



**Convention against Torture
and Other Cruel, Inhuman
or Degrading Treatment
or Punishment**

Distr.: General
4 November 2013

Original: English

**Committee against Torture
Fifty-first session**

Summary record of the 1175th meeting

Held at the Palais Wilson, Geneva, on Wednesday, 30 October 2013, at 3 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr. Grossman

Contents

Consideration of reports submitted by States parties under article 19 of the Convention
(continued)

Fourth periodic report of Uzbekistan (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent *within one week of the date of this document* to the Editing Unit, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the public meetings of the Committee at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.

Consideration of reports submitted by States parties under article 19 of the Convention *(continued)*

Fourth periodic report of Uzbekistan (continued) (CAT/C/UZB/4)

1. *At the invitation of the Chairperson, the delegation of Uzbekistan took places at the Committee table.*
2. **Mr. Saidov** (Uzbekistan) said that his delegation was ready for an open, constructive and honest dialogue with the Committee. However, Committee members appeared to have paid scant attention to the content of his Government's fourth periodic report. His delegation had been left perplexed by the stated position of a number of Committee members that, a priori they placed little faith in information provided by the Government of Uzbekistan. Instead, they lent greater credence to information supplied by politically motivated NGOs. If the Committee did not wish to listen to the point of view of the State party, it should at least pay heed to reports by other international bodies, whose views did not coincide with those expressed by Committee members. They included the report of the universal periodic review (UPR) Working Group on Uzbekistan, which had been adopted in April 2013 and in which largely positive views on the human rights situation in the State party had been expressed. Of 30 recommendations regarding torture made to the State party in the wake of the UPR, it had accepted 17. Most of those rejected had concerned accession to a number of international instruments. States parties were entitled to accept only those recommendations they considered to be in the national interest. Citing further reports from the Human Rights Council, the Human Rights Committee and the Committee on the Rights of the Child, he said that it was important to take into account information from all sources.
3. The single greatest challenge facing his Government with regard to human rights education was the need to change opinions widely held by members of the public. The provision of quality education was a top priority for the Government and, according to World Bank figures, 97 per cent of the population was literate. The Committee against Torture had been critical of the quality of human rights training provided to law enforcement personnel in the State party, but the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women had welcomed its efforts in that regard. The State party followed recommendations on the matter made by United Nations agencies. Human rights education programmes currently reached about one fifth of the population. Particular efforts were made to ensure that law enforcement and prison personnel were apprised of international human rights standards.
4. The Committee had mentioned data relating to child labour that were three years out of date. A recent report by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) showed that 4.5 million children had in no way been involved in the cotton harvest in 2012. Claims that at least 1.5 million children had been forced to work on the 2012 harvest were false. It was equally untrue that the cotton harvest took three months; in 2012, it had been completed in 35 days.
5. Furthermore, it was untrue that civil society activities had been curtailed in recent years. On the contrary, the number of NGOs operating in the State party had risen steadily from around 200 in 1991 to 6,500 in 2013; more than 30 of the latter were foreign and international organizations. Moreover, a parliamentary commission on civil society had been established in order to support such organizations. In the previous five years, the Government had allocated more than 30 billion sum (US\$ 140 million) in grants to over 1,000 NGOs.

6. The European Court of Human Rights had no jurisdiction in the State party, where its rulings carried no legal weight. The former Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, Mr. Manfred Nowak, had stated that there was no evidence of systematic use of torture in Uzbekistan. The role of the State party's interdepartmental working group on the implementation of the Convention had been strengthened by a Government decision adopted in 2012. Prison reform had led to a significant reduction in the prison population, and in the previous five years more than 200 prison visits had been undertaken by various organizations. International treaties took precedence over domestic legislation.

