM (26 January 2013).

In that regard, and in accordance with the provisions of article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Permanent Mission of Peru to the United Nations hereby informs the Secretariat that, by Supreme Decree No. 022-2013-PCM, the aforementioned state of emergency was extended for 60 days, with effect from 6 March 2013.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, set out in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12, and 24(f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

By Supreme Decree 061-2012-PCM (29 May 2012) by which a state of emergency was declared in the Echarate district of the province of La Convención, department of Cusco. The above-mentioned state of emergency was extended by Supreme Decree 080-2012-PCM (1 August 2012) and Supreme Decree 099-2012-PCM (27 September 2012).

In that regard, and in accordance with the provisions of article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Permanent Mission of Peru to the United Nations hereby informs the Secretariat that, by Supreme Decree 011-2013-PCM, the aforementioned state of emergency has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 5 February 2013.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.
Political Rights, the Permanent Mission of Peru to the United Nations hereby informs the Secretariat that, by Supreme Decree 028-2013-PCM, the aforementioned state of emergency has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 31 March 2013.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and of liberty and security of the person, provided for in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f), of the political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

[... by Supreme Decree 061-2012-PCM (29 May 2012) by which a state of emergency was declared in the Echarate district of the province of La Convención, department of Cusco. The aforementioned state of emergency was extended by Supreme Decree 080-2012-PCM (1 August 2012), Supreme Decree 099-2012-PCM (27 September 2012), Supreme Decree 116-2012-PCM (23 November 2012) and Supreme Decree 011-2013-PCM (26 January 2013).

In that regard, and in accordance with the provisions of article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Permanent Mission of Peru to the United Nations hereby informs the Secretariat that, by Supreme Decree 029-2013-PCM, the aforementioned state of emergency has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 6 April 2013.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and of liberty and security of the person, provided for in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f), of the political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

[... by Supreme Decree No. 078-2011-PCM of 12 September 2011, whereby a state of emergency was declared in the District of Cholón, Province of Marañón; in the District of Monzón, Province of Huamalíes; and in the Province of Leoncio Prado, all in the Department of Huánuco; in the Province of Tocache, Department of San Martin; and in the Province of Padre Abad, Department of Ucayali. It should be noted that this state of emergency was extended by Supreme Decrees Nos. 087-2011-PCM of 11 November 2011, 002-2012-PCM of 3 January 2012, 023-2012-PCM of 10 March 2012, 052-2012-PCM, 073-2012-PCM of 7 July 2012, 092-2012-PCM of 6 September 2012, 108-2012-PCM of 26 October 2012, 001-2013-PCM of 3 January 2013 and 022-2013-PCM of 1 March 2013.

In that regard, in accordance with the provisions of article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Permanent Mission of Peru to the United Nations hereby informs the Secretariat that the state of emergency has been extended by a further 60 days, with effect from 5 May 2013, pursuant to Supreme Decree No. 049-2013-PCM.

The rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, as set out in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f), of the political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended during the state of emergency.

[... by Supreme Decree 061-2012-PCM (29 May 2012) by which a state of emergency was declared in the Echarate district of the province of La Convención, department of Cusco. The aforementioned state of emergency was extended by Supreme Decree 080-2012-PCM (1 August 2012), Supreme Decree 099-2012-PCM (27 September 2012), Supreme Decree 116-2012-PCM (23 November 2012), Supreme Decree 011-2013-PCM (26 January 2013) and Supreme Decree 029-2013-PCM (26 March 2013).

In that regard, and in accordance with the provisions of article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Permanent Mission of Peru to the United Nations hereby informs the Secretariat that, by Supreme Decree 059-2013-PCM, the aforementioned state of emergency has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 5 June 2013.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and of liberty and security of the person, provided for in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f), of the political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

[... by Supreme Decree 085-2011-PCM (5 November 2011) by which a state of emergency was declared in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba districts of the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; the province of Satipo; Andamarca and Comas districts of the province of Concepción, and Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca districts of the province of Huanuco, department of Junín. The aforementioned state of emergency was extended by Supreme Decree 004-2012-PCM (4 January 2012), 022-2012-PCM (6 March 2012), 060-2012-PCM (29 May 2012), Supreme Decree 081-2012-PCM (1 August 2012), Supreme Decree 098-2012-PCM (27 September 2012), Supreme Decree 115-2012-PCM (23 November 2012), Supreme Decree 010-2013-PCM (3 January 2013) and Supreme Decree 028-2013-PCM (26 March 2013).

In that regard, and in accordance with the provisions of article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Permanent Mission of Peru to the United Nations hereby informs the Secretariat that, by Supreme Decree 058-2013-PCM, the aforementioned state of emergency has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 30 May 2013.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and of liberty and security of the person, provided for in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f), of the political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

[... by Supreme Decree No. 085-2013-PCM, issued on 28 July 2013, the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; the Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba districts of the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; the province of Satipo; the Andamarca and Comas districts of the province of Concepción; and the Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca districts of the province of Huanuco, department of Junín, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 29 July 2013.

The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being Note 7-1-SG/27 dated 29 May 2013.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended in order to strengthen peacebuilding in the area and in the country.

[... by Supreme Decree No. 086-2013-PCM, issued on 28 July 2013, the state of emergency in the Echarate district of the province of La Convención, department of Cusco, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 4 August 2013.

The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency
in the aforementioned places, the most recent
communication being Note 7-1-SG/26 dated 29 May
2013.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to
liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home,
freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the
territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and
24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in
articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on
Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be
suspended in order to strengthen peacebuilding in the area
and in the country.

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 99-2013-PCM, issued
on 30 August 2013, the state of emergency in the districts of
Cholón of the province of Marañón and Monzón of the
province of Huamalies, and in the province of Leoncio
Prado, all in the department of Huánuco; in the province
of Tocache, department of San Martín; and in
the province of Padre Abad, department of Ucayali, has been
extended for 60 days, with effect from 1 September 2013. The
Permanent Mission has duly reported to the
Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in
the aforementioned places, the most recent
communication being Note 7-1-SG/21 dated 9 May 2013.

During the state of emergency, the right to liberty and
security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of
assembly and freedom of movement within the national
territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and
24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in
articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on
Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended in
order to strengthen peacebuilding in the area and in the
country.

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 110-2013-PCM, issued
on 21 September 2013, the state of emergency in the provinces of
Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; the province of
Huancavelica; the Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba
districts of the province of La Convención, department of
Cusco; the province of Satipo; the Andamarca and Comas
districts of the province of Concepción; and the Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca
districts of the province of Huancayo, department of Junin, has been extended for 60 days, with
effect from 27 September 2013. The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the
Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in
the aforementioned places, the most recent
communication being Note 7-1-SG/34 dated 31 July 2013.

During the state of emergency, the right to liberty and
security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of
assembly and freedom of movement within the national
territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and
24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles
17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on
Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended in
order to strengthen peacebuilding in the area and in the
country.

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 109-2013-PCM, issued
on 21 September 2013, the state of emergency in the
Echarate district of the province of La Convención,
department of Cusco, has been extended for 60 days, with
effect from 3 October 2013. The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the
Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in
the aforementioned place, the most recent
communication being Note 7-1-SG/35 dated 31 July 2013.

During the state of emergency, the right to liberty and
security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of
assembly and freedom of movement within the national
territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and
24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles
17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on
Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended in
order to strengthen peacebuilding in the area and in the
country.

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 122-2013-PCM, issued
on 21 November 2013, the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of
Ayacucho; the province of Tayacaja, department of
Huancavelica; the Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba
districts of the province of La Convención, department of
Cusco; the province of Satipo; the Andamarca and Comas
districts of the province of Concepción; and the Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca
districts of the province of Huancayo, department of Junin, has been extended for 60 days, with
effect from 26 November 2013. The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the
Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in
the aforementioned places, the most recent
communication being Note 7-1-SG/44 dated 10 October 2013.

During the state of emergency, the right to liberty and
security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of
assembly and freedom of movement within the national
territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and
24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles
17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on
Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended in
order to strengthen peacebuilding in the area and in the
country.

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 007-2014-PCM, issued
on 23 January 2014, the state of emergency in the
Echarate district of the province of La Convención,
department of Cusco, has been extended for 60 days, with
effect from 31 January 2014. The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the
Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in
the aforementioned place, the most recent
communication being Note 7-1-SG/45 dated 5 December 2013.

During the state of emergency, the right to liberty and
security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of
assembly and freedom of movement within the national
territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and
24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles
17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on
Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended in
order to strengthen peacebuilding in the area and in the
country.

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 008-2014-PCM, issued
on 23 January 2014, the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of
Ayacucho; the province of Tayacaja, department of
Huancavelica; the Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba
districts of the province of La Convención, department of
Cusco; the province of Satipo; the Andamarca and Comas
districts of the province of Concepción; the Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca
districts of the province of Huancayo, department of Junin, has been extended for 60 days, with
effect from 25 January 2014.
The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being Note 7-1-SG/56 dated 5 December 2013.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended in order to strengthen peacebuilding in the area and in the country.

... by Supreme Decrees Nos. 134-2013-PCM and 017-2014-PCM, issued on 28 December 2013 and 27 February 2014 respectively, the state of emergency in the district of Cholón in the province of Marañón, the District of Monzón in the Province of Huamalíes, and the Province of Leoncio Prado, Department of Huánuco; in the Province of Tocache, Department of San Martín; and in the Province of Padre Abad, Department of Ucayali, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 29 April 2014.

The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being Note 7-1-SG/46 dated 10 October 2013.

During the state of emergency, the right to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the national territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended in order to strengthen peacebuilding in the area and in the country.

... by Supreme Decree No. 021-2014-PCM, issued on 26 March 2014, the state of emergency in the Echarate district of the province of La Convención, department of Cusco, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 1 April 2014.

The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned place, the most recent communication being Note 7-1-SG/7 dated 28 January 2013.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended in order to strengthen peacebuilding in the area and in the country.

... by Supreme Decree No. 020-2014-PCM, issued on 25 March 2014, the state of emergency in the province of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; in the province of Tayacaja, Department of Huancavelica; in the Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba districts of the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; in the province of Satipo; in the Andamarca and Comas districts of the province of Concepción; and in the Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuana of the province of Huancayo, Department of Junín, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 25 May 2014.

The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/13 of 2 April 2014.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country as a whole.

... by Supreme Decree No. 036-2014-PCM, issued on 15 May 2014, the state of emergency in the District of Echarate in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 31 May 2014.

The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/14 of 2 April 2014.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country as a whole.

... by Supreme Decree No. 045-2014-PCM, issued on 26 June 2014, the state of emergency in the District of
Cholón in the Province of Marañón, the District of Monzón in the Province of Huamalies, and the Province of Leoncio Prado, Department of Huánuco; in the Province of Tocache, Department of San Martín; and in the Province of Padre Abad, Department of Ucayali, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 28 June 2014.

The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/26 of 23 June 2014.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country as a whole.

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 048-2014-PCM, issued on 23 July 2014, the state of emergency in the Provinces of Huanta and La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; in the Province of Tocache, Department of Huánuco; in the Districts of Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco; and in the Province of Satipo, the Districts of Andamarca and Comas in the Province of Concepción, and in the Districts of Echarate in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 28 June 2014.

The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/27 of 23 June 2014.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country as a whole.

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 049-2014-PCM, issued on 24 July 2014, the state of emergency in the District of Echarate in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 30 July 2014.

The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned place, the most recent communication being Note 7-1-SG/25 dated 23 June 2014.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country as a whole.
the District of Cholón in the Province of Marañón, the District of Monzón in the Province of Huamalies, and the Province of Leoncio Prado, Department of Huánuco; in the Province of Tocache, Department of San Martín; and in the Province of Padre Abad, Department of Ucayali, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 25 December 2014.

The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/50 of 27 November 2014.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country as a whole.

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 069-2014-PCM, issued on 20 November 2014, a state of emergency was declared in the Districts of Ramón Castilla and Yavari in the Province of Mariscal Ramón Castilla, Department of Loreto, for 60 days as from that date.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country as a whole.

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 057-2014-PCM, issued on 11 September 2014, a state of emergency was declared in the Districts of Ramón Castilla and Yavari in the Province of Mariscal Ramón Castilla, Department of Loreto, for 60 days as from that date.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country as a whole.

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 015-2015-PCM, issued on 20 March 2015, a state of emergency was declared in the Districts of Ramón Castilla and Yavari in the Province of Mariscal Ramón Castilla, Department of Loreto, for 60 days, with effect from 20 March 2015.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country as a whole.

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 040-2015-PCM, issued on 22 May 2015, a state of emergency was declared in the Districts of Mataram, Mollendo, Mejia, Punta de Bombón, Dean Valdivia, La Curva, El Arenal, Cacachaca and Valle del Tambo in the Province of Islay, Department of Arequipa, for 60 days, with effect from 22 May 2015.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country as a whole.

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 031-2015-PCM, issued on 10 April 2015, the state of emergency was declared in the District of Cholón in the Province of Marañon, the District of Monzon in the Province of Huamalies, and the Province of Leoncio Prado, Department of Huánuco; in the Province of Tocache, Department of San Martín; and in the Province of Padre Abad, Department of Ucayali, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 24 April 2015.

The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/030 of 6 July 2015.
During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country as a whole.

[... by Supreme Decree No. 016-2015-PCM, issued on 20 February 2015, a state of emergency was declared in the Provinces of Huanta and La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; in the Province of Tayacaja, Department of Huancavelica; in the Districts of Kimbiri, Pichari, Vilcabamba, Inkawasi and Villa Virgen in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco; in the Province of Satipo, the Districts of Andamarca and Comas in the Province of Concepción, and in the Districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca, in the Province of Huanuco, Department of Junin for 60 days, with effect from 21 March 2015.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country as a whole.

[... by Supreme Decree No. 020-2015-PCM, issued on 26 May 2015, the state of emergency declared in the District of Huaqui in the Province of Ayacucho, in the Province of Padre Abad, Department of Ucayali, was extended for 60 days, with effect from 26 May 2015.

The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/041 of 4 August 2015.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country as a whole.

[... by Supreme Decree No. 018-2015-PCM, issued on 25 March, the state of emergency declared in the District of Echarate in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco, was extended for sixty (60) days, with effect from 27 March 2015.

The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned place, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/041 of 4 August 2015.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country as a whole.

[... by Supreme Decree No. 035-2015-PCM, issued on 15 May 2015, the state of emergency declared in the Provinces of Huanta and La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; in the Province of Tayacaja, Department of Huancavelica; in the Districts of Kimbiri, Pichari, Vilcabamba, Inkawasi and Villa Virgen in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco; in the Province of Satipo, the Districts of Andamarca and Comas in the Province of Concepción, and in the Districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca, in the Province of Huanuco, Department of Junin, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 20 May 2015.

The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous declarations of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/041 of 4 August 2015.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country as a whole.

[... by Supreme Decree No. 036-2015-PCM, issued on 16 May 2015, the state of emergency declared in the Districts of Ramón Castilla and Yavari in the Province of Mariscal Ramón Castilla, Department of Loreto, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 20 May 2015.

The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous declarations of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/040 of 4 August 2015.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country as a whole.

[... by Supreme Decree No. 068-2015-PCM, issued on 28 September 2015, the state of emergency is declared in the provinces of Cotabambas, Grau, Ándahuaylas and Chincheros, Department of Apurímac, and the provinces of Chumbivilcas and Espinar, Department of Cusco, for a period of thirty (30) calendar days. The National Police of Peru shall maintain public order with the support of the armed forces. During the state of emergency and in the locations referred to in the preceding paragraphs, the constitutional rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the Covenant, shall be suspended.

[... by Supreme Decree No. 047-2015-PCM, issued on 16 July 2015, the state of emergency declared in the
Provinces of Huanta and La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; the Province of Tayacaja, Department of Huancavelica; in the Districts of Kimbiri, Pichari, Vilcabamba, Inkawasi and Villa Virgen in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco; in the Province of Satipo; and in the Districts of Andamarca and Comas in the Province of Concepción, and in the Districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca in the Province of Huancayo, Department of Junín, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 19 July 2015.

The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/44 of 5 August 2015.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru, and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country as a whole.

[...], by Supreme Decree No. 046-2015-PCM, issued on 16 July 2015, the state of emergency declared in the Districts of Ramón Castilla and Yavarí in the Province of Mariscal Ramón Castilla, Department of Loreto, was extended for 60 days, with effect from 19 July 2015.

The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/45 of 5 August 2015.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru, and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country as a whole.

[...], by Supreme Decree No. 049-2015-PCM, issued on 16 July 2015, the state of emergency declared in the District of Echarate in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco, was extended for 60 days, with effect from 25 July 2015.

The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/36 of 7 July 2015.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country as a whole.

[...], by Supreme Decree No. 062-2015-PCM, issued on 12 September 2015, the state of emergency declared in the Provinces of Huanta and La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; in the Province of Tayacaja, Department of Huancavelica; in the Districts of Kimbiri, Pichari, Vilcabamba, Inkawasi and Villa Virgen in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco; and in the Province of Satipo, the Districts of Andamarca and Comas in the Province of Concepción, and the Districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca in the Province of Huancayo, Department of Junín, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 17 September 2015.

The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/54 of 5 November 2015.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, are suspended.

[...], by Supreme Decree No. 076-2015-PCM, issued on 12 September 2015, the state of emergency declared in the District of Echarate in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 23 September 2015.

The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/56 of 6 November 2015.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, are suspended.

[...], by Supreme Decree No. 077-2015-PCM, issued on 12 November 2015, the state of emergency declared in the Districts of Ramón Castilla and Yavarí in the Province of Mariscal Ramón Castilla, Department of Loreto, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 16 November 2015.

The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/62 of 11 December 2015.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, are suspended.

[...], by Supreme Decree No. 078-2015-PCM, issued on 12 November 2015, the state of emergency declared in the Provinces of Huanta and La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; in the Province of Tayacaja, Department of Huancavelica; in the Districts of Kimbiri, Pichari, Vilcabamba, Inkawasi and Villa Virgen in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco; and in the Province of Satipo, the Districts of Andamarca and Comas in the Province of Concepción, and the Districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca in the Province of Huancayo, Department of Junín, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 16 November 2015.