7. **Mr. Usmanov** (Uzbekistan) said that his delegation took issue with the assertion that the definition of torture in article 235 of the Criminal Code did not meet the requirements of article 1 of the Convention. Expert opinion considered that the only difference between the two was that the Criminal Code specifically referred to offenders who were law enforcement officials, procurators and prison service personnel. Offenders who were not civil servants were covered by other articles of the Code. Otherwise it was in full conformity with the Convention.

8. **Mr. Saidov** (Uzbekistan) said that on more than one occasion national and international legal opinion had been sought to clarify the question of the compatibility of the Criminal Code with article 1 of the Convention. In early October 2013, the matter had been discussed with a member of the law faculty of the University of London. In 2009, the Supreme Court of Uzbekistan had issued a ruling, binding on all courts, to the effect that, in conformity with the Convention and the Criminal Code, a representative, or a party acting in the name, of a State body that committed acts of torture or in any way aided and abetted the commission of such acts was criminally liable.

9. **Mr. Djasimov** (Uzbekistan) said that there was no impunity for offenders who perpetrated acts of torture or other cruel treatment in Uzbekistan. Since the beginning of 2012, 22 members of law enforcement agencies had been brought to trial on criminal charges relating to the use of torture in cases involving 15 victims. To date, 8 cases had been heard and 18 convictions had been handed down. Three of those convicted had subsequently been released under an amnesty. The guilty parties had been sentenced to prison terms of up to 12 years, depending on the seriousness of the offences. The sentences were in full conformity with the law and decisions of the Supreme Court. Contrary to statements by the Committee, Dilmurod Saidov, convicted of theft by a court in Samarkand Province, had in fact been represented by legal counsel from Tashkent.

10. **Mr. Saidov** (Uzbekistan), noting that Committee members had queried amnesties granted to persons who had been convicted of acts of torture, asked why they should be less entitled to benefit from amnesties than any other offenders serving prison terms for other crimes. International human rights law, after all, laid particular emphasis on the importance of equal rights for all.

11. **Mr. Usmanov** (Uzbekistan) said that the activities, life and health of lawyers were safeguarded by the State. The Chamber of Lawyers, which had branches in Karakalpakstan and Tashkent Province, was an independent, self-regulating body. Licensed lawyers had the right to practise individually, as partners in a law firm or as consultants. They could be registered only in one such capacity with the Ministry of Justice, in line with regulations established by the Cabinet.

12. **Mr. Saidov** (Uzbekistan) said that the Chamber of Lawyers had been established by parliament in order to bring the former association of lawyers into line with international standards. The Chamber had a section that monitored lawyers' qualifications. It was a wholly independent body, but licences to practise as a lawyer were granted by the Ministry of Justice.

13. **Mr. Shodiyev** (Uzbekistan) said that, in conformity with article 58 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, women prisoners were housed separately from men. Similarly, underage offenders were separated from adults and first-time offenders from prisoners serving lengthy sentences. All prisoners were provided with clothes and shoes that met seasonal requirements, three meals a day and medical care. All prisoners, both unconvicted and convicted, were entitled to see lawyers and relatives, and had an unlimited right to legal assistance, without need to obtain permission from the authorities. The State party worked with the World Health Organization to ensure that appropriate health care was available in places of detention. All prisoners had access to health care and convicted prisoners were given medical check-ups every six months. A permanent clinic operated in all prisons and there was a national central hospital for prisoners.

14. Thirteen highly qualified doctors were employed by the prisons medical service and, since 2012, 127 prison medical staff members had attended refresher courses. The prison service was working closely with the Ministry of Health on a programme to combat tuberculosis that covered 80 per cent of the prison population. The incidence of the disease had fallen by 40 per cent in recent years and tuberculosis mortality had been halved. The State party also worked with the joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), the German Development Bank and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. Doctors working for the prison service attended supplementary training courses.

15. Prison medical staff, along with some non-medical colleagues and justice officials, received regular training to assess patients for signs of torture and ill-treatment. Prisoners had the right to file complaints of ill-treatment and received thorough follow-up medical examinations. Where signs of torture were detected, appropriate measures were taken.

16. **Mr. Saidov** (Uzbekistan) said that the principal goal of human rights training for law enforcement and prison service personnel was to bring about a fundamental change in their attitudes to human rights.

17. **Mr. Djasimov** (Uzbekistan) said that the principle of habeas corpus had been applied successfully in the State party since 2008. As in other countries, suspects were placed in custody, which in Uzbekistan could not exceed 72 hours, prior to being brought to trial. Under the Code of Criminal Procedure, a suspect could be arrested if caught in the place where the offence had been committed, if evidence of involvement in the criminal act was found on his or her person, or if victims or witnesses of the crime identified the suspect as the culprit.

18. The procurator must apply to the courts for a warrant to arrest the suspect, became personally responsible for questioning the suspect and must ensure that the suspect was examined for possible signs of ill-treatment under questioning. In 2012, the courts had rejected more than 300 requests for arrest warrants by procurators. Court proceedings never took place in the absence of the accused, except in cases of trial in absentia. No data were available to suggest that there had been violations of the 72-hour limit on police custody. The procurator was obliged to bring the suspect before a court no later than 12 hours before expiry of the lawful period of custody. Only in a few cases had that obligation not been met.

19. The application of habeas corpus had led to a significant drop in the number of persons held in pretrial detention as a proportion of the total prison population (from 22 per cent in 2010 to 15 per cent in 2013). Increasingly, alternatives to pretrial detention were being applied.

20. **Mr. Saidov** (Uzbekistan) said that, when introducing the remedy of habeas corpus, the Government had distributed thousands of booklets to prisoners concerning their rights and obligations. The booklets were available in the most commonly spoken languages in Uzbekistan. The remedy served as a guarantee of the prevention of torture.

21. Many of the questions posed by Committee members related to the rights of so-called human rights defenders; yet, it was unclear to him what criteria were used to identify individuals as such. The majority of the persons mentioned by Committee members had been convicted for specific crimes, not for their defence of human rights. In his view, to refer to them as human rights defenders was to politicize the debate.

22. **Mr. Shodiyev** (Uzbekistan) said that articles in both the Constitution and the Code of Criminal Procedure expressly prohibited all forms of torture. A special inspectorate answerable to the Ministry of Internal Affairs had been established for the purpose of investigating offences, including torture, committed by State officials or police officers. Those who were found guilty received heavy penalties. A number of the human rights defenders named by the Committee had been released and had returned to their country of origin, including Norboy Kholjigitov in October 2011 and Yusuf Jumaev in May 2011. The authorities had thoroughly investigated allegations made in the case of Gaibullo Djalilov but had not been able to find any evidence that he had been subjected to torture. Mutabar Tajibaeva had been sent to a women's prison in 2008, and when it had been discovered that she had cancer, she had been given medical treatment and had undergone a successful operation.

23. **Mr. Saidov** (Uzbekistan) said that Uzbekistan had ratified the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights in 1995, and a number of communications concerning Uzbekistan had subsequently been considered by the Human Rights Committee. However, many of those communications had been rejected by the Committee. The existence of a plethora of communications concerning Uzbekistan showed that the persons submitting them were acquiring greater legal knowledge and awareness about their rights — which was a positive development — but political conclusions should not be drawn from it.

24. **Mr. Djasimov** (Uzbekistan), responding to a question from Ms. Gaer concerning reports of forced sterilizations, said that surgical sterilization of women was performed on a voluntary basis and with the informed consent of the patient and her husband. Surgical sterilization was one of the most modern and safest forms of contraception, and since its introduction in Uzbekistan, it had resulted in a dramatic reduction in the number of abortions, with an attendant decrease in maternal mortality. Those considerations aside, all States had the right to implement their own national population policy. He had been monitoring the situation since 2007 and had found no instances of forced sterilization. If Ms. Gaer could supply him with specific information on cases in which a woman had been forced to undergo such sterilization, he would ensure that the matter was investigated properly and the findings transmitted to the Committee.