The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/63 of 11 December 2015.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, are suspended.

[...], by Supreme Decree No. 079-2015-PCM, issued on 12 November 2015, the state of emergency declared in the District of Echarate in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 22 November 2015.
The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/61 of 11 December 2015.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, are suspended.

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 083-2015-PCM, issued on 4 December 2015, a state of emergency has been declared for 45 days in the Constitutional Province of Callao, with effect from 4 December 2015.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person and inviolability of the home, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, are suspended.

During the state of emergency in the aforementioned locality, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/67 dated 11 December 2015.

The Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/55 of 6 November 2015.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, are suspended.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person and inviolability of the home, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended.

(See C.N.116.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 7 April 2016 for the text of the above-mentioned notification.)

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 003-2016-PCM, issued on 15 January 2016, the state of emergency declared in the Constitutional Province of Callao has been extended for 45 days, with effect from 18 January 2016.

It should be recalled that the Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat the declaration of a state of emergency in the aforementioned locality though note No. 7-1-SG/67 dated 11 December 2015.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person and inviolability of the home, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended.

(See C.N.117.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 7 April 2016 for the text of the above-mentioned notification.)

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 013-2016-PCM issued on 2 March 2016, the state of emergency declared in the Constitutional Province of Callao has been extended for 45 days, with effect from 3 March 2016.

It should be recalled that the Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat the extension of the state of emergency in the aforementioned locality though note No. 7-1-SG/15 dated 16 March 2016.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person and the inviolability of the home, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country.

(See C.N.118.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 7 April 2016 for the text of the above-mentioned notification.)

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 024-2016-PCM issued on 15 April 2016, the state of emergency declared in the Constitutional Province of Callao has been extended for 45 days, with effect from 18 April 2016.

It should be recalled that the Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat the extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned locality, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/17 of 21 March 2016.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person and the inviolability of the home, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country.

(See C.N.539.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 2 August 2016 for the text of the above-mentioned notification.)

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 093-2015-PCM issued on 24 December 2015, a state of emergency has been declared for 45 days in the Provinces of Santa and Casma, Department of Ancash.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person and the inviolability of the home, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country.

(See C.N.554.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 5 August 2016 for the text of the above-mentioned notification.)

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 018-2016-PCM, issued on 17 March 2016, the state of emergency declared in the District of Echarate in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 21 March 2016.

It should be recalled that the Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned place, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/14 of 16 March 2016.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, are suspended.

(See C.N.540.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 2 August 2016 for the text of the above-mentioned notification.)

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 002-2016-PCM, issued on 2 August 2016, the state of emergency declared in the District of Echarate in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 21 March 2016.

It should be recalled that the Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned place, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/14 of 16 March 2016.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended.

(See C.N.540.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 2 August 2016 for the text of the above-mentioned notification.)
Ayacucho; in the Districts of Pampas, Huachocolpa, Quishuar, Salcabamba, Salcahuasi, Surucumbamba, Tintay Puncu, Roble and Andaymarca in the Province of Tayacaja, Department of Huancavelica; in the Districts of Kimbiri, Pichari, Villcabamba, Inkwasi, Villa Kintiarnina, Villa Virgen in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco; in the Districts of Llaylla, Mazamari, Pampa Hermosa, Pangoa, Vizcatán del Ene and Rio Tambo in the Province of Satipo, the Districts of Andamarca and Comas in the Province of Concepción, and the Districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca in the Province of Huancayo, Department of Junín, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 14 May 2016.

It should be recalled that the Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/49 of 29 June 2016.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, are suspended.

(See C.N.581.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 17 August 2016 for the text of the above-mentioned notification.)

[... by Supreme Decree No. 032-2016-PCM issued on 12 May 2016, the state of emergency declared in the District of Echarate in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 20 May 2016.

It should be recalled that the Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/44 of 24 June 2016.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, are suspended.

(See C.N.556.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 5 August 2016 for the text of the above-mentioned notification.)

[... by Supreme Decree No. 036-2016-PCM issued on 31 May 2016, the state of emergency declared in the Constitutional Province of Callao has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 1 June 2016.

It should be recalled that the Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned place, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/43 dated 24 June 2016.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person and the inviolability of the home, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country.

(See C.N.555.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 5 August 2016 for the text of the above-mentioned notification.)

[... by Supreme Decree No. 031-2016-PCM, issued on 12 May 2016, the state of emergency declared in the Districts of Huanta, Ayahuancu, Santillana, Chacu, Sivía, Llochegua, Canayre, Uchuraccay and Pucacolpa in the Province of Huanta, in the Districts of San Miguel, Ayno, Chingui, Santa Rosa, Tambo, Samugari and Anchihua in the Province of La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; in the Districts of Pampas, Huachocolpa, Quishuar, Salcabamba, Salcahuasi, Surucumbamba, Tintay Puncu, Roble and Andaymarca in the Province of Tayacaja, Department of Huancavelica; in the Districts of Kimbiri, Pichari, Villcabamba, Inkwasi, Villa Kintiarnina, Villa Virgen and Villa Virgen in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco; in the Districts of Llaylla, Mazamari, Pampa Hermosa, Pangoa, Vizcatán del Ene and Rio Tambo in the Province of Satipo, in the Districts of Andamarca and Comas in the Province of Concepción, and in the Districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca in the Province of Huancayo, Department of Junín, has been extended for 60 days, with effect from 14 May 2016.

It should be recalled that the Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being note No. 7-1-SG/49 of 29 June 2016.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, are suspended.

(See C.N.581.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 17 August 2016 for the text of the above-mentioned notification.)

[... by Supreme Decree No. 020-2016-PCM issued on 24 March 2016, a state of emergency has been declared for 45 days in the Provinces of Santa and Casma, Department of Ancash.

IV 4. HUMAN RIGHTS
It should be recalled that the Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being note No. 7-I-SG/50 of 29 June 2016.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person and the inviolability of the home, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended.

(See C.N.582.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 17 August 2016 for the text of the above-mentioned notification.)

[... by Supreme Decree No. 056-2016-PCM issued on 30 July 2016, a state of emergency in the Constitutional Province of Callao has been declared for 30 days, with effect from 31 July 2016.

It should be recalled that the Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being note No. 7-I-SG/47 dated 29 June 2016.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person and the inviolability of the home, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended.

(See C.N.584.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 17 August 2016 for the text of the above-mentioned notification.)

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 029-2016-PCM issued on 5 May 2016, a state of emergency has been declared for 45 days in the Provinces of Santa and Casma, Department of Ancash, with effect from 10 May 2016.

It should be recalled that the Permanent Mission has duly reported to the Secretariat previous extensions of the state of emergency in the aforementioned places, the most recent communication being note No. 7-I-SG/61 of 26 July 2016.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person and the inviolability of the home, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended, in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country.

(See C.N.585.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 17 August 2016 for the text of the above-mentioned notification.)

[...] by Supreme Decree No. 044-2016-PCM, issued on 12 July 2016, the state of emergency declared in the Districts of Huanta, Ayahuancos, Sanillana, Chaca, Sivia, Llochegua, Canayre, Uchuraccay and Pucacola in the Province of Huanta, the Districts of Sam Miguel, Ancos, Ayna, Chunguis, Santa Rosa, Tambo, Samagarí and Anchiway in the Province of La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; in the Districts of Pampas, Huacho colpa, Quisuar, Salcabamba, Salcahuasi, Surucambá, Tintay Puncu, Roble and Andaymarca in the Province of Tácajaca, Department of Huancavelica; in the Districts of Kimbiri, Pachari, Vilcabamba, Inkawasi, Villa Kintiari and Villa Virgen in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco; in the Districts of Llallay, Mazamari, Pampa Hermosa, Pangoa, Vizcayán del Ene and Río Tambo in the Province of Satipo, in the Districts of Andamarca and Comas in the Province of Concepción, and in the Districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca in the Province of Huancayo, Department of Junín, has been extended for 30 days, with effect from 11 September 2016.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, are suspended.

(See C.N.845.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 14 September 2016 for the text of the above-mentioned notification.)

[... by Supreme Decree No. 070-2016-PCM, issued on 11 September 2016, the state of emergency declared in the Districts of Huanta, Ayahuancos, Sanillana, Chaca, Sivia, Llochegua, Canayre, Uchuraccay and Pucacola in the Province of Huanta, the Districts of Sam Miguel, Ancos, Ayna, Chunguis, Santa Rosa, Tambo, Samagarí and Anchiway in the Province of La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; in the Districts of Pampas, Huacho colpa, Quisuar, Salcabamba, Salcahuasi, Surucambá, Tintay Puncu, Roble and Andaymarca in the Province of Tácajaca, Department of Huancavelica; in the Districts of Kimbiri, Pachari, Vilcabamba, Inkawasi, Villa Kintiari and Villa Virgen in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco; in the Districts of Llallay, Mazamari, Pampa Hermosa, Pangoa, Vizcayán del Ene and Río Tambo in the Province of Satipo, in the Districts of Andamarca and Comas in the Province of Concepción, and in the Districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca in the Province of Huancayo, Department of Junín, has been extended for 30 days, with effect from 11 September 2016.

During the state of emergency, the rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, are suspended.

(See C.N.846.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 14 September 2016 for the text of the above-mentioned notification.)

By Supreme Decree No. 057-2016-PCM, published on 5 August 2016, the state of emergency in the Provinces of Santa and Casma, Department of Ancash, is extended for a period of forty-five (45) calendar days, with effect from 8 August 2016.

During the extension of the state of emergency and in the locations referred to, the constitutional rights relating
to liberty and security of person and the inviolability of the home, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru, shall be suspended. (See C.N.848.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 31 October 2016 for the text of the above-mentioned notification.)

By Supreme Decree No. 045-2016-PCM, issued on 12 July 2016, the state of emergency in the District of Echarate in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco, was extended for a period of sixty (60) calendar days, with effect from 19 July 2016.

During the state of emergency and in the location referred to, the constitutional rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home and freedom of assembly and movement within the territory, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru, shall be suspended. (See C.N.847.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 31 October 2016 for the text of the above-mentioned notification.)

During the state of emergency declared in various districts of the Provinces of Huanta and La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; the Province of Tayacaja, Department of Huancavelica; the Province of Chumbivilcas, Department of Cusco; the Provinces of Satipo, Concepción and Huancayo, Department of Junín, has been extended for sixty (60) days, with effect from 10 December 2016.

During the state of emergency, the constitutional rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and movement within the territory recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru, and in articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, will be suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country as a whole. (See C.N.989.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 21 February 2017 for the text of the above-mentioned notification.)

During the state of emergency declared in various districts of the Provinces of Huanta and La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; the Province of Tayacaja, Department of Huancavelica; the Province of Chumbivilcas, Department of Cusco; the Provinces of Satipo, Concepción and Huancayo, Department of Junín, has been extended for sixty (60) days, with effect from 10 December 2016.

During the state of emergency, the constitutional rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and movement within the territory recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru, and in articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, will be suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country as a whole. (See C.N.986.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 13 January 2017 for the text of the above-mentioned notification.)

During the state of emergency declared in various districts of the Provinces of Huanta and La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; the Province of Tayacaja, Department of Huancavelica; the Province of Chumbivilcas, Department of Cusco; the Provinces of Satipo, Concepción and Huancayo, Department of Junín, has been extended for sixty (60) days, with effect from 10 December 2016.

During the state of emergency, the constitutional rights relating to liberty and security of person, inviolability of the home, freedom of assembly and movement within the territory recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru, and in articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, will be suspended in order to consolidate peace in the area and in the country as a whole. (See C.N.985.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 21 February 2017 for the text of the notification.)
The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 26 April 2017, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of a state of emergency in the Districts of Huanta, Ayahuanco, Santillana, Chaca, Sivia, Llocheagua, Canayre, Uchuraccay and Pucacolpa in the Province of Huanta, for a period of thirty days from 21 February 2017 by Supreme Decree No. 020-2017-PCM.

(See C.N.259.2017.TREATIES-IV.4 of 4 May 2017 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 26 April 2017, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of a state of emergency in the District of Coporaque, Province of Espinar, Department of Cusco, for a period of thirty days from 21 February 2017 by Supreme Decree No. 020-2017-PCM.

(See C.N.260.2017.TREATIES-IV.4 of 4 May 2017 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 29 June 2017, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency in the in the districts of Huanta, Ayahuanco, Santillana, Chaca, Sivia, Llocheagua, Canayre, Uchuraccay and Pucacolpa in the Province of Huanta, in the districts of San Miguel, Anco, Ayna, Chungui, Oroncocoy, Santa Rosa, Tambo, Samugari and Anchihuay in the Province of La Mar, in the districts of Pampas, Huachocolpa, Quishuar, Salcabamba, Salcahuasi, Sircabamba, Tintaypuncu, Roble, Santiago de Tucuma and Andaymarca in the Province of Tayacaja, Department of Huancavelica; in the districts of Echarate, Megantoni, Kimbiri, Pichari, Vilcabamba, Inkawasi, Villa Kintiarina and Villa Virgen in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco; in the districts of Llaylla, Mazamari, Pampa Hermosa, Pangoa, Vizcatán del Ené and Rio Tambo in the Province of Satipo, in the districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca in the Province of Huancayo, Department of Junín, for a period of sixty calendar days from 9 April 2017 by Supreme Decree No. 042-2017-PCM.

(See C.N.395.2017.TREATIES-IV.4 of 12 July 2017 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 7 August 2017, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of a state of emergency in the District of Tumán, Province of Chiclayo, Department of Lambayeque, for a period of thirty calendar days from 15 July 2017 by Supreme Decree No. 074-2017-PCM.

(See C.N.504.2017.TREATIES-IV.4 of 8 September 2017 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 7 August 2017, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the declaration of a state of emergency in the in the districts of Juliaca, Province of San Román, Department of Puno, in the districts of Wanchaq, San Sebastián and Cusco, Province of Cusco, and in the districts of Machupichu and Ollantaytambo, Province of Urubamba, Department of Cusco, for a period of thirty calendar days from 19 July 2017 by Supreme Decree No. 078-2017-PCM.

(See C.N.505.2017.TREATIES-IV.4 of 8 September 2017 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 4 January 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the declaration of a state of emergency in the Districts of Chalhualuahue, Haquira and Mara in the Province of Cotabambas, Department of Apurímac, for a period of thirty (30) calendar days by Supreme Decree No. 085-2017-PCM issued on 16 August 2017.

(See C.N.13.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 23 January 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 5 January 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency in the Districts of Chalhualuahue, Haquira and Mara in the Province of Cotabambas, Department of Apurímac, for a period of thirty (30) calendar days from 16 September 2017, and the declaration of a state of emergency for a period of thirty (30) calendar days in the District of Capañmarca in the Province of Chumbivilcas, Department of Cusco by Supreme Decree No. 093-2017-PCM issued on 15 September 2017.

(See C.N.14.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 23 January 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 9 January 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency in the Districts of Huanta, Ayahuancu, Santillana, Chaca, Sivia, Llocheagua, Canayre, Uchuraccay, Pucacolpa and Lucrúcocha in the Province of Huanta, in the Districts of San Miguel, Anco, Ayna, Chungui, Oroncocoy, Santa Rosa, Tambo, Samugari and Anchihuay in the Province of La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; in the districts of Pampas, Huachocolpa, Quishuar, Salcabamba, Salcahuasi, Sircabamba, Tintaypuncu, Roble, Santiago de Tucuma, Andaymarca, San Marcos de Rocchac, Huariabamba, Pazos, Acraquía, Aluačcha, Daniel Hernández and Colcabamba in the Province of Tayacaja, and in the Districts of Ancos, Chinchihuasi, Churacamba, Cosme, El Carmen, La Meced, Locroja, Pauchmarca, Pucacolpa, Quishuar, San Miguel de Carolima, Santa Carmen, La Merced, Locroja, Pachmarca, San Pedro de Taris, of the Province of Churcampa, Department of Huancavelica; in the Districts of Echarate, Megantoni, Kimbiri, Pichari, Vilcabamba, Inkawasi, Villa Kintiarina and Villa Virgen in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco; in the districts of Llaylla, Mazamari, Pampa Hermosa, Pangoa, Vizcatán del Ené and Rio Tambo in the Province of Satipo, in the districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca in the Province of Huancayo, Department of IV 4. HUMAN RIGHTS 70
of Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca in the Province of Huancayo, Department of Junín for a period of sixty calendar days from 5 December 2017 by Supreme Decree No. 114-2017-PCM.

(See C.N.35.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 23 January 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 9 January 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of a state of emergency in the Districts of Chalhauhuacho and Mara, in the Province of Cotabambas, Department of Apurímac, and in the District of Capamacarca in the Province of Chumbivilcas, Department of Cusco for a period of thirty calendar days from 16 October 2017 by Supreme Decree No. 101-2017-PCM.

(See C.N.33.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 23 January 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 8 January 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency in the Districts of Chalhauhuacho and Mara in the Province of Cotabambas, Department of Apurímac, and in the District of Capamacarca in the Province of Chumbivilcas, Department of Cusco, for a period of thirty calendar days from 10 November 2017 by Supreme Decree No. 104-2017-PCM.

(See C.N.30.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 23 January 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 11 January 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of a state of emergency in the District of Tumán, Province of Chiclayo, Department of Lambayeque for a period of thirty calendar days from 12 August 2017 by Supreme Decree No. 083-2017-PCM.

(See C.N.18.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 23 January 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 10 January 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of a state of emergency in the District of Tumán, Province of Chiclayo, Department of Lambayeque for a period of thirty calendar days from 10 November 2017 by Supreme Decree No. 119-2017-PCM.