25. **Mr. Saidov** (Uzbekistan) said that a number of indicators could be used to refute the allegation that forced sterilization of women was practised in Uzbekistan. Those included the fact that the Government consistently met its obligations to achieve the Millennium Development Goals, that maternal and child mortality had been reduced more than threefold, that average life expectancy for both men and women had risen, and that the total population had increased from 22 million to 30 million.

26. **Mr. Usmanov** (Uzbekistan) said that domestic violence, trafficking in women, sexual assault, violation of sexual freedom and attacks on women's dignity were punishable under the Criminal Code. Special facilities, including crisis centres, a telephone helpline, women's centres and health centres, offered psychological and social assistance to women victims. In 2012, complaints of domestic violence had numbered 66,000 and convictions 42,000.

27. **Mr. Saidov** (Uzbekistan) said that his country attached great importance to combating domestic violence and had prepared a bill on domestic violence at the urging of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women.

28. **Mr. Zakirov** (Uzbekistan) said that his Government had had a 20-year relationship with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). Since 1993, the activities of UNHCR in Uzbekistan had centred on providing humanitarian assistance in the repatriation of refugees from neighbouring countries through its territory. Although a decision had been taken in 2006 to close the UNHCR country office, the Government continued to cooperate with UNHCR.

29. The Government had carefully considered the Committee's recommendation that Uzbekistan should accede to the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and the Protocol thereto. It had come to the conclusion that the country's institutional, legal and social frameworks were not yet adequate, since ratifying those instruments would require ensuring that refugees were accorded treatment at least as favourable as that of Uzbek citizens in a number of important respects.

30. The executive branch had also given careful consideration to the question of acceding to the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture, which provided for the grant of a wide range of powers to the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture. In fact, Uzbekistan was in the process of establishing the necessary components of a national preventive mechanism, including an Ombudsman's Office, a prison monitoring body, training programmes for prison staff and a system for cooperating with NGOs. As a result, it had decided there was no need to take on obligations under the Optional Protocol when it was developing a national preventive mechanism that would achieve the same objective.

31. **Mr. Saidov** (Uzbekistan) said that the reasons underlying the Government's decision not to follow the relevant recommendation made to it during the UPR process were, first, that the ratification of any international instrument was a matter of national sovereignty. Second, under international law, States were subjects of international law, but international entities, such as the Committee against Torture, were subsidiary subjects, and as such, they should not exert pressure on principal subjects. Third, Uzbekistan had already ratified more than 70 international human rights instruments, all of them without reservation, which entailed a large number of international obligations.

32. **The Chairperson** requested additional clarification of the reasons for the Government's failure to implement many of the recommendations made during the Uzbekistan UPR, as well as those contained in a report by the Council of the European Union (EU), which he cited. In order to clear up any misunderstanding, he reiterated that all decisions taken by the Committee were collective and that Committee members spoke as independent experts, not as representatives of their countries.

33. **Ms. Gaer** (Country Rapporteur) said that the Committee based its questions on information it received from international, regional and national organizations, as well as NGOs, individuals, the media, the Government concerned and other relevant sources. She had before her a report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders (including a set of cases) in which the Special Rapporteur provided an extensive definition of human rights defenders; she would make it available to the delegation. She also had before her: a report of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances; a report, including cases, of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention; the concluding observations of several treaty bodies following their consideration of periodic reports submitted by Uzbekistan; and a report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. Moreover, she had been given General Assembly resolution 60/174 of 16 December 2005 on the situation of human rights in Uzbekistan, in which the Assembly

expressed its grave concern at continuing and serious human rights violations in Uzbekistan.

34. In addition, the European Court of Human Rights had stated in its conclusions in at least seven cases that to extradite an individual to Uzbekistan would constitute a breach of the absolute ban on return to risk of torture. Despite the fact that Uzbekistan was not a member of the EU, the Committee considered that to be an important series of findings.

35. Given the many sources from which the Committee had received information on allegations, accusations and complaints of torture and ill-treatment in Uzbekistan, she found it more than inappropriate for the State party to have declared in its reply to question 5 of the list of issues (CAT/C/UZB/Q/4) that accusations that Uzbek law enforcement agencies had engaged in numerous acts of torture against detainees were unfounded.

36. On the question of the reduction of the NGO sector in Uzbekistan, one could see by looking around the meeting room that there were no Uzbek NGOs present, unlike during the State party's previous interactive dialogue with the Committee. Although there might currently be thousands of NGOs in Uzbekistan, since 2005, many of the independent, credible, international NGOs had been silenced and no longer operated there, which was regrettable.

37. As to the so-called remedy of habeas corpus in Uzbekistan, she had received numerous allegations to the effect that authorities routinely used three techniques to deny habeas corpus to individuals. The first was that administrative detention was used instead of ordinary arrest as a means of circumventing the requirement to invoke habeas corpus immediately. The second was that counsel was misled about the time and place of hearings so that defendants were denied the assistance of counsel. The third was that the hearings themselves were closed.

38. Despite the fact that Uzbekistan had reformed a number of its laws, it was important to point out that the definition of torture in the Criminal Code did not include third parties, given claims that prisoners beat other prisoners at the instigation of prison guards. The Committee found itself making that recommendation frequently to any State party whose definition of torture did not include third parties.

39. With regard to cases of coerced confessions, she cited the names of various defendants who claimed that, despite having reported to the judge that they had suffered ill-treatment in pretrial detention, no investigation had been conducted and they had nevertheless been convicted. The Committee had not received any information concerning the punishment of officials who had failed to conduct the investigations or those who had carried out the alleged beatings or acts of torture. Those were serious, documented claims, and the Committee would like to receive responses from the delegation to each of them.

40. On the question of forced sterilization of women, the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) had prepared a documentary on the subject in April 2012 in which they had featured the cases of people from various parts of Uzbekistan who had reported incidents of forced sterilization. In her view, the BBC was a not inconsiderable source.

41. Ultimately, the sense one got from the many reports of misconduct in Uzbekistan was that the problem concerned the judiciary and its lack of independence. According to one Uzbek NGO, the President of the Republic dominated the judiciary through the system of judicial appointments and dismissals, both of which were at his discretion. Judges could be dismissed at will by the Higher Qualification Commission on the President's recommendation, and there were no independent civil society representatives on the Commission, despite the legal requirement for them to make up part of its membership. She would appreciate hearing the delegation's views on how to address the difficult problem of ensuring the independence of the judiciary in Uzbekistan.

42. **Mr. Tugushi** (Country Rapporteur) said that the Committee had based its opinions and concerns on a close reading of the replies to the list of issues and supplementary materials provided by the State party, as well as alternative reports and general information available online. Reviewing the many procedural violations in the *Dilmurod Saidov* case, he expressed particular concern about article 12 of the Act on the legal profession, which stipulated that the head of the Chamber of Lawyers was appointed by the Ministry of Justice and required lawyers to resit the Chamber exam every three years in order to renew their licence to practise.

43. The State party had failed to provide any evidence of an independent mechanism for prison inspections. The Ombudsman, NGOs and foreign ambassadors had conducted visits, but they had been announced ahead of time and had been restricted to certain parts of prisons and there had not been a single report on their findings.

44. Referring to the alleged torture of Zahid Umataliev, Grigoriy Grigoryev, Gulchehra Abdullayeva and Gulnaza Yuldasheva, he asked whether their cases had been investigated and, if so, what the results had been. He reiterated earlier questions regarding the outcome of the investigation of alleged torture cases initiated by the Ombudsman but later transferred to the Procurator's Office and the complaints of degrading treatment and incommunicado detention lodged by 28 Uzbek nationals returning from Kazakhstan. Drawing the delegation's attention to general comment No. 3 on the implementation of article 14, he invited it to comment on the obvious conflict between the State party's laws and the Convention regarding the right to redress.