(See C.N.31.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 23 January 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 12 January 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of a state of emergency in the Districts of Huanta, Ayahuaxco, Santillana, Chaca, Sivía, Llochequía, Canayre, Uchuraccay, Pucapola and Luricocha in the Province of Huanta, Department of Ayacucho; in the Districts of San Marcos de Rocchac, Huaribamba, Pazos, Acraquia, Ahuaycha, Daniel Hernández and Colcabamba in the Province of Tayacaja, and in the Province of Chucuito, Department of Huancavelica for a period of twenty calendar days by Supreme Decree No. 233-2018-PCM.

(See C.N.28.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 23 January 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 8 January 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the declaration of a state of emergency in the District of Tumán, Province of Chiclayo, Department of Lambayeque for a period of sixty calendar days from 10 November 2017 by Supreme Decree No. 101-2017-PCM.

(See C.N.27.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 23 January 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 4 January 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency in the Districts of Huanta, Ayahuaxco, Santillana, Chaca, Sivía, Llochequía, Canayre, Uchuraccay, Pucapola and Luricocha in the Province of Huanta, in the Districts of San Miguel, Anco, Ayna, Chungui, Oronecayo, Santa Rosa, Tambo, Samugari, Anchiñuay in the Province of La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; in the Districts of Pampas, Huachocolpa, Quishuar, Salcabamba, Salcahuasi, Surcabamba, Tintaypuncu, Roble, Santiago de Tucuma and Andaymarca in the Province of Tayacaja, Department of Huancavelica; in the Districts of Echarate, Megantoni, Andaymarca and Pariahuanca in the Province of Huancayo, Department of Junín, for a period of sixty calendar days from 7 August 2017 by Supreme Decree No. 079-2017-PCM.

(See C.N.17.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 23 January 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 9 January 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency in the Districts of Tumán, Province of Chiclayo, Department of Lambayeque, for a period of thirty calendar days from 11 October 2017 by Supreme Decree No. 100-2017-PCM.

(See C.N.29.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 23 January 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 5 January 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency in the Districts of Chalhauhuacho and Mara in the Province of Cotabambas, Department of Apurímac, and in the District of Capamacarca in the Province of Chumbivilcas, Department of Cusco, for a period of thirty calendar days from 10 November 2017 by Supreme Decree No. 101-2017-PCM.

(See C.N.33.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 23 January 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 8 January 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency in the District of Chalhauhuacho and Mara in the Province of Cotabambas, Department of Apurímac, and in the District of Capamacarca in the Province of Chumbivilcas, Department of Cusco, for a period of thirty calendar days from 16 October 2017 by Supreme Decree No. 101-2017-PCM.

(See C.N.33.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 23 January 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 11 January 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of a state of emergency in the District of Tumán, Province of Chiclayo, Department of Lambayeque for a period of thirty calendar days from 12 August 2017 by Supreme Decree No. 083-2017-PCM.

(See C.N.18.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 23 January 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 10 January 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of a state of emergency in the District of Tumán, Province of Chiclayo, Department of Lambayeque for a period of thirty calendar days from 10 November 2017 by Supreme Decree No. 104-2017-PCM.

(See C.N.30.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 23 January 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 11 January 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of a state of emergency in the District of Tumán, Province of Chiclayo, Department of Lambayeque for a period of thirty calendar days from 10 December 2017 by Supreme Decree No. 119-2017-PCM.

(See C.N.31.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 23 January 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 12 January 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of a state of emergency in the Districts of Huanta, Ayahuaxco, Santillana, Chaca, Sivía, Llochequía, Canayre, Uchuraccay, Pucapola and Luricocha in the Province of Huanta, Department of Ayacucho; in the Districts of San Marcos de Rocchac, Huaribamba, Pazos, Acraquia, Ahsuaycha, Daniel Hernández and Colcabamba in the Province of Tayacaja, and in the Province of Chucuito, Department of Huancavelica for a period of sixty calendar days from 9 January 2018 by Supreme Decree No. 001-2018-PCM.

(See C.N.32.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 23 January 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 8 January 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of a state of emergency in the Districts of Huanta, Ayahuaxco, Santillana, Chaca, Sivía, Llochequía, Canayre, Uchuraccay, Pucapola and Luricocha in the Province of Huanta, Department of Ayacucho; in the Districts of Pampas, Huachocolpa, Quishuar, Salcabamba, Salcahuasi, Surcabamba, Tintaypuncu, Roble, Santiago de Tucuma and Andaymarca in the Province of Tayacaja, Department of Huancavelica; in the Districts of Echarate, Megantoni, Kimbiri, Pichari, Vilcabamba, Inkawasi, Villa Kintiarina and Villa Virgen in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco;
and in the Districts of Llaylla, Mazamari, Pampa Hermosa, Pangoa, Vizcatán del Ene and Río Tambo in the Province of Satipo, in the Districts of Andamarca and Comas in the Province of Concepción, and in the Districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca in the Province of Huancayo, Department of Junín for a period of sixty calendar days from 6 October 2017 by Supreme Decree No. 97-2017-PCM.

(See C.N.34.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 23 January 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 10 January 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of a state of emergency in the Districts of Chalhualuacho and Mará, in the Province of Cotabambas, Department of Apurímac, and in the District of Capamarcas, in the Province of Chumbivilcas, Department of Cusco for a period of thirty calendar days from 15 December 2017 by Supreme Decree No. 120-2017-PCM.

(See C.N.39.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 23 January 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 12 June 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency in the District of Tumán, Province of Chiclayo, Department of Lambayeque, for a period of sixty (60) calendar days from 9 May 2018 by Supreme Decree No. 048-2018-PCM.

(See C.N.303.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 22 June 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 12 June 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency in the districts of the provinces of Huanta and La Mar (Ayacucho), of the provinces of Tayacaja and Churcampa (Huancalevica), of the province of La Convención (Cusco) and of the provinces of Satipo, Concepción and Huancayo (Junín) for a period of sixty (60) calendar days from 4 April 2018 by Supreme Decree No. 035-2018-PCM.

(See C.N.300.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 22 June 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 12 June 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency in the District of Tumán, Province of Chiclayo, Department of Lambayeque, for a period of sixty (60) calendar days from 10 March 2018 by Supreme Decree No. 024-2018-PCM.

(See C.N.302.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 22 June 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 12 June 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency in the districts of Huanta, Ayahuanco, Santillana, Chaca, Sivia, Llochequía, Canayre, Uchuraccay, Pucacolpa and Luricocha in the Province of Huanta and in the Districts of San Miguel, Anco, Ayna, Chungui, Oroncoy, Santa Rosa, Tambo, Samugari, Anchihuay in the Province of La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; in the Districts of Pampas, Huachocolpa, Quishuar, Salcabamba, Salcahuasi, Surucumbamba, Tintaypuncu, Roble, Andaymarca, Daniel Hernández and Colcabamba in the Province of Tayacaja and in the Districts of Chinchihuasi, Churcampa, La Merced, Pachamarca, Paucarbamba, San Pedro de Coris in the Province of Churcampa, Department of Huancalevica, in the Districts of Echarate, Megantoni, Kimbiri, Pichari, Vilcabamba, Inkawasi, Villa Kintiuana and Villa Virgen in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco; and in the Districts of Llaylla, Mazamari, Pampa Hermosa, Pangoa, Vizcatán del Ene and Río Tambo in the Province of Satipo, in the Districts of Andamarca and Comas in the Province of Concepción and in the Districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca in the Province of Huancayo, Department of Junín, for a period of sixty calendar days from 3 June 2018 by Supreme Decree No. 058-2018-PCM.

(See C.N.325.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 6 July 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 3 July 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency declared in the districts of Quichuas and Pichos in the province of Tayacaja, Department of Huancalevica, for a period of sixty (60) calendar days from 3 March 2018 by Supreme Decree No. 021-2018-PCM.

(See C.N.323.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 6 July 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 17 August 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the declaration of the state of emergency in the districts of Huanta, Ayahuanco, Santillana, Chaca, Sivia, Llochequía, Canayre, Uchuraccay, Pucacolpa and Luricocha in the Province of Huanta and in the Districts of San Miguel, Anco, Ayna, Chungui, Oroncoy, Santa Rosa, Tambo, Samugari, Anchihuay in the Province of La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; in the Districts of Pampas, Huachocolpa, Quishuar, Salcabamba, Salcahuasi, Surucumbamba, Tintaypuncu, Roble, Andaymarca, Daniel Hernández and Colcabamba in the Province of Tayacaja and in the Districts of Chinchihuasi, Churcampa, La Merced, Pachamarca, Paucarbamba, San Pedro de Coris in the Province of Churcampa, Department of Huancalevica, in the Districts of Echarate, Megantoni, Kimbiri, Pichari, Vilcabamba, Inkawasi, Villa Kintiuana and Villa Virgen in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco; and in the Districts of Llaylla, Mazamari, Pampa Hermosa, Pangoa, Vizcatán del Ene and Río Tambo in the Province of Satipo, in the Districts of Andamarca and Comas in the Province of Concepción and in the Districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca in the Province of Huancayo, Department of Junín, for a period of sixty (60) calendar days from 4 August 2018 by Supreme Decree No. 045-2018-PCM.

(See C.N.301.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 22 June 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 12 June 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency declared in the districts of Quichuas and Pichos in the province of Tayacaja, Department of Huancalevica, for a period of sixty (60) calendar days from 2 May 2018 by Supreme Decree No. 045-2018-PCM.

(See C.N.324.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 6 July 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 2 July 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency in the Districts of Huanta, Ayahuanco, Santillana, Chaca, Sivia, Llochequía, Canayre, Uchuraccay, Pucacolpa and Luricocha in the Province of Huanta and in the Districts of San Miguel, Anco, Ayna, Chungui, Oroncoy, Santa Rosa, Tambo, Samugari, Anchihuay in the Province of La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; in the Districts of Pampas, Huachocolpa, Quishuar, Salcabamba, Salcahuasi, Surucumbamba, Tintaypuncu, Roble, Andaymarca, Daniel Hernández and Colcabamba in the Province of Tayacaja and in the Districts of Chinchihuasi, Churcampa, La Merced, Pachamarca, Paucarbamba, San Pedro de Coris in the Province of Churcampa, Department of Huancalevica, in the Districts of Echarate, Megantoni, Kimbiri, Pichari, Vilcabamba, Inkawasi, Villa Kintiuana and Villa Virgen in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco; and in the Districts of Llaylla, Mazamari, Pampa Hermosa, Pangoa, Vizcatán del Ene and Río Tambo in the Province of Satipo, in the Districts of Andamarca and Comas in the Province of Concepción and in the Districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca in the Province of Huancayo, Department of Junín, for a period of sixty calendar days from 3 June 2018 by Supreme Decree No. 058-2018-PCM.

(See C.N.325.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 6 July 2018 for the text of the notification.)
of Andamarca and Comas in the Province of Concepción, and in the districts of Santo Domingo de Acóbamba and Pariahuanca in the Province of Huancayo, Department of Junín, for a period of sixty (60) calendar days, with effect from 2 August 2018 by Supreme Decree No. 078-2018-PCM.

(See C.N.384.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 23 August 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 28 January 2019, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency declared over the stretch of the Apurímac-Cusco-Arequipa road corridor that extends from kilometre 130 (Ref. Muyu Orco sector) to kilometre 160 (Ref. Tiendayoc sector) of national route PE-3S, which encompasses the district of Colquemarca, Province of Chumbivilcas, Department of Cusco, including the five hundred (500) metres adjacent to either side of the road corridor, for a period of thirty (30) calendar days, with effect from 30 August 2018 by Supreme Decree No. 091-2018-PCM.

(See C.N.30.2019.TREATIES-IV.4 of 12 February 2019 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 28 January 2019, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency declared over the stretch of the Apurímac-Cusco-Arequipa road corridor that extends from kilometre 30 (Ref. Muyu Orco sector) to kilometre 160 (Ref. Tiendayoc sector) of national route PE-3S, which encompasses the district of Colquemarca, Province of Chumbivilcas, Department of Cusco, including the five hundred (500) metres adjacent to either side of the road corridor, for a period of thirty (30) calendar days, with effect from 30 September 2018 by Supreme Decree No. 100-2018-PCM.

(See C.N.31.2019.TREATIES-IV.4 of 12 February 2019 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 28 January 2019, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency declared over the stretch of the Apurímac-Cusco-Arequipa road corridor that extends from kilometre 130 (Ref. Muyu Orco sector) to kilometre 160 (Ref. Tiendayoc sector) of national route PE-3S, which encompasses the district of Colquemarca, Province of Chumbivilcas, Department of Cusco, including the five hundred (500) metres adjacent to either side of the road corridor, for a period of thirty (30) calendar days, with effect from 30 October 2018 by Supreme Decree No. 105-2018-PCM.

(See C.N.32.2019.TREATIES-IV.4 of 12 February 2019 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 28 January 2019, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency declared over the stretch of the Apurímac-Cusco-Arequipa road corridor that extends from kilometre 130 (Ref. Muyu Orco sector) to kilometre 160 (Ref. Tiendayoc sector) of national route PE-3S, which encompasses the district of Colquemarca, Province of Chumbivilcas, Department of Cusco, including the five hundred (500) metres adjacent to either side of the road corridor, for a period of thirty (30) calendar days, with effect from 29 November 2018 by Supreme Decree No. 116-2018-PCM.

(See C.N.24.2019. TREATIES-IV.4 of 5 February 2019 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification dated 28 January 2019, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency declared over the stretch of the Apurímac-Cusco-Arequipa road corridor that extends from kilometre 130 (Ref. Muyu Orco sector) to kilometre 160 (Ref. Tiendayoc sector) of national route PE-3S, which encompasses the district of Colquemarca, Province of Chumbivilcas, Department of Cusco, including the five hundred (500) metres adjacent to either side of the road corridor, for a period of thirty (30) calendar days, with effect from 29 December 2018 by Supreme Decree No. 128-2018-PCM.

(See C.N.22.2019.TREATIES-IV.4 of 5 February 2019 for the text of the notification.)
and Villa Virgen in the Province of La Convención, Department of Junín, for a period of sixty (60) calendar days, with effect from 30 November 2018 by Supreme Decree No. 117-2018-PCM.

(See C.N.23.2019.TREATIES-IV.4 of 5 February 2019 for the text of the notification.)

POLAND

"In connection with the proclamation of martial law by the Council of State of the Polish People's Republic, as based on article 33, paragraph 2, of Poland's Constitution, there has been temporary derogation from or limitation of application of provisions of articles 9, 12 (paragraphs 1 and 2), 14 (paragraph 5), 19 (paragraphs 2, 21 and 22) of the Covenant, to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation; and in the situation of certain rights of citizens has been prompted by the supreme national interest. It was caused by the exigencies of averting a civil war, economic anarchy as well as destabilization of state and social structures ...

The restrictive measures in question are of a temporary nature. They have already been considerably cut back and along with the stabilizing of the situation, will be successively terminated."

Basing on the law by the Diet (Seym) of the Polish People's Republic of 18 December 1982 concerning special legal regulation in the time of suspension of martial law, derogation from Covenant's articles 9, 12 paragraphs 1 and 2, articles 21 and 22, has been terminated as of 31 December 1982.

By terms of the same law as well as a result of earlier successive measures, restrictions in the application of Covenant provisions which are still derogated from, namely article 14 paragraph 5 and article 19 paragraph 2, have also been considerably reduced.

For instance, with reference to Covenant's article 14 paragraph 5, emergency procedures have been lifted in relation to crimes and offences committed in social conflicts out of political motivations, they have only been retained with regard to crimes most dangerous to State's basic economic interests as well as to life, health and property of its citizens.

Termination as from 22 July 1983 of derogations.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

(Dated 13 October 1988)

[Owing to] nationalistic clashes in the Soviet Union in the Nagorno-Karabach Autonomous Region and the Agdam district of the Azerbaydzhan Soviet Socialist Republic [and to] contraventions of public order, accompanied in a number of cases by the use of weapons, [which] have unfortunately resulted in casualties and damage to the property of the State and of private individuals [and owing to the attack of] some State institutions ... a state of emergency has been temporarily imposed, and a curfew is in effect, in the Nagorno-Karabach Autonomous Region and the Agdam district of the Azerbaydzhan SSR, as of 21 September 1988. The state of emergency has been imposed in order to restore public order, protect citizens' individual and property rights and enforce strict compliance with the law, in accordance with the powers conferred by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

While the state of emergency is in force, demonstrations, rallies, meetings and strikes are banned. The movements of civilians and vehicles are restricted between 9 p.m. and 6 a.m. These restrictions represent a partial departure from the provisions of articles 12 and 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Steps to ensure the safety of civilians and maintain public order are being taken by units of the militia and the armed forces. The local and central organs of power and government are taking steps to normalize the situation; and elucidation effort is in progress, with the aim of preventing criminal acts and incitement to national hatred.

Further [information will be provided as concerns] the date on which the state of emergency is lifted after the normalization of the situation.

(Dated 15 January 1990)

Proclamation of the state of emergency as from 11 p.m. local time on 15 January 1990, in territory of the Nagorno-Karabach autonomous region, the regions of the Azerbajan SSR adjacent thereto, the Gorissa region of the Armenian SSR and the border zone along the state frontier between the USSR and the territory of the Azerbajan SSR. The state of emergency was proclaimed owing to incitement by extremist groups which are organizing disorders, stirring up dissension and hostility between nationalities, and do not hesitate to make roads, open fire in inhabited areas and take hostages. Articles 9, 12, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant were accordingly suspended.

(Dated 29 January 1990)

Proclamation of the state of emergency, as from 20 January in the city of Baku and application to that territory of the Decree adopted by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on 15 January 1990, in the light of massive disorders organized by criminal extremist forces to overthrow the Government, and also with a view to ensure the protection and security of citizens. Articles 9, 12, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant were accordingly suspended.

(Dated 23 March 1990)

Establishment of the state of emergency as from 12 February 1990 in Dushanbe (Tadzhik SSR) because of widespread disorders, arson and other criminal acts which resulted in a threat to the citizens. Articles 9, 12 and 21 of the Covenant were accordingly suspended.