45. Though he welcomed the reduction in number of prisoners, he cautioned that fewer prisoners did not mean that remaining prisoners were treated with dignity or that their rights were upheld. He appreciated the State party's efforts to align its legislation with international human rights standards; however, prohibiting torture was not simply a matter of enacting laws, but also of ensuring that they were implemented. The Committee would never condone the granting of amnesties to perpetrators of torture. Amnesty was not a matter of mercy or morality; it was nothing short of promoting a culture of impunity.

46. **Mr. Wang** Xuexian commended the State party for adopting a range of laws, ratifying a number of international instruments and designing action plans in the area of human rights, but requested specific examples of how the Committee's recommendations had been implemented under those plans. He asked for confirmation that two police officers had been prosecuted for torture and sentenced to over 20 years' imprisonment, together with a detailed description of the acts they had committed.

47. **Mr. Gaye** stressed that granting amnesty to perpetrators of torture was absolutely inconsistent with the ideal of eradicating torture. He asked whether the courts invoked the definition of torture as set out in the Supreme Court decision of 19 December 2009.

48. **Mr. Bruni**, reiterating some of his earlier questions regarding Jaslyk prison — which certain NGOs called the "house of torture" — and obstacles to prison inspections by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), said that the Committee could not gain a complete and balanced view of prison conditions without knowing the State party's position on the issue.

49. **Ms. Sveaass** asked whether the Ombudsman's Office complied with the Paris Principles and whether the information it gathered was made public. Recalling some of the UPR recommendations that the State party had accepted, she asked whether the Government intended to issue a standing invitation to United Nations special rapporteurs and how it planned to enable ICRC and NGOs, including Human Rights Watch, to resume their activities in the country.

50. **Mr. Mariño Menéndez**, asked about the status of the thousands of refugees living in Uzbekistan, whether they were free to return to their countries of origin, whether they lived in camps, how they interacted with the local population, whether they were permitted to marry Uzbek nationals and whether the Government intended to ratify the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees.

51. **Mr. Domah** repeated his earlier questions regarding the non-conformity of the State party's definition of torture with article 1 of the Convention, the principle of mediation in criminal law and the reasons for revoking the courts' executive powers. The State party had failed to demonstrate that it had set up a system for the prompt and impartial investigation of torture allegations.

52. **Ms. Gaer**, quoting paragraph 5 of general comment No. 2 on the non-derogability of the prohibition of torture, explained why the Committee was probing the legal and practical impediments to torture prevention in the State party.

53. **Ms. Belmir**, reiterating her earlier questions regarding the transfer of arrest warrants to the courts, the 15-day period of administrative detention and the role of public prosecutors in the implementation of article 241 of the Criminal Code, assured the delegation of the Committee's utmost commitment to diligence.

54. **The Chairperson** invited the delegation to comment on reports that 8 Uzbek nationals had died during the cotton harvest and that 1 to 1.5 million children worked in the cotton industry. Although the Labour Code barred children under the age of 10 from arduous work, including cotton-picking, he asked why the State party permitted child labour of any sort. He also asked what measures were in place to commute death sentences.

55. **Mr. Saidov** (Uzbekistan) said that some of the Committee's questions had not been answered because the delegation had not been given sufficient time.

56. **Mr. Shodiyev** (Uzbekistan) said that Jaslyk prison was the only detention centre in the entire autonomous republic of Karakalpakstan and conditions there fully complied with international norms; there was therefore no question of closing it. Pretrial detention was imposed only in cases of wilful aggravated murder and terrorism. The legal provisions governing prison conditions had been drafted on the basis of practice in dozens of countries. The first 10 years of a life term were served under a strict regime, after which detainees were moved to the ordinary regime, whereby they were allowed to receive family visits and parcels. ICRC had decided of its own accord to stop conducting prison visits, but the Government was cooperating with it in other areas, such as the recent international conference on human rights held at the Ministry of Internal Affairs. ICRC had suspended and resumed its visits before.

57. **Mr. Saidov** (Uzbekistan) said that the child labour figures cited by the Committee were out of date and no child was forced to work in his country. Uzbekistan had never had thousands of refugees. When ethnic Uzbeks had fled ethnic cleansing in Kyrgyzstan in 2010, his country had agreed to host them for two months and all had since returned to Kyrgyzstan. There were approximately 250 Afghan refugees remaining in the country, but no Tajiks. Members of parliament were working on a refugee bill.

58. He categorically rejected the accusation that Uzbekistan promoted impunity because it granted amnesties. The decision of the Supreme Court regarding the definition of torture was binding on all jurisdictions and law enforcement personnel. The Government still wished to work with ICRC despite the suspension of its visits, which, given the timing — a mere 10 days before Uzbekistan had been due to undergo the UPR — was clearly political. He rejected as irrelevant the climate argument put forward to justify the closure of Jaslyk prison since millions of people lived comfortably in the region. He strongly questioned the Committee's grasp of the actual situation at Jaslyk since none of the members had visited it.

The national action plan on torture had been based on 20 of the 22 recommendations made by the former Special Rapporteur on torture and was being initiated. The only recommendations not taken into account were those to close Jaslyk prison and to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention. As far as his Government was concerned, the matter of the May 2005 events in Andijan was closed. Uzbekistan was autonomous and capable of conducting its own investigations, and it prosecuted any person who broke the law.

59. Comparing the Uzbek judicial system with that of other countries, notably the United States of America, he asked what was the nature of the so-called systemic failure alluded to by the Committee. Uzbekistan had made significant progress in the past 20 years, such as abolishing capital punishment. It had, on the Committee's recommendation, instituted the right to habeas corpus and yet the Committee still found fault with its application. The Ombudsman published a magazine on human rights and reported to both chambers of parliament. While his delegation fully appreciated the members' professional standing, the Committee's attitude undermined the trust between it and Uzbekistan; and the delegation resented its interference in organizational matters, such as the authority to issue arrest warrants. Lawmakers based their work on national interests and needs, international human rights standards and the experience of other countries. Some 203 recommendations had been made during the UPR and the Government had accepted the 145 it deemed feasible, most of the rest being redundant. The Government, along with United Nations bodies, would be holding a meeting to draw up a global action plan that incorporated those recommendations and all those made by the treaty bodies.

60. **Mr. Djasimov** (Uzbekistan) said that the courts were the warrant-issuing authority. The 15-day period of administrative detention constituted a punishment for administrative offences and should not be confused with pretrial detention, which was for a maximum of 72 hours. The registration of offences, as provided for in article 241 of the Criminal Code, was the responsibility of the police. Nevertheless, the Procurator's Office checked police records every 10 days and if any omissions were suspected, an investigation was opened. The number of such omissions had declined since 2011, with none found so far in 2013.

61. **Mr. Saidov** (Uzbekistan) said that his Government fully understood that adopting appropriate legislation was only half the battle; it would be following up the recommendations made by all United Nations bodies. He thanked the Committee members for an interesting and spirited dialogue.

62. **The Chairperson** thanked the delegation for the additional material it had provided during the dialogue, which was helpful and transparent. He nonetheless requested further details on the findings and conditions of prison inspections. Recalling that the Committee was not a stakeholder but a supervisory United Nations body of independent experts, he invited the delegation to study the recommendations the Committee issued to other States parties. He appreciated the delegation's passion and pledged the Committee's assistance, within its mandate, to ensure that human rights were observed in Uzbekistan.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.