(Dated 3 November 1992)

Establishment of the state of emergency from 2 p.m. on 2 November 1992 to 2 p.m. on 2 December 1992 in the territory of the North Ossetian SSR and the Ingush Republic as a result of the serious deterioration in the situation with mass disturbances and conflicts between nationalities accompanied by use of arms and military equipment and leading to the loss of human lives, and also in view of the threat to the security and territorial integrity of the Russian Federation. Articles 9, 12, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant were accordingly suspended.

(Dated 7 April 1993)

Establishment of the state of emergency from 1400 hours on 31 March 1993 to 1400 hours on 31 May 1993 in the Prigorodny district and adjacent areas of the North Ossetian SSR and part of the Nazran district of the Ingush Republic due to "the continuing deterioration of the situation in parts of the North Ossetian Socialist Republic and the Ingush Republic, popular unrest and inter-ethnic conflicts, accompanied by violence involving the use of arms and military equipment".

The provisions from which it has derogated are articles 9, 12, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant.

(Dated 10 August 1993)

Proclamation of the state of emergency by Decree No. 1149 of 27 and 30 July 1993, as from 31 July 1993 at 1400 hours until 30 September 1993 at 1400 hours in the territories of the Mozdok district, the Prigorodny district and adjacent localities of the North Ossetian Soviet Socialist Republic (SSR) and the Malgobek and Nazran districts of the Ingush Republic due to the deteriorating situation in the certain parts of these territories.
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The provisions from which it has derogated are articles 12 (1), 13, 17(1), 19(2), 21 and 22.

(Dated 4 October 1993)

Proclamation of the state of emergency as from 3 October 1993 at 4 p.m. to 10 October 1993 at 4 p.m. in the city of Moscow "in connection with the attempts of extremist forces to provoke mass violence through organized attacks against the representatives of authority and the Police". The provisions from which it has derogated are articles 12(1), 13, 19(2) and 22.

(Dated 21 October 1993)

Extension of the state of emergency in the city of Moscow pursuant to Decree No. 1675 of 9 October 1993 until 18 October 1993 at 5 a.m. owing to "the need to ensure further normalization of the situation in Moscow, strengthen the rule of law and ensure the security of the inhabitants after the attempted armed coup d'état of 3-4 October 1993

Termination of the state of emergency established in Moscow pursuant to Decree of 3 October 1993 and extended pursuant to Decree of 9 October 1993, as from 18 October 1993 at 5 a.m.

(Dated 26 October 1993)

Proclamation of the state of emergency pursuant to Presidential Decree of 29 September 1993 as from 30 September 1993 at 1400 hours until 30 November 1993 at 1400 hours in the territories of the Mozdok district, the Prigorodny district and adjacent localities of the North Ossetian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Malgobek and Nazran districts (Ingush Republic). The Government of the Russian Federation specified that the reasons for the state of emergency were the deterioration of the situation in a number of districts of the North Ossetian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Ingush Republic as a result of the non-implementation of the agreements concluded earlier by the two sides and the decisions of the interim administration regarding the settlement of the conflict, and the increase in the number of acts of terrorism and violence. (Derogations from articles 12(1), 13, 19(2) and 22.)

(Dated 23 December 1993)

Extension of the state of emergency until 31 January 1994 at 1400 hours by Presidential Decree to parts of the territories of the Republic of North Ossetia and the Ingush Republic ... necessitated by the worsening of the situation in a number of districts of the Republic of North Ossetia and the Ingush Republic.

(Dated 22 June 1994)

In view of the deterioriation of the situation and the increased frequency of terrorist acts and widespread disorder on national soil involving the use of firearms, the President of Russia issued a Decree on 29 May 1993 declaring a state of emergency from 1400 hours on 31 May 1993 to 1400 hours on 31 July 1993 in the Mozdok district, the Prigorodny district and adjacent localities of the North Ossetian SSR and in the Malgobek and Nazran districts of the Ingush Republic.

The Government of the Russian Federation has specified that the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 12 (1) and (2), 19 (2), 21 and 22 (1) and (2) of the Covenant.

(Dated 20 May 1994)

Proclamation of the state of emergency by Decree No. 836 on 27 April 1994 from 2 p.m. on 27 April 1994 to 2 p.m. on 31 May 1994 in a portion of the territory of the Republic of North Ossetia. The said Decree extends the applicability of paragraphs 3 to 8 of presidential Decree No. 657 of 4 April 1994 to the territories of the Prigorodny district (the Otkyabrskoe, Kambileevskoe and Sunja populated areas) and Vladikavkaz (the Sputnik military cantonment), in the Republic of North Ossetia. (In this regard, reference is made to the notification received on 25 April 1994 and dated 22 April 1994).

The Government of the Russian Federation has specified that the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 12 (1) and (2), 19 (2), 21 and 22 (1) and (2) of the Covenant.

(Dated 21 June 1994)

Lifting, as from 31 May 1994, by virtue of Decree No. 1112 of 30 May 1994, of the state of emergency in part of the territories of the Republic of North Ossetia and the Ingush Republic, instituted by the President of the Russian Federation under Decrees Nos. 657 of 4 April 1994 and 836 of 27 April 1994. (In this regard, reference is made to the notifications received on 25 April and 23 May 1994, and dated 22 April and 20 May 1994, respectively).

Declaration of the state of emergency as from 31 May 1994 at 1400 hours until 31 July 1994 at 1400 hours in the following territories: Mozdok district, the Pravoberezhny district, the Prigorodny district, the city of Vladikavkaz (Republic of North Ossetia, the Malgobek, Nazran, Sunzha and Dzheirakh districts (Ingush Republic) by Decree 1112 of 30 May 1994, in view of the continuing state of tension in those districts and the need to ensure the return of refugees and forcibly displaced persons to their places of permanent residence and implement a set of measures aimed at eliminating the consequences of the armed conflict.

Derogation from the provisions of article 12 (1) and (2), 19 (2), 21 and 22 (1) and (2) of the Covenant.

(Dated 12 August 1994)

Lifting as from 31 July 1994 of the state of emergency in part of the territories of the Republic of North Ossetia and the Ingush Republic, instituted on 30 May 1994 (in this regard, reference is made to the notifications received on 21 June 1994) and proclamation of a state of emergency from 1400 hours on 31 July 1994 until 1400 hours on 30 September 1994 in the territories of the Mozdok, Pravoberezhny, and Prigorodny districts, the city of Vladikavkaz (Republic of North Ossetia), and of Malgobek, Nazran, Sunja and Dzheirakh districts (Ingush Republic) in view of the continuing state of tension in those territories and the need for refugees and forcibly displaced persons to return to their places of permanent residence as well as for the elimination of the consequences of armed conflict.

Derogation from the provisions of article 12 (1) and (2), 19 (2), 21 and 22 (1) and (2) of the Covenant.

(Dated 21 October 1994)

Lifting of the state of emergency instituted by Decree No. 1541 of 25 July 1994 and proclamation of a state of emergency with effect from 1400 hours on 3 October 1994 until 1400 hours on 2 December 1994 in the territories of the Mozdok, Pravoberezhny and Prigorodny districts and the city of Vladikavkaz (Republic of North Ossetia) and the Malgobek, Nazran, Sunja and Dzheirakh districts (Ingush Republic) in view of the continuing state of tension and the need to ensure the return of forcibly displaced persons to their places of permanent residence and the implementation of a set of measures to deal with the aftermath of the armed conflict in order to guarantee State and public security.

Derogation from the provisions of articles 12 (1) and (2), 19 (2), 21 and 22 (1) and (2) of the Covenant.
was declared in view of the progressive escalation of 21 and 22 (1) and (2) of the Covenant.

Emergency regulations and Special Laws were temporary 14 (3), 17 (1), 19 (2), 21 and 22.

from the Government of Serbia and Montenegro a 1994 of the state of emergency from 1400 hours on 3 March 2003.

Lanka, and derogation as a consequence from articles 9 12, 14, 17, 19, 21 and 22 (2) of the Covenant.

SÉRIEBIA

(Dated 12 March 2003)

On 13 March 2003, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Serbia and Montenegro a notification, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting the Decision and the Order dated 12 March 2003 from the Acting President of the Republic, concerning the declaration of a state of emergency in the Republic.

The above Order, issued by the Acting President of the Republic of Serbia concerning special measures to be applied during the state of emergency, provides for the derogation from rights guaranteed by Articles 9, 12, 14, 17, 19, 21 and 22 (2) of the Covenant.

(Dated 23 April 2003)

Termination of the state of emergency as proclaimed on 12 March 2003.

SRI LANKA

Proclamation of state of emergency throughout Sri Lanka, and derogation as a consequence from articles 9 (3) and 14 (3) (b) of the Covenant as from 18 May 1983.

The Government of Sri Lanka specified that the Emergency regulations and Special Laws were temporary measures necessitated by the existence of an extraordinary security situation and that it was not intended to continue with them longer than it was absolutely necessary.

(Dated 13 January 1989)

Termination of the state of emergency as from 11 January 1989.

(Dated 18 August 1989)

Establishment of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days as from 20 June 1989 and derogation from provisions of article 9 (2).

The notification specifies that the state of emergency was declared in view of the progressive escalation of violence, acts of sabotage and the disruption of essential services throughout the country as from the termination of the state of emergency on 11 January 1989 (see previous notification of 16 January 1989).

(Dated 29 September 1994)

Lifting of the state of emergency established on 20 June 1989 and notified by notification of 18 August 1989, as from 4 September 1994, except with regard to the Northern and Eastern Provinces and certain areas which border the above two Provinces specifically designated in the Presidential Proclamation dated 1 September 1994.

(Dated 30 May 2000)

Declaration of a State of emergency in Sri Lanka

Derogation from articles 9 (2), 9 (3), 12 (1), 12 (2), 14 (3), 17 (1), 19 (2), 21 and 22.

“On 2nd May 2010 His Excellency the President of Sri Lanka promulgated the Emergency Regulations under Section 5 of the Public Security Ordinance (PSO). The Emergency Regulations have been officially proclaimed by the Gazette Extraordinary No. 1651/24 dated 2nd May 2010. The new proclamation amends and repeals a number of Emergency Regulations that have been in operation since their publication in the Gazette Extraordinary No. 1405/14 of 13th August 2005 as amended from time to time.

The Emergency Regulations prior to the recent amendments were promulgated in August, 2005 immediately after the assassination of the former Foreign Minister of Sri Lanka Mr. Lakshman Kadirgamar. These Regulations were amended from time to time and continued due to the conflict situation which prevailed in certain areas of the island. As a result of the successful security operations launched by the Government of Sri Lanka, this situation ended in mid May 2009, with the elimination of the menace of terrorism posed by the ruthless organization styling itself the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE). However, there does remain a need for vigilance to ensure the complete recovery of arms caches secreted by the LTTE and the reintegration back into society of LTTE cadres, after successfully completing programmes of rehabilitation and of vocational training. Moreover, Sri Lanka requires to be alert against attempts by residues of the LTTE operating overseas to channel funds for de-stabilization and to try to re-kindle the embers of secession through endeavours such as the Provisional Transnational Government of Tamil Eelam. It is in this context that the Government of Sri Lanka decided to further significantly scale down the Emergency Regulations, while keeping in force only a limited number essential for national security.

The recent amendments to the Emergency Regulations that have come into effect from 2nd May 2010 are in keeping with the consistent commitment of Sri Lanka towards the promotion of human rights and the maintenance of strong judicial safeguards. It is in this context that the Government of Sri Lanka at the outset wishes to enumerate the terminations of derogations of the following ICCPR articles [: 9 (2), 12, 14 (3), 17 (1), 19 (2), 21 and 22 (1)] ...

In reference to previous notifications submitted by the Government of Sri Lanka under Article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, as the Depository of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) made on 9th June 2010 and 30th May 2000 respectively:

“The Government of Sri Lanka is pleased to notify His Excellency the Secretary General that the Emergency Regulations that have been promulgated under the Public Security Ordinance have been allowed to lapse since August 2011. The Emergency Regulations were promulgated in August 2005 by means of a Presidential Proclamation pursuant to Section 05 of the Public Security Ordinance. Due to the conflict situation which then prevailed in the country, the Regulations were amended from time to time and were allowed to continue in force. In view of the end of the conflict in 2009 and in keeping with Sri Lanka’s commitments towards protection and promotion of human rights, the emergency regulations have been allowed to lapse since August 2011.

The Government of Sri Lanka therefore wishes to notify the Secretary-General of the termination of all derogations previously notified under the ICCPR, pursuant to the lapse of the Emergency Regulations in August 2011.”

This communication is being made pursuant to Sri Lanka’s obligations under Article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which stipulate the obligations of the State Parties to notify the derogation as well as the termination of such derogations.”
SUDAN

(Dated 21 August 1991)

"The state of emergency was declared all over the Sudan on June 30, 1989, when the Revolution for National Salvation took over the power, in order to ensure security and safety of the country. [The articles of the Covenant which are being derogated from are articles 2 and 22 (1) as subsequently indicated by the Government of the Sudan.]

The reasons for declaring the State of Emergency were [that] the Revolution has in June 1989, inherited a very chaotic socio-economic and political situation with a civil war raging in the South (the Civil War started in 1983 and since then the state of emergency was declared), and lawlessness engulfing the North, and armed-robbery being practised, in a serious manner, in the west (as a result of the present crisis in Tchad), and also in the east, in addition to possible threats of foreign interventions.

The emergency regulations were also issued to complement the provisions of the Constitutional Decree No. (2) (the State of Emergency) which contain more that 40 sections aimed at ensuring security and safety of the country. But no person has ever been convicted till now, or sentenced to death in accordance with these regulations since the declaration of the state of emergency. The army officers who were executed on July 26, 1990, were charged in accordance with:-

I) The People's Armed Forces Act (Section 47).  
III) The Penal Code, 1983 (Section 96).

Other three civilians were sentenced to death in accordance with the provisions of the Dealing in Currency Act, 1981.

It has to be mentioned that the President of the National Salvation Revolution Command Council had issued last April a general amnesty by which all the political detainees were released, and powers of detention entrusted to the Judiciary. Also a decree had been issued abrogating the Special courts which were established in accordance with the constitution of the Special Courts Act, 1989 and its Amendment of January 30, 1990, to have Jurisdiction over acts and charges arising from violation of the Constitutional Decrees and the Emergency Regulations.

Under those circumstances, it became necessary for the Revolution to proclaim the State of Emergency Regulations.

In conclusion, it was to be emphasised that the existence of the state of emergency in the Sudan came well before the eruption of the National Salvation Revolution in June 1989. As stated above, it initially came as a direct result of the political and military situation that existed, and still exists, in the Southern part of the country.

However, with the achievement of progress in the peace process and the establishment of the political system, which is currently underway, the State of Emergency will naturally be lifted."

The Government of the Sudan informed [the Secretary-General] that the state of emergency in the Sudan has been extended until 31 December 2001.  
(Dated 19 December 2001)

The Government of the Sudan informed [the Secretary-General] that the state of emergency in the Sudan has been extended until 31 December 2002.

The Secretary-General received from the Government of the Republic of the Sudan a notification dated 8 March 2019, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the declaration of a National State of Emergency for a period of one year starting from 22 February 2019. Subsequently, on 13 March 2019, the Government of the Republic of the Sudan notified the Secretary-General that the National Legislative Assembly “the Parliament” approved on 11 March 2019 by the majority of votes the State of Emergency and shortened it from one year to six months. (See C.N.88.2019.TREATIES-IV-4 of 22 March 2019 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of the Republic of the Sudan a notification dated 8 March 2019, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the declaration of a state of emergency in the State of Kassala and in the State of North Kordofan for a period of 6 months from 1 January 2019 to 30 June 2019. (See C.N.87.2019.TREATIES-IV-4 of 22 March 2019 for the text of the notification.)

SURINAME

Termination, as from 1 September 1989, of the state of emergency declared on 1 December 1986 in the territory of the Districts of Marowijne, Commewijne, Para, Brokopondo and in part of the territory of the district of Sipaliwini (between the Marowijne river and 56 ° WLO. The articles of the Covenant being derogated from were articles 12, 21 and 22 of the Covenant.

THAILAND

“[...] pursuant to Paragraph 3 of Article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), and has the honour to inform [...] that the Royal Thai Government has declared a severe emergency situation in the areas of Bangkok; Nonthaburi Province; Muang, Bang Phli, Phra Pradang, Phra Samut Chedi, Bang Bo and Bang Sao Thong Districts, Samut Prakan Province; Thanyaburi, Lad Lumkaew, Sam Kok, Lam Luk Ka and Khlong Luang Districts, Pathumthani Province; Phuththamonthon District, Nakhon Pathom Province; and Wang Noi, Bang Pa-in, Bang Sai and Lat Bua Luang Districts, Ayuthaya Province, since 7 April 2010.

The Declaration of a Severe Emergency Situation was promulgated by Mr. Abhisit Vejjajiva, Prime Minister of Thailand, in accordance with Sections 5 and 11 of the Emergency Decree on Public Administration in Emergency Situations B.E. 2548 (2005), as well as Section 29 in conjunction with Sections 32, 33, 34, 36, 38, 41, 43, 45 and 63 of the Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand, to deal effectively with the actions of a group of persons that caused grave disturbances and led to disorder in certain parts of the country. The Emergency Decree was invoked in order to quickly resolve and put an end to the situation of turmoil as well as to restore normalcy in the country.

In light of the above-mentioned reasons, the Royal Thai Government has exercised its right to derogation under Paragraph 1 of Article 4 of the Covenant, specifically in relation to its obligations under Articles 12 (right to liberty of movement), 19 (freedom of expression and freedom of the press) and 21 (right of peaceful assembly) of the Covenant for the duration of the Emergency Situation in the aforementioned areas.

The Permanent Mission would further like to inform [...] that the non-derogable rights as set forth in Articles 6, 7, 8 (paragraphs 1 and 2), 11, 15, 16 and 18 of the Covenant, which are guaranteed by the Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand, have been kept intact. [...]"

The Permanent Mission of Thailand to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and, with reference to the former’s Note no. 56101/242 dated 14 April 2010, has the honour to inform the latter that the Royal Thai Government has lifted the declaration of a severe emergency situation as referred to in the above-mentioned Note and that, in accordance with Paragraph 3 of Article 4 of the
The Permanent Mission wishes to inform the Secretary-General that the non-derogable rights as set forth in Articles 6, 7, 8 (paragraphs 1 and 2), 11, 15, 16 and 18 of the Covenant, which are guaranteed by the Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand, have been kept intact.

The Permanent Mission is forwarding herewith a copy of the unofficial translation of the Declaration of a Severe Emergency Situation of 21 January 2014 and would therefore appreciate it if the Secretary-General could notify other States Parties to the Covenant of the foregoing information as required by Article 4 of the Covenant.

The Permanent Mission of Thailand to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and, pursuant to Paragraph 3 of Article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), has the honour to inform the latter that the Royal Thai Government has declared a severe emergency situation in the areas of Bangkok; Nonthaburi Province; Lad Lumkaew District, Pathumthani Province; and Bang Phli District, Samut Prakan Province, since 22 January 2014.

The Declaration of a Severe Emergency Situation was promulgated by Ms. Yingluck Shinawatra, Prime Minister of Thailand, in accordance with Sections 6, 11 and 6 of the Emergency Decree on Public Administration in Emergency Situation B.E. 2548 (2005) as well as Section 29 in conjunction with Sections 32, 33, 34, 36, 38, 41, 43, 45 and 63 of the Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand, to deal effectively with the actions of a group of persons that caused grave disturbances and led to disorder in certain parts of the country. The Emergency Decree was invoked in order to quickly resolve and put an end to the situation of turmoil as well as to restore normality in the country.

In light of the above-mentioned reasons, the Royal Thai Government has exercised its right of derogation under Paragraph 1 of Article 4 of the Covenant, specifically in relation to its obligations with regards to the right to liberty of movement under Article 12, the right to freedom of expression under Article 19, and the right of peaceful assembly under Article 21 of the Covenant for the duration of the Emergency Situation in the aforementioned areas.

The Permanent Mission wishes to further inform the Secretary-General that any and all derogations of rights under the ICCPR, specifically in relation to its obligations under:

- Article 9, 12, 14 and 21 are suspended.
- Article 12 (1), by the announcement of a curfew which was lifted on 13 June 2014; Article 14 (5), only where a jurisdiction has been conferred to the Martial Court over Sections 107-112 of the Penal Code and the offences against the internal security of the Kingdom; Article 19, by the prohibition of broadcasting or publishing certain content, particularly those inciting conflict and alienation in the society, false or provoking messages, and Article 21, by the limitation of political gathering. These restrictions are under constant review and are progressively lifted.

The Permanent Mission would further like to inform the Secretary-General that the non-derogable rights as set forth in Articles 6, 7, 8 (paragraphs 1 and 2), 11, 15, 16 and 18 of the Covenant have not been affected.

The Permanent Mission of Thailand to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and, pursuant to Paragraph 3 of Article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), has the honour to inform the latter that the Royal Thai Government has declared the existence of a state of public emergency in the City of Port of Spain on 21st August 2011, for a period of fifteen days with a further extension by Parliament for a period of three months has ended at midnight on Monday 5th December 2011.

The said state of emergency was lifted on 7 August 1995 by a resolution of the House of Representatives.

By Legal Notice No. 162 of 2011, on 21 August 2011, the President of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago declared the existence of a state of public emergency in the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago for a period of ninety days and derogation from articles 9, 12, 21 and 14 (3).

By a Proclamation issued on 3 August 1995, a state of emergency has been declared in the City of Port of Spain as of 3 August 1995 owing to the fact that, as indicated by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago, action has been taken or is immediately threatened by persons or bodies of persons of such a nature and on so extensive a scale as to be likely to endanger the public safety or to deprive the community of supplies or services essential to life. The provisions of the Covenant from which the Government of Trinidad and Tobago has derogated are articles 9, 12, 14 (3) and 21.

The said state of emergency was lifted on 7 August 1995 by a resolution of the House of Representatives.

By Legal Notice No. 162 of 2011, on 21 August 2011, the President of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago declared the existence of a state of public emergency in the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago for a period of ninety days and derogation from articles 9, 12, 21 and 14 (3).

By Legal Notice No. 162 of 2011, on 21 August 2011, the President of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago declared the existence of a state of public emergency in the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago for a period of ninety days and derogation from articles 9, 12, 21 and 14 (3).

By a Proclamation issued on 3 August 1995, a state of emergency has been declared in the City of Port of Spain as of 3 August 1995 owing to the fact that, as indicated by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago, action has been taken or is immediately threatened by persons or bodies of persons of such a nature and on so extensive a scale as to be likely to endanger the public safety or to deprive the community of supplies or services essential to life. The provisions of the Covenant from which the Government of Trinidad and Tobago has derogated are articles 9, 12, 14 (3) and 21.

The said state of emergency was lifted on 7 August 1995 by a resolution of the House of Representatives.

By Legal Notice No. 162 of 2011, on 21 August 2011, the President of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago declared the existence of a state of public emergency in the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago for a period of ninety days and derogation from articles 9, 12, 21 and 14 (3).

By a Proclamation issued on 3 August 1995, a state of emergency has been declared in the City of Port of Spain as of 3 August 1995 owing to the fact that, as indicated by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago, action has been taken or is immediately threatened by persons or bodies of persons of such a nature and on so extensive a scale as to be likely to endanger the public safety or to deprive the community of supplies or services essential to life. The provisions of the Covenant from which the Government of Trinidad and Tobago has derogated are articles 9, 12, 14 (3) and 21.

The said state of emergency was lifted on 7 August 1995 by a resolution of the House of Representatives.

By Legal Notice No. 162 of 2011, on 21 August 2011, the President of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago declared the existence of a state of public emergency in the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago for a period of ninety days and derogation from articles 9, 12, 21 and 14 (3).

By a Proclamation issued on 3 August 1995, a state of emergency has been declared in the City of Port of Spain as of 3 August 1995 owing to the fact that, as indicated by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago, action has been taken or is immediately threatened by persons or bodies of persons of such a nature and on so extensive a scale as to be likely to endanger the public safety or to deprive the community of supplies or services essential to life. The provisions of the Covenant from which the Government of Trinidad and Tobago has derogated are articles 9, 12, 14 (3) and 21.

The said state of emergency was lifted on 7 August 1995 by a resolution of the House of Representatives.
"... The Republic of Turkey is taking the required measures as prescribed by law, in line with the national legislation and its international obligations. In this context, on 20 July 2016, the Government of Turkey declared a State of Emergency for a duration of 90 days, in accordance with the Turkish Constitution (Article 120) and the Law No. 2935 on State of Emergency (Article 3/1b)....

The decision was published in the Official Gazette and approved by the Turkish Grand National Assembly on 21 July 2016. In this process, measures taken may involve derogation from obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights regarding Articles 2/3, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 17, 19, 21, 22, 25, 26 and 27, as permissible in Article 4 of the said Covenant...

For the full text of the notification, see depositary notification C.N.580.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 11 August 2016.

On 14 October 2016, the Secretary-General was notified of the following:

"... with reference to our letter no. 2016/11235663 dated 2 July 2016, through which we had brought to your attention that on 20 July 2016, a State of Emergency was declared by the Government of Turkey for a duration of 90 days, in accordance with the Turkish Constitution (article 120) and the Law No. 2935 on State of Emergency (article 3/1b).

In this framework, I wish to inform you that the State of Emergency has been extended for a period of three months starting from 19 October 2016 at 01.00 AM by Decision no. 1130 dated 11 October 2016..."

For the full text of the notification, see C.N.775.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 21 October 2016.

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Turkey a notification signed by the Deputy Permanent Representative and Chargé d' affaires, dated 9 January 2017, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency for a period of three months from 19 January 2017 pursuant to Decision no. 1134 of 3 January 2017.

(See C.N.4.2017.TREATIES-IV.4 of 10 January 2017 for the text of the above-mentioned notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Turkey a notification signed by the Permanent Representative, dated 19 April 2017, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency for a period of three months from 19 April 2017 pursuant to Decision no. 1139 of 18 April 2017.

(See C.N.241.2017.TREATIES-IV.4 of 20 April 2017 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Turkey a notification signed by the Chargé d' affaires a.i., dated 24 July 2017, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency for a period of three months from 19 July 2017 pursuant to Decision no. 1154 of 17 July 2017.

(See C.N.424.2017.TREATIES-IV.4 of 27 July 2017 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Turkey a notification signed by the Permanent Representative, dated 19 October 2017, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency for a period of three months from 19 October 2017 pursuant to Decision no. 1165 of 17 October 2017.

(See C.N.683.2017.TREATIES-IV.4 of 26 October 2017 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Turkey a notification signed by the Deputy Permanent Representative and Chargé d'affaires, dated 19 January 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency for a period of three months from 19 January 2018 pursuant to Decision no. 1178 of 18 January 2018.

(See C.N.45.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 22 January 2018 for the text of the notification.)

The Secretary-General received from the Government of Turkey a notification signed by the Permanent Representative, dated 19 April 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, regarding the extension of the state of emergency for a period of three months from 19 April 2018 pursuant to Decision no. 1182 of 18 April 2018.

(See C.N.215.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 23 April 2018 for the text of the notification.)

On 8 August 2018, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Turkey a notification signed by the Deputy Permanent Representative dated 8 August 2018, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, concerning the end of the state of emergency, established by Decision 2016/9064 by the Council of Ministers and subsequently extended.

(See C.N.378.2018.TREATIES-IV.4 of 9 August 2018 for the text of the notification.)

UKRAINE

"The Permanent Mission of Ukraine to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and, with the reference to the Article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, has the honour to transmit herewith the text of the Declaration of the Verkhovna Rada (Parliament) of Ukraine ‘On derogation from certain obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms’ adopted 21 May 2015."

(See C.N.416.2015.TREATIES-IV.4 of 16 July 2015 for the text of the above-mentioned declaration.)

"The Permanent Mission of Ukraine to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and, with the reference to its Note Verbale No. 4132/28-194/501-803 of 5 June 2015, has the honour to inform that Ukraine exercises the right of derogation from its obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms with regard to the territory of certain areas of the Donetsk and Luhansk regions of Ukraine, that are under control/partial control of the Government of Ukraine.

The list of localities in the Donetsk and Luhansk regions that are under control/partial control of the Government of Ukraine as of October 1, 2015 is attached hereto.

(See C.N.656.2015.TREATIES-IV.4 of 14 December 2015 for the text of the above-mentioned declaration.)


... in pursuance of Article 4, paragraph 3, of the Covenant the Permanent Mission of Ukraine to the United Nations has the honour to transmit the reviewed list of localities in Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts under control/partially controlled by the Government of Ukraine as of 14 June 2016...

(See C.N.502.2016.TREATIES-IV.4 of 18 July 2016 for the text of the above-mentioned notification.)
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"The Government of the United Kingdom notify other States Parties to the present Covenant, in accordance with article 4, of their intention to take and continue measures derogating from their obligations under the Covenant.

"There have been in the United Kingdom in recent years campaigns of organised terrorism related to Northern Irish affairs which have manifested themselves in activities which have included murder, attempted murder, maiming, intimidation and violent civil disturbances and in bombing and fire-raising which have resulted in death, injury and widespread destruction of property. This situation constitutes a public emergency within the meaning of article 4 (1) of the Covenant. The emergency commenced prior to the ratification by United Kingdom of the Covenant and Legislation has, from time to time, been promulgated with regard to it.

"The Government of the United Kingdom have found it necessary (and in some cases continue to find it necessary) to take powers, to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation, for the protection of life and property, for the protection of property and the prevention of outbreaks of public disorder, and including the exercise of powers of arrest and detention and exclusion. In so far as any of these measures is inconsistent with the provisions of articles 9, 10 (2), 10 (3), 12 (1), 14, 17, 19 (2), 21 or 22 of the Covenant, the United Kingdom hereby derogates from its obligations under the provisions.

"Termination forthwith of derogations from articles 9, 10 (2), 10 (3), 12 (1), 14, 17, 19 (2), 21 and 22 of the Covenant.

[The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland] have found it necessary to take or continue measures derogating in certain respects from their obligations under Article 9 of the Covenant. (For the reasons of that decision, see paragraph 2 of a previous notification of 17 May 1976, which continue to apply).

"Persons reasonably suspected of involvement in terrorism connected with the affairs of Northern Ireland, or of offences under the legislation and who have been detained for 48 hours may be, on the authority of the Secretary of State, further detained without charge for periods of up to five days.

Notwithstanding the judgement of 29 November 1988 by the European Court of Human Rights in the case of Brogan and Others [various measures], derogating in certain respects from obligations under Article 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

On 14 November 1989 the Home Secretary announced that the Government has concluded that a satisfactory procedure for the review of detention of terrorist suspects involving the judiciary had not been identified and that the derogation notified under Article 4 of the Covenant would remain in place for as long as circumstances require.

(Dated 20 February 2001)
the particular case, to effect removal and that, if it becomes clear that removal is not going to be possible within a reasonable time, detention will be unlawful (Rv Governor of Durham Prison, ex parte Singh[1984] All ER 983).

In some cases, where the intention remains to remove or deport a person on national security grounds, continued detention may not be consistent with Article 9 of the Covenant. This may be the case, for example, if the person has established that removal to their own country might result in treatment contrary to Article 7 of the Covenant. In such circumstances, irrespective of the gravity of the threat to national security posed by the person concerned, it is well established that the international obligations of the United Kingdom prevent removal or deportation to a place where there is a real risk that the person will suffer treatment contrary to that article. If no alternative destination is immediately available, then removal or deportation may not, for the time being, be possible even though the ultimate intention remains to remove or deport the person once satisfactory arrangements can be made. In addition, it may not be kosher to prosecute the person for a criminal offence given the strict rules on the admissibility of evidence in the criminal justice system of the United Kingdom and the high standard of proof required.

The Government has considered whether the exercise of the extended power to detain contained in the Anti-terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001 may be inconsistent with the obligations under Article 9 of the Covenant. To the extent that the exercise of the extended power may be inconsistent with the United Kingdom's obligations under Article 9, the Government has decided to avail itself of the right of derogation conferred by Article 4(1) of the Covenant and will continue to do so until further notice."

(Dated 15 March 2005)

"The provisions referred to in the 18 December 2001 notification, namely the extended power of arrest and detention in the Anti-terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001, ceased to operate on 14 March 2005. Accordingly, the notification is withdrawn as from that date, and the Government of the United Kingdom confirm that the relevant provisions of the Covenant will again be executed as from then."

URUGUAY

[The Government of Uruguay] has the honour to request that the requirement laid down in article 4 (3) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights should be deemed to have been formally fulfilled with regard to the existence and maintenance in Uruguay of a public emergency as referred to in article 4 (1).

This emergency situation, the nature and consequences of which match the description given in article 4, namely that they threaten the life of the nation, is a matter of universal knowledge, and the present communication might thus appear superfluous in so far as the provision of substantive information is concerned.

This issue has been the subject of countless official statements at both the regional and the international level. Nonetheless, [the Government of Uruguay] wishes to have formally complied with the abovementioned requirement and to reiterate that the emergency measures which it has taken, and which comply strictly with the requirements of article 4 (2), are designed precisely to achieve genuine, effective and lasting protection of human rights, the observance and promotion of which are the essence of our existence as an independent and sovereign nation.

Notwithstanding what has been stated above, the information referred to in article 4 (3) concerning the nature and duration of the emergency measures will be provided in more detailed form when the report referred to in article 40 of the Covenant is submitted, so that the scope and evolution of these measures can be fully understood.

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

(Dated 17 March 1989)

Establishment of emergency measures and derogation from articles 9, 12, 17, 19 and 21 throughout Venezuela. The notification stipulates that derogation was effected due to a series of serious breaches of the peace having taken place throughout Caracas and in other cities in the country and outbursts of violence, acts of vandalism and violations of the security of Venezuelan individuals and households, leading to loss of life and the destruction of much property, thus causing a further deterioration in the economic situation of the country. (Dated 31 March 1989)

Re-establishment as from 22 March 1989 of the constitutional order of the Republic thereby constituting an attempt against the achievements of the Venezuelan people over more than three decades of fully democratic government.

The constitutional guarantees suspended in Venezuela relate to the rights provided for in articles 9, 12, 17, 19 and 21. The right to strike was also temporarily suspended.

(Dated 21 February 1992)

Restoration, as from 17 February 1991, of the guarantees provided for under articles 12 and 19 of the Covenant and also of the right to strike. (Dated 30 April 1992)

Restoration, as from 21 February 1991, of the guarantees provided for in articles 9, 17 and 21 of the Covenant, thereby fully ending the state of emergency declared on 4 February 1992. (Dated 30 November 1992)

On 27 November 1992, certain constitutional guarantees relating to the rights provided for in articles 9, 17, 19 and 21 of the Covenant have been suspended in Venezuela.

This measure was made necessary after a group of civil subversives in connivance with a small military squad took over Palo Negro air base in the city of Maracay, Aragua State, and Francisco de Miranda Base in the city of Caracas, which services as Headquarters of the Air Force Command, thereby threatening the democratic system.

On 28 November 1992, restoration, as from that date, of the rights provided for in article 21 of the Covenant, so as to allow public electioneering in contemplation of the elections to be held on 6 December 1992. Restoration, pursuant to Decree No. 2764 of 16 January 1993, of rights regarding personal liberty corresponding to articles 9 (1) and 11 of the Covenant throughout the national territory. Rights regarding liberty and security of person as well as the inviolability of the home and the right to demonstrate had been restored as from 22 December 1992.
December 1992 of certain rights which had been suspended by Decree No. 2668 of 27 November 1992. Suspension, pursuant to Decree 2765 of 16 January 1993, of certain rights in the State of Sucre as a result of a breach of the peace in that State. These rights, corresponding to articles 12 (1) and 21, were restored by Decree No. 2780 on 25 January 1993. (Dated 29 June 1994)
By Decree No. 241 of 27 June 1994, suspension of certain constitutional guarantees in view of the fact that the economic and financial situation of the country has created circumstances liable to endanger public order. Derogation from the provisions of articles 9, 12 and 17 of the Covenant. (Dated 18 July 1995)
By Decree No. 739 of 6 July 1995, restoratif the constitutional guarantees, suspended by Decree No. 241 of 27 June 1994 [see notification received on 7 July 1994], throughout the national territory, except in the autonomous municipalities of Rosario de Perijá and Catatumbo, State of Zulia; García de Hevia, Pedro María Ureña, Bolivar, Panamericano and Fernández Feo, State of Táchira; Páez, Pedro Camejo and Rómulo Gallegos, State of Apure; and Atures, Atuana, Manapiare, Atabapo, Alto Orinoco and Guania, State of Amazonas. The Government considers that the situation in these border municipalities, where the theatre of conflict and the theatre of operations No. 1 were decreed, requires that, in the interest of protecting its borders, the above guarantees remain suspended. (Dated 3 March 1999)
Resoration of the guarantees provided for in articles 9, 12 and 17 of the Covenant, suspended by Decree No. 739 of 6 July 1995. [See notification received on 1 September 1995.] (Dated 17 March 1989)
Establishment of emergency measures and derogation from articles 9, 12, 17, 19 and 21 throughout Venezuela. The notification stipulates that derogation was effected due to a series of serious breaches of the peace having taken place throughout Caracas and in other cities in the country and outbursts of violence, acts of vandalism and violations of the security of Venezuelan individuals and households, leading to loss of life and the destruction of much property, thus causing a further deterioration in the economic situation of the country. (Dated 31 March 1989)
Re-establishment as from 22 March 1989 of the constitutional safeguards which had been suspended as stated in the previous notification of 17 March 1989. (Dated 4 February 1992)
Temporary suspension of certain constitutional guarantees throughout Venezuela with a view to facilitating the full restoration of public order throughout the national territory.
The Government of Venezuela specified that "the measures were made necessary after criminal attempt was made to assassinate the President of the Republic with the aim of upsetting the rule of law and undermining the constitutional order of the Republic thereby constituting an attempt against the achievements of the Venezuelan people over more than three decades of fully democratic government". The constitutional guarantees suspended in Venezuela relate to the rights provided for in articles 9, 12, 17, 19 and 21. The right to strike was also temporarily suspended. (Dated 21 February 1992)
Restoration, as from 17 February 1991, of the guarantees provided for under articles 12 and 19 of the Covenant and also of the right to strike. (Dated 30 April 1992)
Restoration, as from 21 February 1991, of the guarantees provided for in articles 9, 17 and 21 of the Covenant, thereby fully ending the state of emergency declared on 4 February 1992. (Dated 30 November 1992)
On 27 November 1992, certain constitutional guarantees relating to the rights provided for in articles 9, 17, 19 and 21 of the Covenant have been suspended in Venezuela.
This measure was made necessary after a group of civil subservives in connivance with a small military squad took over Palo Negro air base in the city of Maracay, Aragua State, and Francisco de Miranda Base in the city of Caracas, which services as Headquarters of the Air Force Command, thereby threatening the democratic system.
On 28 November 1992, restoration, as from that date, of the rights provided for in article 21 of the Covenant, so as to allow public electioneering in contemplation of the elections to be held on 6 December 1992.
Restoration, pursuant to Decree No. 2764 of 16 January 1993, of rights regarding personal liberty corresponding to articles 9 (1) and 11 of the Covenant throughout the national territory. Rights regarding liberty and security of person as well as the inviolability of the home and the right to demonstrate had been restored as from 22 December 1992.
Restoration, pursuant to Decree No. 2672 of 1 December 1992 of certain rights which had been suspended by Decree No. 2668 of 27 November 1992.
Suspension, pursuant to Decree 2765 of 16 January 1993, of certain rights in the State of Sucre as a result of a breach of the peace in that State. These rights, corresponding to articles 12 (1) and 21, were restored by Decree No. 2780 on 25 January 1993. (Dated 29 June 1994)
By Decree No. 241 of 27 June 1994, suspension of certain constitutional guarantees in view of the fact that the economic and financial situation of the country has created circumstances liable to endanger public order. Derogation from the provisions of articles 9, 12 and 17 of the Covenant. (Dated 18 July 1995)
By Decree No. 739 of 6 July 1995, restoratif the constitutional guarantees, suspended by Decree No. 241 of 27 June 1994 [see notification received on 7 July 1994], throughout the national territory, except in the autonomous municipalities of Rosario de Perijá and Catatumbo, State of Zulia; García de Hevia, Pedro María Ureña, Bolivar, Panamericano and Fernández Feo, State of Táchira; Páez, Pedro Camejo and Rómulo Gallegos, State of Apure; and Atures, Atuana, Manapiare, Atabapo, Alto Orinoco and Guania, State of Amazonas. The Government considers that the situation in these border municipalities, where the theatre of conflict and the theatre of operations No. 1 were decreed, requires that, in the interest of protecting its borders, the above guarantees remain suspended. (Dated 3 March 1999)
Resoration of the guarantees provided for in articles 9, 12 and 17 of the Covenant, suspended by Decree No. 739 of 6 July 1995. [See notification received on 1 September 1995.]

YUGOSLAVIA (FORMER)
**Territorial Application**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Date of receipt of the notification</th>
<th>Territories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>11 Dec 1978</td>
<td>Netherlands Antilles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>27 Apr 1993</td>
<td>Macau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland</td>
<td>20 May 1976</td>
<td>Belize, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands (Malvinas) and Dependencies, Gibraltar, Gilbert Islands, Guernsey, Hong Kong, Isle of Man, Bailiwick of Jersey, Montserrat, Pitcairn Island, St. Helena and Dependencies, Solomon Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands and Tuvalu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1 The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Covenant on 8 August 1967 and 2 June 1971, respectively. It will be recalled that the former Yugoslavia had deposited the following notifications under article 4(3) of the Covenant (Derogations), on the dates indicated hereinafter:

**17 April 1989 (Dated 14 April 1989)**

Derogation from articles 12 and 21 of the Covenant in the Autonomous Province of Kosovo as from 28 March 1989. The measure became necessary because of disorders which led to the loss of human lives and which had threatened the established social system. This situation which represented a general danger was a threat to the rights, freedoms and security of all the citizens of the Province regardless of nationality.

**30 May 1989 (Dated 29 May 1989)**

Termination of the derogation from the provisions of article 12 of the Covenant in the Autonomous Province of Kosovo as from 21 May 1989. The right of public assembly [article 21] continues to be temporarily suspended but only as concerns demonstrations. This is aimed at protecting public order, peace and the rights of citizens, regardless of nationality.

**20 March 1990 (Dated 19 March 1990)**

As of 21 February 1990 and owing to the escalation of disorders which had led to the loss of human lives, the movement of persons in Kosovo was prohibited from 9 PM to 4 AM, thereby derogating from article 12; and that public assembly was prohibited for the purpose of demonstration, thereby derogating from article 21. The Government of Yugoslavia further indicated that the measure derogating from article 12 had been terminated as of 10 March 1990.

**26 April 1990 (Dated 24 April 1990)**

Termination of the state of emergency with effect from 18 April 1990.

See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2 Although Democratic Kampuchea had signed both [the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights] on 17 October 1980, the Government of Cambodia deposited an instrument of accession to the said Covenants.

3 The signature was effected by Democratic Kampuchea. In this regard the Secretary-General received, on 5 November 1980, the following communication from the Government of Mongolia:

"The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that only the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea as the sole authentic and lawful representative of the Kampuchean people has the right to assume international obligations on behalf of the Kampuchean people. Therefore the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that the signature of the Human Rights Covenants by the representative of the so-called Democratic Kampuchea, a régime that ceased to exist as a result of the people's revolution in Kampuchea, is null and void.

"The signing of the Human Rights Covenants by an individual, whose régime during its short period of reign in Kampuchea had exterminated about 3 million people and had thus grossly violated the elementary norms of human rights, each and every provision of the Human Rights Covenants is a regrettable precedence, which discredits the noble aims and lofty principles of the United Nations Charter, the very spirit of the above-mentioned Covenants, gravely impairs the prestige of the United Nations."

Thereafter, similar communications were received from the Government of the following States on the dates indicated and their texts were circulated as depositary notifications or, at the request of the States concerned, as official documents of the General Assembly (A/33/781 and A/35/784):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Date of receipt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German Democratic Republic</td>
<td>11 Dec 1980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
assume obligations on its behalf was the Government of the People's Republic of China.

Governments did not recognize the said signature as valid since the People's Republic of China.

Mongolia, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yugoslavia, stating that their United Nations of Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary.

Communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portugal" regarding Macao in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume. Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Covenant will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

Subsequently, on 12 March 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia had declared the following:

[The Czech and Slovak Federal Republic] recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee established on the basis of article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

Further, on 7 June 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia had made the following objection:

"The Government of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic considers the reservations entered by the Government of the Republic of Korea to the provisions of paragraphs 5 and 7 of article 14 and article 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. In the opinion of the Czechoslovak Government these reservations are in contradiction to the generally recognized principle of international law according to which a state cannot invoke the provisions of its own internal law as justification for its failure to perform a treaty."

"Therefore, the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic does not recognize these reservations as valid. Nevertheless the present declaration will not be deemed to be an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic and the Republic of Korea."

See also note 1 under “Czech Republic” and note 1 under “Slovakia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

On 25 August 1997, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea a notification of withdrawal from the Covenant, dated 23 August 1997.

As the Covenant does not contain a withdrawal provision, the Secretariat of the United Nations forwarded on 23 September 1997 an aide-mémoire to the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea notifying it of the withdrawal.

The residents of Macao shall not be restricted in the rights and freedoms that they are entitled to, unless otherwise provided for by law. In case of restrictions, they shall not contravene the provisions of the Covenant that are applicable to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

Within the above ambit, the Government of the People's Republic of China will assume the responsibility for the international rights and obligations that place on a Party to the Covenant.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Macao from China and Portugal (see note 3 under “China” and note 1 under “Portugal” regarding Macao in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Covenant with the statement made by China will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

2. The provisions of the Covenant which are applicable to the Macao Special Administrative Region shall be implemented in Macao through legislation of the Macao Special Administrative Region.

The residents of Macao shall not be restricted in the rights and freedoms that they are entitled to, unless otherwise provided for by law. In case of restrictions, they shall not contravene the provisions of the Covenant that are applicable to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

Within the above ambit, the Government of the People's Republic of China will assume the responsibility for the international rights and obligations that place on a Party to the Covenant.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Macao from China and Portugal (see note 3 under “China” and note 1 under “Portugal” regarding Macao in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Covenant with the statement made by China will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

5 Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 5 October 1967. See note 1 under “China” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

With reference to the above-mentioned signature, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Permanent Representatives of Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Mongolia, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yugoslavia, stating that their Governments did not recognize the said signature as valid since the only Government authorized to represent China and to assume obligations on its behalf was the Government of the People's Republic of China.

In letters addressed to the Secretary-General in regard to the above-mentioned communications, the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations stated that the Republic of China, a sovereign State and Member of the United Nations, had attended the twenty-first regular session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and contributed to the formulation of, and signed the Covenants and the Optional Protocol concerned, and that "any statements or reservations relating to the above-mentioned Covenants and Optional Protocol that are incompatible with or derogatory to the legitimate position of the Government of the Republic of China shall in no way affect the rights and obligations of the Republic of China under these Covenants and Optional Protocol".

6 With regard to the application of the Covenant to Hong Kong, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from the United Kingdom and China (see note 2 under “United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland” and note 2 under “China” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Covenant will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

7 Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 7 October 1968 and 23 December 1975, respectively, with reservations and declarations. For the texts of the reservations and declarations made upon signature and ratification, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 999, pp. 283 and 289.

On 25 August 1997, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea a notification of withdrawal from the Covenant, dated 23 August 1997.

As the Covenant does not contain a withdrawal provision, the Secretariat of the United Nations forwarded on 23 September 1997 an aide-mémoire to the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, stating that the said signature as valid since the only Government authorized to represent China and to assume obligations on its behalf was the Government of the People's Republic of China.

In letters addressed to the Secretary-General in regard to the above-mentioned communications, the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations stated that the Republic of China, a sovereign State and Member of the United Nations, had attended the twenty-first regular session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and contributed to the formulation of, and signed the Covenants and the Optional Protocol concerned, and that "any statements or reservations relating to the above-mentioned Covenants and Optional Protocol that are incompatible with or derogatory to the legitimate position of the Government of the Republic of China shall in no way affect the rights and obligations of the Republic of China under these Covenants and Optional Protocol".

6 With regard to the application of the Covenant to Hong Kong, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from the United Kingdom and China (see note 2 under “United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland” and note 2 under “China” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Covenant will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

7 Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 7 October 1968 and 23 December 1975, respectively, with reservations and declarations. For the texts of the reservations and declarations made upon signature and ratification, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 999, pp. 283 and 289.

Subsequently, on 12 March 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia had declared the following:

[The Czech and Slovak Federal Republic] recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee established on the basis of article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

Further, on 7 June 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia had made the following objection:

"The Government of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic considers the reservations entered by the Government of the Republic of Korea to the provisions of paragraphs 5 and 7 of article 14 and article 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. In the opinion of the Czechoslovak Government these reservations are in contradiction to the generally recognized principle of international law according to which a state cannot invoke the provisions of its own internal law as justification for its failure to perform a treaty."

"Therefore, the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic does not recognize these reservations as valid. Nevertheless the present declaration will not be deemed to be an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic and the Republic of Korea."

See also note 1 under “Czech Republic” and note 1 under “Slovakia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

8 On 25 August 1997, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea a notification of withdrawal from the Covenant, dated 23 August 1997.

As the Covenant does not contain a withdrawal provision, the Secretariat of the United Nations forwarded on 23 September 1997 an aide-mémoire to the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea notifying it of the withdrawal.
People's Republic of Korea explaining the legal position arising from the above notification.

As elaborated in this aide-mémoire, the Secretary-General is of the opinion that a withdrawal from the Covenant would not appear possible unless all States Parties to the Covenant agree with such a withdrawal.

The above notification of withdrawal and the aide-mémoire were duly circulated to all States Parties under cover of C.N.467.1997.TREATIES-10 of 12 November 1997.

9 See note 1 under “Germany” regarding Berlin (West) in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

10 The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Covenant with reservations and declarations, on 23 March 1973 and 8 November 1973, respectively (See, C.N.88.1973.TREATIES-3 of 20 April 1973). For the text of the reservations and declarations, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 999, p. 294. See also note 2 under “Germany” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

11 See note 1 under “Montenegro” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

12 See note 1 under “New Zealand” regarding Tokelau in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

13 With respect to the interpretative declarations made by Algeria the Secretary-General received, on 25 October 1990, from the Government of Germany the following declaration:

[The Federal Republic of Germany] interprets the declaration under paragraph 2 to mean that the latter is not intended to eliminate the obligation of Algeria to ensure that the rights guaranteed in article 8, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and in article 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights may be restricted only for the reasons mentioned in the said articles and that such restrictions shall be prescribed by law.

It interprets the declaration under paragraph 4 to mean that Algeria, by referring to its domestic legal system, does not intend to restrict its obligation to ensure through appropriate steps equality of rights and responsibilities of spouses as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution.

14 By a communication received on 6 November 1984, the Government of Australia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservations and declarations made upon ratification with regard to articles 2 and 50, 17, 19, 25 and to partially withdraw its reservations to articles 10 and 14. For the text of the reservations and declarations, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1197, p. 411.

15 The reservation was lodged with the Secretary-General on 4 December 2006 by Bahrain, following its accession to the Covenant on 20 September 2006.

In keeping with the depositary practice followed in similar cases, the Secretary-General proposed to receive the reservation in question for deposit in the absence of any objection on the part of any of the Contracting States, either to the deposit itself or to the procedure envisaged, within a period of 12 months from the date of the relevant depositary notification. In the absence of any such objection, the above reservation would be accepted in deposit upon the expiration of the above-stipulated 12 month period, that is on 28 December 2007.

In view of the below objections, the Secretary-General did not accept the reservation made by Bahrain in deposit. The Secretary-General received the following objections on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Netherlands (27 July 2007):

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Since the reservations were made after the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations were too late and therefore inconsistent with article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Furthermore, the reservation with respect to articles 3, 18 and 23 of the Covenant is a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that with this reservation the application of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights is made subject to the Islamic Shariah. This makes it unclear to what extent the Kingdom of Bahrain considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain as being inconsistent with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Since the reservations were made after the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations were too late and therefore inconsistent with article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain as being inconsistent with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Since the reservations were made after the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations were too late and therefore inconsistent with article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain as being inconsistent with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Since the reservations were made after the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations were too late and therefore inconsistent with article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain as being inconsistent with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Since the reservations were made after the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations were too late and therefore inconsistent with article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain as being inconsistent with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Since the reservations were made after the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations were too late and therefore inconsistent with article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain as being inconsistent with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Since the reservations were made after the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations were too late and therefore inconsistent with article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain as being inconsistent with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Since the reservations were made after the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations were too late and therefore inconsistent with article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain as being inconsistent with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Since the reservations were made after the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations were too late and therefore inconsistent with article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.
upon signature, ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. Taking into considerations the aforementioned, the Government of the Republic of Latvia considers that the said reservation is not in force since its submission."

Portugal (29 August 2007):

"The Government of the Portuguese Republic has carefully examined the reservations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). The Government of the Portuguese Republic notes that the reservations were made after the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant and is of the view that the practice of late reservations should be discouraged.

According to the first part of the reservation, the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain interprets the provisions of articles 3, 18 and 23 as not affecting in any way the prescriptions of the Islamic Shariah. These provisions deal namely with the questions of equality between men and women, freedom of thought, conscience and religion and the protection of family and marriage.

Portugal considers that these articles are fundamental provisions of the Covenant and the first reservation makes it unclear to what extent the Kingdom of Bahrain considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant, raises concerns as to the commitment of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the object and purpose of the Covenant and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international law.

It is in the common interest of all States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic, therefore, objects to the above mentioned reservation made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the ICCPR.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Portugal and Bahrain."

Czech Republic (12 September 2007):

"The Government of the Czech Republic has carefully examined the contents of reservation made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted on 16 December 1966, in respect of Articles 3, 18 and 23 thereof. Since the reservation was made after the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant, the Government of the Czech Republic considers that the reservation was too late and therefore inconsistent with article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Furthermore the Government of the Czech Republic is of the opinion that the aforementioned reservation is in contradiction with the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a State party to a treaty may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform according to the obligations set out by the treaty. Furthermore, the reservation consists of a general reference to the Constitution without specifying its content and as such does not clearly define to other Parties to the Covenant the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Covenant.

The Government of the Czech Republic recalls that it is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. According to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Czech Republic therefore objects to the aforementioned reservation made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Czech Republic and the Kingdom of Bahrain, without the Kingdom of Bahrain benefiting from its reservation."

Estonia (12 September 2007):

"The Government of Estonia has carefully examined the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Since the reservations were made after the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant, the Government of Estonia considers that the reservations were late and therefore inconsistent with international customary law as codified into Article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Furthermore, the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to Articles 3, 18 and 23 of the Covenant make a general reference to the prescriptions of the Islamic Shariah. The Government of Estonia is of the view that in the absence of any further clarification, the reservation makes it unclear to what extent the Kingdom of Bahrain considers itself bound by the obligations of the Convention and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

Therefore, the Government of Estonia objects to all of the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights since they were made after the accession, and specifically objects to the content of the reservations to Articles 3, 18 and 23.

Nevertheless, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights as between Estonia and the Kingdom of Bahrain."

Canada (18 September 2007):

"The Government of Canada has carefully examined the declaration made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain upon acceding to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, in accordance with which the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain ‘interprets the Provisions of Article 3, 18 and 23 as not affecting in any way the prescriptions of the Islamic Shariah’.

The Government of Canada notes that these declarations constitute in reality reservations and that they should have been lodged at the time of accession by Bahrain to the Covenant.
The Government of Canada considers that by making the interpretation of articles 3, 18 and 23 of the Covenant subject to the prescriptions of the Islamic Shariah, the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain is formulating reservations with a general, indeterminate scope, such that they make it impossible to identify the modifications to obligations under the Covenant, which they purport to introduce and they do not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention.

The Government of Canada notes that the reservations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain, addressing some of the most essential provisions of the Covenant, and aiming to exclude the obligations under those provisions, are in contradiction with the object and purpose of the Covenant. In addition, article 18 of the Covenant is among the provisions from which no derogation is allowed, according to article 4 of the Covenant.

The Government of Canada therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain. This objection does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Covenant between Canada and the Kingdom of Bahrain."

Australia (18 September 2007):

"The Government of Australia has examined the reservation made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. As the reservations were made after the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant, the Government of Australia considers that the reservations were late and therefore inconsistent with article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

The Government of Australia considers that the reservation with respect to articles 3, 18 and 23 of the Covenant is a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. The Government of Australia recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty is not permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Australia considers that the Kingdom of Bahrain is, through this reservation, purporting to make the application of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights subject to Islamic Shariah law. As a result, it is unclear to what extent the Kingdom of Bahrain considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Australia recalls the general principle of treaty interpretation, codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform a treaty.

Further, as regards the reservation with respect to article 18, the Government of Australia recalls that according to article 4 (2) of the Covenant, no derogation of article 18 is permitted.

The Government of Australia objects to all of the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain as they were made after accession, and specifically objects to the content of the reservation on article 3, 18 and 23 made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Australia and the Kingdom of Bahrain."

Ireland (27 September 2007):

"The Government of Ireland has examined the reservations made on 4 December 2006 by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Government of Ireland notes that the reservation was not made by the Kingdom of Bahrain at the time of its accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights on 20 September 2006.

The Government of Ireland further notes that the Kingdom of Bahrain subjects application of Articles 3, 18 and 23 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights to the prescriptions of the Islamic Shariah. The Government of Ireland is of the view that a reservation which consists of a general reference to religious law may cast doubts on the commitment of the reserving State to fulfil its obligations under the Covenant.

The Government of Ireland is furthermore of the view that such a general reservation may undermine the basis of international treaty law and is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Ireland also notes that the Kingdom of Bahrain does not consider that Article 9 (5) detracts from its right to layout the basis and rules of obtaining the compensation mentioned therein. The Government of Ireland is of the view that such a reservation which is vague and general in nature is to the basis and rules referred to may similarly make it unclear to what extent the reserving State considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant and cast doubts on the commitment of the reserving State to fulfil its obligations under the Covenant.

The Government of Ireland further notes that the Kingdom of Bahrain considers that no obligation arises from Article 14 (7) beyond those contained in Article 10 of its national Criminal Law. The Government of Ireland is of the view that such a reservation may cast doubts on the commitment of the reserving State to fulfil its obligations under the Covenant and may undermine the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of Ireland therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Ireland and the Kingdom of Bahrain."

Italy (1 November 2007):
"The Government of Italy has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain to Articles 3, 18 and 23 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Government of Italy considers that the reservation of the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain, whereby it excludes any interpretation of the provisions of Articles 3, 18 and 23, which would affect the prescription of the Islamic Shariah, does not clearly define the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligation under these Articles.

This reservation raises serious doubts about the real extent of the commitment undertaken by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain and is capable of contravening the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Italy therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain. This objection, however, shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Government of Italy and the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain."

Poland (3 December 2007)

“The Government of the Republic of Poland has examined the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain after its accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, opened for signature at New York on 19 December 1966, hereinafter called the Covenant, in respect of article 3, article 9 paragraph 5, article 14 paragraph 7, article 18 and article 23.

The Government of the Republic of Poland considers that the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain are so called late reservations, since they were made after the date of accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant. Therefore the reservations are inconsistent with article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, which provides for the possibility of formulation of reservations only when signing, ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to a treaty.

Furthermore, the Government of the Republic of Poland considers that as a result of reservations with respect to articles 3, 18 and 23 of the Covenant, the implementation of provisions of these articles by the Kingdom of Bahrain is made subject to the prescriptions of the Islamic Shariah, with the result that the extent to which the Kingdom of Bahrain has accepted the obligations of the said articles of the Covenant is not defined precisely enough for the other State Parties. The Republic of Poland considers that these reservations lead to differentiation in enjoyment of the rights warranted in the Covenant, which is incompatible with the purpose and object of the Covenant and therefore not permitted (article 19 c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties).

The Government of the Republic of Poland therefore objects to the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain.

However this objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Poland and the Kingdom of Bahrain."

Sweden (3 December 2007)

“The Government of Sweden notes that the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain were made after its accession to the Covenant. Since these reservations were formulated late they are to be considered inconsistent with the general principle of pacta sunt servanda as well as customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Furthermore the Government of Sweden notes that the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain has made a reservation with respect to articles 3, 18 and 23 giving precedence to the provisions of Islamic Shariah and national legislation over the application of the provisions of the Covenant. This reservation does not, in the opinion of the Government of Sweden, clearly specify the extent of the derogation by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain from the provisions in question and raises serious doubts as to the commitment of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Sweden would like to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties, to which they have chosen to become party, are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to all of the reservations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, as they were made after accession, and specifically objects to the content of the reservations on articles 3, 18 and 23 made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant, and considers them null and void.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant [in] its entirety between the Kingdom of Bahrain and Sweden, without the Kingdom of Bahrain benefiting from its reservations."

Hungary (4 December 2007)

“The Government of the Republic of Hungary has carefully examined the contents of the reservation made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted on 16 December 1966, in respect of Articles 3, 18 and 23 thereof. Since the reservation was made after the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant, the Government of the Republic of Hungary considers that the reservation was too late and therefore inconsistent with article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Furthermore the Government of the Republic of Hungary is of the opinion that the aforementioned reservation is in contradiction with the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a State party to a treaty may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform according to the obligations set out by the treaty. Furthermore, the reservation consists of a general reference to the Constitution without specifying its content and as such does not clearly define to other Parties to the Covenant the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Covenant.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary recalls that it is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake
any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. According to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Hungary and the Kingdom of Bahrain."

Mexico (13 December 2007)

The Permanent Mission of Mexico to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Treaty Section of the Office of Legal Affairs and has the honour to refer to the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights on 20 December 2006 and to the reservations that it made to various provisions, including articles 3, 18 and 23.

In that regard, the Permanent Mission of Mexico would like to state that the Government of Mexico has studied the content of Bahrain’s reservation and is of the view that it should be considered invalid because it is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The reserve formulated, if applied, would have the unavoidable result of making implementation of the articles mentioned subject to the provisions of Islamic Shariah, which would constitute discrimination in the enjoyment and exercise of the rights enshrined in the Covenant; this is contrary to all the articles of this international instrument. The principles of the equality of men and women and non-discrimination are enshrined in the preamble and article 2, paragraph 1 of the Covenant and in the preamble and Article 1, paragraph 3 of the Charter of the United Nations.

The objection of the Government of Mexico to the reservation in question should not be interpreted as an impediment to the entry into force of the Covenant between Mexico and the Kingdom of Bahrain.

Slovakia (18 December 2007):

"The Government of Slovakia has carefully examined the content of the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain upon its accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Government of Slovakia is of the opinion that the reservation of the Kingdom of Bahrain, whereby it excludes any interpretation of the provisions of Articles 3, 18 and 23, which would affect the prescription of the Islamic Shariah, does not clearly define the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligation under these Articles. This reservation is too general and raises serious doubts as to the commitment of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the object and the purpose of the Covenant.

For these reasons, the Government of Slovakia objects to the above mentioned reservations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain upon its accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Slovakia and the Kingdom of Bahrain. The Covenant enters into force in its entirety between Slovakia and the Kingdom of Bahrain without the Kingdom of Bahrain benefiting from its reservations."

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (27 December 2007):

"The United Kingdom objects to Bahrain’s reservations as they were made after the date of Bahrain’s accession to the Covenant.

The United Kingdom further objects to the substance of Bahrain’s first reservation, to Articles 3, 18 and 23. In the view of the United Kingdom a reservation should clearly define for the other States Parties to the Covenant the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Covenant. A reservation which consists of a general reference to a system of law without specifying its contents does not do so.

These objections shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Kingdom of Bahrain. However on account of their lateness the reservations shall have no effect as between Bahrain and the United Kingdom."

16 On 30 September 1992, the Government of Belarus notified the Secretary-General its decision to withdraw the reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification. For the text of the declaration regarding article 48 (1) so withdrawn, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 999, p. 282.

17 In a notification received on 14 September 1998, the Government of Belgium informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with regard to articles 2, 3 and 25 made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1312, p. 328.

18 With regard to the reservation made by Botswana upon signature and confirmed upon ratification, the Secretary-General received, from the following States, communications on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Austria (17 October 2001):

"Austria has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Botswana upon signature of the 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and confirmed upon ratification, regarding Articles 7 and 12 para. 3 of the Covenant.

The fact that Botswana is making the said articles subject to a general reservation referring to the contents of existing national legislation, in the absence of further clarification raises doubts as to the commitment of Botswana to the object and purpose of the Covenant. According to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. In Austria’s view the reservation in question is therefore inadmissible to the extent that its application could negatively affect the compliance by Botswana with its obligations under Articles 7 and 12 para. 3 of the Covenant."
For these reasons, Austria objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Botswana to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant in its entirety between Botswana and Austria, without Botswana benefiting from its reservation."

Italy (20 December 2001):

“The Government of the Italian Republic has examined the reservations made by the Republic of Botswana upon signature of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and confirmed upon ratification, regarding articles 7 and 12, paragraph 3 of the Covenant.

The Government of the Italian Republic notes that the aforesaid articles of the Covenant are being made subject to a general reservation referring to the contents of existing legislation in Botswana. The Government of the Italian Republic is of the view that, in the absence of further clarification, these reservations referring to international legislation raise doubts as to the commitment of Botswana to fulfill its obligation under the Covenant.

The Government of the Italian Republic considers these reservations to be incompatible with the object and the purpose of the Covenant according to article 19 of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the law of treaties. These reservations do not fall within the rule of article 20, paragraph 5, and can be objected at any time.

Therefore, the Italian Government objects to the reservations made by the Republic of Botswana to the Covenant.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Italy and Botswana”.  

On 2 April 2014, Denmark modified the reservation made upon ratification which reads as follows:

"1. The Government of Denmark makes a reservation in respect of Article 10, paragraph 3, second sentence. In Danish practice, considerable efforts are made to ensure appropriate age distribution of convicts serving sentences of imprisonment, but it is considered valuable to maintain possibilities of flexible arrangements.

2. (a). Article 14, paragraph 1, shall not be binding on Denmark in respect of public hearings. In Danish law, the right to exclude the press and the public from trials may go beyond what is permissible under this Covenant, and the Government of Denmark finds that this right should not be restricted.

(b). Article 14, paragraphs 5 and 7, shall not be binding on Denmark.

The Danish Administration of Justice Act contains detailed provisions regulating the matters dealt with in these two paragraphs. In some cases, Danish legislation is less restrictive than the Covenant (e.g. a verdict returned by a jury on the question of guilt cannot be reviewed by a higher tribunal, cf. paragraph 5); in other cases, Danish legislation is more restrictive than the Covenant (e.g. with respect to resumption of a criminal case in which the accused party was acquitted, cf. paragraph 7).

3. Reservation is further made to Article 20, paragraph 5. This reservation is in accordance with the vote cast by Denmark in the XVI General Assembly of the United Nations in 1961 when the Danish Delegation, referring to the preceding article concerning freedom of expression, voted against the prohibition against propaganda for war.”

In communications received on 29 March 1985 and 26 July 1990, the Government of Finland notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservations made upon ratification with respect to articles 13 and 14 (1) (the notification indicates that the withdrawal was effected because the relevant provisions of the Finnish legislation have been amended as to correspond fully to articles 13 and 14 (1) of the Covenant), and with respect to articles 9 (3) and 14 (3) (d), respectively. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 999, p. 291.

In a communication received on 22 March 1988, the Government of France notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw, with effect from that date, its reservation with regard to article 19 made upon accession to the said Covenant. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1202, p. 395.

In a communication received on 26 July 2012, the Government of France notified the Secretary-General of its decision to partially withdraw, its reservation with regard to article 14, paragraph 5 made upon accession. The reservation upon accession read as follows:

The Government of the Republic interprets article 14, paragraph 5, as stating a general principle to which the law may make limited exceptions, for example, in the case of certain offences subject to the initial and final adjudication of a police court and of criminal offences. However, an appeal against a final decision may be made to the Court of Cassation which rules on the legality of the decision concerned.

In a communication received on that same date, the Government of Germany indicated that it wishes to call attention to the reservations made by the Federal Republic of Germany upon ratification of the Covenant with regard to articles 19, 21 and 22 in conjunction with articles 2 (1), 14 (3), 14 (5) and 15 (1).

On 18 October 1993, the Government of Iceland notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw as of 18 October 1993, the reservation to paragraph 3(a) of article 8, made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1144, p. 386.

On 19 October 2009, the Government of Iceland notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation concerning article 13 (3), made upon ratification to the Covenant. The text of the reservation withdrawn reads as follows:

Article 13, to the extent that it is inconsistent with the Icelandic legal provisions in force relating to the right of aliens to object to a decision on their expulsion.

On 12 April 1994 and 24 August 1998, respectively, the Government of Ireland notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the declaration with respect to article 6 (5),
on the one hand, and the reservations made to articles 14 (6) and 23 (4), on the other, made upon ratification. For the text of the declaration and reservations, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1551, p. 352.

On 26 January 2009, the Government of Ireland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation with respect to article 14 made upon ratification, which read as follows: “Ireland reserves the right to confer a monopoly on or require the licensing of broadcasting enterprises.”

On 15 December 2011, the Government of Ireland informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation concerning article 19 paragraph 2 of the Covenant made upon ratification. The text of the reservation withdrawn reads as follows:

“Ireland reserves the right to confer a monopoly on or require the licensing of broadcasting enterprises.”

With reference to the ratification of the above Covenant by Italy, the Government of Italy informed the Secretary-General, by a notification received on 20 December 2005, of its decision to withdraw the following reservations in respect of articles 9 (5), 12 (4) and 14 (5), made upon ratification of the Covenant:

Article 9, paragraph 5

The Italian Republic, considering that the expression "unlawful arrest or detention" contained in article 9, paragraph 5, could give rise to differences of interpretation, declares that it interprets the aforementioned expression as referring exclusively to cases of arrest or detention contrary to the provisions of article 9, paragraph 1.

Article 12, paragraph 4

Article 12, paragraph 4, shall be without prejudice to the application of transitional provision XIII of the Italian Constitution, respecting prohibition of the entry into and sojourn in the national territory of certain members of the House of Savoy.

Article 14, paragraph 5

Article 14, paragraph 5, shall be without prejudice to the application of existing Italian provisions which, in accordance with the Constitution of the Italian Republic, govern the conduct, at one level only, of proceedings instituted before the Constitutional Court in respect of charges brought against the President of the Republic and its Ministers.

On 20 May 2016, the Government of the State of Kuwait notified the Secretary-General of its decision to partially withdraw the reservation to article 25 (b) made upon its accession to the Covenant. The reservation made upon accession read as follows:

"The Government of Kuwait wishes to formulate a reservation with regard to article 25(b). The provisions of this paragraph conflict with the Kuwaiti electoral law, which restricts the right to stand and vote in elections to males.

It further declares that the provisions of the article shall not apply to members of the armed forces or the police.”

With regard to the reservation made by the Lao People's Democratic Republic upon ratification, the Secretary-General received, from the following States, communications on the dates indicated hereinafter:

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (21 October 2010):

“The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland has carefully examined the reservation made by the Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic upon ratification of the International Covenant on Civil and Political rights.

The United Kingdom considers that with this reservation the application of Article 22 of the Covenant is made subject to national law in force in the Lao People's Democratic Republic. This makes it unclear to what extent the Lao People's Democratic Republic considers itself bound by the obligations under Article 22 of the Covenant.

The United Kingdom therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic to Article 22 of the Covenant. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Lao People's Democratic Republic.”

Sweden (18 October 2010):

“The Government of Sweden notes that the Lao People’s Democratic Republic has reserved the right to interpret Article 22 in accordance with Article 1, and to apply to Article 22 as to be in conformity with the Constitution and relevant national laws of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic. The Government of Sweden is of the belief that this reservation, which does not clearly specify the extent of the derogation, raises serious doubt as to the commitment of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

According to international customary law, as codified in Article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a Convention shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of all States that treaties, to which they have chosen to become parties, are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligation under the treaties.

Furthermore, the Government of Sweden recalls that the designation assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is modified or excluded does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. It is the understanding of the Government of Sweden that the declaration of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic concerning articles 1 and 18 of the Covenant modifies the legal effect of the
provisions of the Covenant in their application to Lao People’s Democratic Republic. Hence the Government of Sweden considers that these interpretative declarations in substance constitute reservations.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Lao People’s Democratic Republic to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and considers the reservations null and void.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Lao People’s Democratic Republic and Sweden. The Covenant enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without Lao People’s Democratic Republic benefiting from its reservations.”

31 On 28 April 2000, the Government of Liechtenstein informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation to article 20 paragraph 2 of the Covenant made upon accession. The text of the reservation reads as follows:

“The Principality of Liechtenstein reserves the right not to adopt further measures to ban propaganda for war, which is prohibited by article 20, paragraph 1 of the Covenant. The Principality of Liechtenstein reserves the right to adopt a criminal provision which will take into account the requirements of article 20, paragraph 2, on the occasion of its possible accession to the Convention of 21 December 1965 on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.”

On 13 October 2009, the Government of Liechtenstein informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation concerning article 24 paragraph 3 of the Covenant made upon accession. The text of the reservation withdrawn reads as follows:

“The Principality of Liechtenstein reserves the right to apply the Liechtenstein legislation according to which Liechtenstein nationality is granted under certain conditions.”

32 With regard to the reservation made by Maldives upon accession, the Secretary-General received, from the following States, communications on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Italy (1 November 2007):

"The Government of Italy has examined the reservation made by the Republic of Maldives with respect to Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Government of Italy considers that, by providing that the application of Article 18 is without prejudice to the Constitution of the Republic of Maldives, the reservation does not clearly define the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligation under that Article. This reservation raises serious doubts about the real extent of the commitment undertaken by the Republic of Maldives and is capable of contravening the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Italy therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservation made by the Republic of Maldives.

This objection, however, shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Government of Italy and the Republic of Maldives.”

Slovakia (21 December 2007):

“The Government of Slovakia has carefully examined the content of the reservations made by the Republic of Maldives upon its accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Government of Slovakia is of the view that general reservation made by the Republic of Maldives that (The application of the principles set out in Article 18 of the Covenant shall be without prejudice to the Constitution of the Republic of Maldives) is too general and does not clearly specify the extent of the obligations under the Covenant for the Republic of Maldives.

According to the Maldivian legal system, mainly based on the principles of Islamic law, the reservation raises doubts as to the commitment of the Republic of Maldives to its obligations under the Covenant, essential for the fulfillment of its object and purpose.

The Government of Slovakia objects for these reasons to the above-mentioned reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Maldives upon its accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

33 On 15 March 2002, the Government of Mexico notified the Secretary-General of a partial withdrawal of its reservation to article 25 (b) made upon accession. The reservation made upon accession read as follows:

Article 25, subparagraph (b):

The Government of Mexico also makes a reservation to this provision, since article 130 of the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States provides that ministers of religion shall have neither an active nor a passive vote, nor the right to form associations for political purposes.

On 11 July 2014, the Government of Mexico notified the Secretary-General of the Partial withdrawal of the reservation made upon accession. The portion of the reservation which has been withdrawn read as follows:

Article 13. The Government of Mexico makes a reservation to this article, in view of the present text of article 33 of the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States.

34 In a communication received on 20 December 1983, the Government of the Netherlands notified the Secretary-General that it was withdrawing its reservation with regard to article 25 (c). The text of the reservation read as follows:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not accept this provision in the case of the Netherlands Antilles."

See notes 1 and 2 under “Netherlands” regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

35 In a notification received by the Secretary-General on 12 December 1979, the Government of Norway withdrew the reservation formulated simultaneously in respect of article 6 (4).
The Secretary-General received the following communication(s) related to the reservations made by Pakistan, on the date(s) indicated hereinafter:

The Netherlands (30 June 2011)

“The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon ratification of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that with its reservations to the Articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13,18, 19 and 25 of the Covenant, the Islamic Republic of Pakistan has made the application of essential obligations under the Covenant concerning, amongst others, equality between men and women, the right to life, including restrictions on the imposition of the death penalty, the prohibition of torture, freedom of thought, conscience and religion, freedom of expression, the right to liberty of movement and freedom in the choice of residence, restrictions on the expulsion of aliens lawfully in the territory of a State Party, the right to take part in public affairs, the right to vote and to be elected and the right to have access to public service on terms of equality subject to the Sharia laws and/or the constitutional and/or national laws in force in Pakistan.

This makes it unclear to what extent the Islamic Republic of Pakistan considers itself bound by the obligations of the treaty and raises concerns as to the commitment of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that reservations of this kind must be regarded as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant and would recall that, according to customary international law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has also examined the reservation of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan with respect to Article 40 of the Covenant.

The Government of the Netherlands considers that the supervisory machinery established under the Covenant, including the system of periodic reporting to the Human Rights Committee established pursuant to Article 40 forms an essential part of the treaty. Accordingly, a reservation such as the reservation of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, in which a State Party declares not to recognize the competence of the Human Rights Committee to review and comment State periodic reports must be considered contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant and shall therefore not be permitted.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the reservations of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the aforesaid Articles of the Covenant.

This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.”

Subsequently, in a communication received on 20 September 2011, the Government of Pakistan notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to partially withdraw the reservations, made upon ratification, to articles 3 and 25 of the Convention.

These reservations read as follows:

Article 3

“‘The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan declares that the provisions of Article 3 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights shall be so applied as to be in conformity with Personal Law of the citizens and Qanoon-e-Shahadat’.

Article 25

“‘The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan states that the application of Article 25 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights shall be subject to the principle laid down in Article 41 (2) and Article 91 (3) of the Constitution of Pakistan’.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 20 September 2011, the Government of Pakistan notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to partially withdraw the reservations, made upon ratification, to articles 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19 and 40 of the Convention.

These reservations read as follows:

“Article 3, 6, 7, 18 and 19

‘[The] Islamic Republic of Pakistan declares that the provisions of Articles 3, 6, 7, 18 and 19 shall be so applied to the extent that they are not repugnant to the Provisions of the Constitution of Pakistan and the Sharia laws’.

Article 12

‘The Islamic Republic of Pakistan declares that the provisions of Articles 12 shall be so applied as to be in conformity with the Provisions of the Constitution of Pakistan’.

Article 13

‘With respect to Article 13, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan reserves its right to apply its law relating to foreigners’.

Article 40

‘The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan hereby declares that it does not recognize the competence of the Committee provided for in Article 40 of the Covenant’.”

On 15 March 1991, 19 January 1993 and 2 April 2007, respectively, the Government of the Republic of Korea notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservations made in respect of article 23 (4) (with effect from 15 March 1991), of article 14 (7) (with effect from 21 January 1993) and of article 14 (5) (with effect from 2 April 2007) made upon accession.

On 16 October 1995, the Government of Switzerland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its
reservation to article 20, paragraph 2 made upon accession, which reads as follows:

Switzerland reserves the right to adopt a criminal provision which will take into account the requirements of article 20, paragraph 2, on the occasion of its forthcoming accession to the 1966 International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

Further, on 12 January 2004, the Government of Switzerland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation to article 14, paragraph 3, sub-paragraphs (d) and (f) made upon accession, which reads as follows:

The guarantee of free legal assistance assigned by the court and of the free assistance of an interpreter does not definitively exempt the beneficiary from defraying the resulting costs.

Further, on 1 May 2007, the Government of Switzerland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservations to article 10, paragraph 2 (b) and article 14, paragraph 1 and 5 made upon accession, which reads as follows:

(a) Reservation concerning article 10, paragraph 2 (b): The separation of accused juvenile persons from adults is not unconditionally guaranteed.

(b) Reservations concerning article 14, paragraph 1:

The principle of a public hearing is not applicable to proceedings which involve a dispute relating to civil rights and obligations or to the merits of the prosecution's case in a criminal matter; these, in accordance with cantonal laws, are held before an administrative authority. The principle that any judgement rendered shall be made public is adhered to without prejudice to the cantonal laws on civil and criminal procedure, which provide that a judgement shall not be rendered at a public hearing, but shall be transmitted to the parties in writing.

The guarantee of a fair trial has as its sole purpose, where disputes relating to civil right and obligations are concerned, to ensure final judicial review of the acts or decisions of public authorities which have a bearing on such rights or obligations. The Term "final judicial review" means a judicial examination which is limited to the application of the law, such as a review by a Court of Cassation.

The right to liberty of movement and freedom to choose one's residence is applicable, subject to the federal laws on aliens, which provide that residence and establishment permits shall be valid only for the canton which issues them.

(c) Reservation concerning article 14, paragraph 5:

The reservation applies to the federal laws on the organization of criminal justice, which provide for an exception to the right of anyone convicted of a crime to have his conviction and sentence reviewed by a higher tribunal, where the person concerned is tried in the first instance by the highest tribunal.

39 On 6 July 2012, the Government of the Thailand notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its declarations made upon accession with respect to articles 6 (5) and 9 (3) of the Covenant. The text of the withdrawn declarations read as follows:

2. With respect to article 6, paragraph 5 of the Covenant, the Thai Penal Code enjoins, or in some cases allows much latitude for, the Court to take into account the offender's youth as a mitigating factor in handing down sentences. Whereas Section 74 of the Code does not allow any kind of punishment levied upon any person below fourteen years of age, Section 75 of the same Code provides that whenever any person over fourteen years but not yet over seventeen years of age commits any act provided by the law to be an offence, the Court shall take into account the sense of responsibility and all other things concerning him in order to come to decision as to whether it is appropriate to pass judgment inflicting punishment on him or not. If the court does not deem it appropriate to pass judgment inflicting punishment, it shall proceed according to Section 74 (viz. to adopt other correction measures short of punishment), or if the Court deems it appropriate to pass judgment inflicting punishment, it shall reduce the scale of punishment provided for such offence by one half. Section 76 of the same Code also states that whenever any person over seventeen years but not yet over twenty years of age, commits any act provided by the law to be an offence, the Court may, if it thinks fit, reduce the scale of the punishment provided for such offence by one third or one half. The reduction of the said scale will prevent the Court from passing any sentence of death. As a result, though in theory, sentence of death may be imposed for crimes committed by persons below eighteen years, but not below seventeen years of age, the Court always exercises its discretion under Section 75 to reduce the said scale of punishment, and in practice the death penalty has not been imposed upon any persons below eighteen years of age. Consequently, Thailand considers that in real terms it has already complied with the principles enshrined herein.

3. With respect to article 9, paragraph 3 of the Covenant, Section 87, paragraph 3 of the Criminal Procedure Code of Thailand provides that the arrested person shall not be kept in custody for more than forty-eight hours from the time of his arrival at the office of the administrative or police official, but the time for bringing the arrested person to the Court shall not be included in the said period of forty-eight hours. In case it is necessary for the purpose of conducting the inquiry, or there arises any other necessity, the period of forty-eight hours may be extended as long as such necessity persists, but in no case shall it be longer than seven days."

The instrument of withdrawal included an annex which read as follows:

The Government of Kingdom of Thailand declares that:

1. With respect to Article 6 paragraph 5 of the Covenant, Section 18 of the Thai Criminal Code has been amended to include provisions stipulating that the death and life sentences shall not be imposed on an offender who is below the age of 18 and in which case, the sentence shall be reduced to a sentence of 50 years imprisonment.

2. As with regard to Article 9 paragraph 3 of the Covenant, Section 40 paragraph 7 of the 2007 Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand stipulates that in criminal cases, the accused or defendant shall have the right to proper, prompt and fair investigations or trial and Section 87 of the Thai Criminal Procedural Code has been amended to stipulate that an arrested person shall not be held in custody beyond the necessity of the circumstances of the case. In the case of a petty offence, the arrested person shall be in custody...
only until such time as that person has given his/her pleadings, and that the identity and the location of that person have been sought. In the case where the arrested person has not been temporarily released and it is necessary to investigate or try the person, the arrested person shall be arraigned before the Court within 48 hours from the time the person was taken to the offices of the inquiry officer in accordance with Section 83 of the same Code unless for reasons of force majeure or other unavoidable necessity.

3. Such amendments are fully in compliance with Article 6 paragraph 5 and Article 9 paragraph 3 of the Covenant.

40 In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 31 January 1979, the Government of Trinidad and Tobago confirmed that paragraph (vi) constituted an interpretative declaration which did not aim to exclude nor modify the legal effect of the provisions of the Covenant.

41 In a communication received on 2 February 1993, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation to sub-paragraph c) of article 25 made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1007, p. 394.

In a communication received on 4 February 2015, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the following reservation:

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right not to apply article 11 in Jersey."

42 The formality was effected by Democratic Yemen. See also note 1 under “Yemen” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

43 See "ENTRY INTO FORCE:" at the beginning of this chapter.


45 A note verbal, dated 28 January 1998, transmitting the text of the declaration made by the Government of Spain recognizing the competence of the Human Rights Committee under article 41 of the Covenant was deposited on 30 January 1998. Subsequently, in order to correct an error contained in that declaration, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Spain a note verbal dated 9 March 1998, transmitting a corrected and signed text of the declaration which was deposited on 11 March 1998.

Previous declarations were received on 25 January 1985 and 21 December 1988, and expired on 25 January 1988 and 21 December 1993, respectively.

46 On 3 October 1983, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following declaration in respect of the territorial application of the Covenant to the Falkland Islands:

[The Government of Argentina makes a] formal objection to the [declaration] of territorial extension issued by the United Kingdom with regard to the Malvinas Islands (and dependencies), which that country is illegally occupying and refers to as the "Falkland Islands".

The Argentine Republic rejects and considers null and void the [said declaration] of territorial extension.

With reference to the above-mentioned objection the Secretary-General received on 28 February 1985 from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the following declaration:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have no doubt as to their right, by notification to the Depositary under the relevant provisions of the above-mentioned Convention, to extend the application of the Convention in question to the Falkland Islands or to the Falkland Islands Dependencies, as the case may be.

For this reason alone, the Government of the United Kingdom are unable to regard the Argentine [communication] under reference as having any legal effect."

With reference to the above-mentioned declaration by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following declaration made upon ratification:

The Argentine Republic rejects the extension, notified to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 20 May 1976 by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, of the application of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 16 December 1966, to the Malvinas, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands, and reaffirms its sovereign rights to those archipelagos, which it considers as integral part of its national territory.

The General Assembly of the United Nations had adopted resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6 and 40/21 in which it recognizes the existence of a sovereignty dispute regarding the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) and urges the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to pursue negotiations in order to find as soon as possible a peaceful and definitive solution to the dispute, through the good offices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall inform the General Assembly of the progress made."

With reference to the above-mentioned declaration by the Government of Argentina, the Secretary-General received on 13 January 1988 from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following communication:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland rejects the statements made by the Argentine Republic, regarding the Falkland Islands and South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, when ratifying [the said Covenants and acceding to the said Protocol]."
The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland has no doubt as to British sovereignty over the Falkland Islands and South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and its consequent right to extend treaties to those territories.

Subsequently, on 5 October 2000, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following communication:

[The Argentine Republic] wishes to refer to the report submitted by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the Human Rights Committee concerning its overseas territories (CCPR/C/UKOT/99/5).

In that connection, the Argentine Republic wishes to recall that by its note of 3 October 1983 it rejected the extension of the application of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights to the Malvinas Islands, which was effected by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on 20 May 1976.

The Government of Argentina rejects the designation of the Malvinas Islands as Overseas Dependent Territories of the United Kingdom or any other similar designation.

Consequently, the Argentine Republic does not recognize the section concerning the Malvinas Islands contained in the report which the United Kingdom has submitted to the Human Rights Committee (CCPR/C/UKOT/99/5) or any other document or instrument having a similar tenor that may derive from this alleged territorial extension.

The United Nations General Assembly has adopted resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6, 40/21, 41/40, 42/19 and 43/25, in which it recognizes that a dispute exists concerning sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands and urges the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to continue negotiations with a view to resolving the dispute peacefully and definitively as soon as possible, assisted by the good offices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who is to report to the General Assembly on the progress made.

The Argentine Republic reaffirms its rights of sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime spaces, which are an integral part of its national territory.

Further, on 20 December 2000, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the following communication:

“The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland rejects as unfounded the claims made by the Argentine Republic in its communication to the depositary of 5 [October] 2000. The Government of the United Kingdom recalls that in its declaration received by the depositary on 13 January 1988 it rejected the objection by the Argentine Republic to the extension by the United Kingdom of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights to the Falkland Islands and to South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands. The Government of the United Kingdom has no doubt about the sovereignty of the United Kingdom over the Falkland Islands and over South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and its consequential rights to apply the Convention with respect to those territories.”