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1. INTRODUCTION: THE SAFETY OF LAWMAKERS AND ACTIVISTS

The assassination of Boris Nemtsov, prominent oppositional politician in Russia, illustrates all too well the negative trend in Russian democracy and rule of law. Five men have been found guilty of carrying out the murder in a judicial process subject to substantial criticism, while the instigators and the motive behind the assassination remain unidentified. Solving this case is important not only for Mr Nemtsov’s family and friends, but also to prevent future attacks on the opposition.

A number of elected representatives in the OSCE region have paid the ultimate price for their political activity. One of them, Anna Lindh – foreign minister of Sweden – became the target of a person with mental illness, drug issues and a hatred for politicians, with the randomness of the attack contributing to its cruelty. Not long after, Serbian Prime Minister Zoran Đinđić was assassinated in what appears to be a carefully planned conspiracy. Three years ago, British MP Jo Cox was murdered for her political views by a hateful right-wing extremist and this year an attempt from another right-wing extremist to murder British MP Rosie Cooper was averted.

The ability of elected politicians to conduct their work without fear is a fundamental prerequisite for any representative democracy. Safeguarding the integrity and functioning of the political system requires the protection of those who work within it, and democracy particularly requires that opposition politicians and activists are able to act without fear of reprisal. The murder of a politician is not only devastating for their loved ones – but it is also an attack on democracy. Any lingering doubts about the motives and perpetrators behind such attacks cast long, chilling shadows over the political life of a country. Therefore, it is crucial that attacks on politicians are subject to thorough, impartial and transparent investigation.

The assassination of Boris Nemtsov took place in the context of an increasingly repressive climate in Russia. The government of the Russian Federation uses a range of legal tools, such as “anti-extremism” legislation and laws on “foreign agents” and “undesirable organisations” to stifle political dissent and opposition. Attacks on human rights defenders and activists are enabled by smear campaigns and impunity. The judiciary, Freedom House concludes in its latest report, is subordinate to the political authorities and access to due process is not guaranteed, particularly for members of the opposition.

In society governed by the rule of law, the political opposition is equally protected. When such a system is lacking, so that justice and the protection of democratic rights cannot be sought at the national level, the international community must engage.

The safety of lawmakers and political activists is an increasingly urgent matter. While comprehensive statistics on threats and violence against politicians are lacking, studies conducted in individual OSCE member states indicate a substantial problem that may affect the quality of democracy. A 2017 survey of British candidates found that a third of
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the candidates had experienced abuse of some kind during the elections the same year.\textsuperscript{3} The latest Swedish survey found that one out of four elected representatives have experienced threats or violence in their role as politicians.\textsuperscript{4}

When it comes to the ability of oppositional forces to operate, an even darker picture emerges. As stated in the OSCE PA Third Committee draft resolution of 2019, state repression is increasing in the OSCE region.

We see today a hardening climate, with threats, harassment and intimidation tactics increasingly directed towards lawmakers. The threats come both from members of the public, organised groups and repressive states.

In the document of the Moscow Meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the CSCE, the participating states “categorically and irrevocably” declared “that the commitments undertaken in the field of the human dimension of the OSCE are matters of direct and legitimate concern to all participating States and do not belong exclusively to the internal affairs of the State concerned.” This is why, earlier this year, I was appointed Special Rapporteur on the Nemtsov case by President Tsereteli.

THE OSCE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY SPECIAL RAPPORTEUR

At the Annual Session of 2018 in Berlin, the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly adopted a resolution urging the Russian authorities to undertake a new investigation into the assassination of Boris Nemtsov, including those who ordered or facilitated the crime, and to cooperate with the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly and the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe on this matter.

In February 2019, Swedish MP and Vice President of the OSCE PA Margareta Cederfelt was appointed Special Rapporteur and tasked to overview and report to the OSCE PA on the investigation into the murder of Boris Nemtsov.

It is not within the capacity of the Rapporteur to pursue a criminal investigation. The mandate, rather, is to bring attention to the existing information regarding the Nemtsov case, and to continue to build the political will necessary for a new investigation.

\textsuperscript{3} Committee on Standards in Public Life, \textit{Intimidation in Public Life: A Review by the Committee on Standards in Public Life}, 2017
2. **THE ASSASSINATION OF BORIS NEMTSOV**

- **BORIS NEMTSOV**

Boris Nemtsov was shot on Bolshoi Moskvoretsky Bridge in Moscow, on 27 February 2015. At the time of his death, he was a Member of the Yaroslavl Regional Duma and a leading figure within the Russian opposition.

First elected to Parliament in 1990, Mr Nemtsov served as Member of the Russian Parliament, presidential representative in the Nizhny Novgorod Region, Governor of the Nizhny Novgorod Region and Deputy Prime Minister of the Russian Federation before becoming a prominent opposition leader. Throughout his political career, Mr Nemtsov showed a strong dedication to promoting democracy. He worked tirelessly and fearlessly to expose and fight corruption, often at odds with powerful sections of society, and produced several investigative reports on this subject.

On 1 March 2015, Mr Nemtsov was meant to participate in a protest march of which he was one of the organisers. At the time of his murder, he was also working on an investigative report on Russian military involvement in Ukraine.

As one of several murders of well-known oppositional figures in Russia in recent years, the assassination is reported to have contributed to a climate of fear. The demonstration two days after the assassination was made into a mourning march, where up to 50,000 people are reported to have participated.

- **INVESTIGATION AND TRIAL**

The Chief Investigative Directorate of the Investigative Committee of the Russian Federation was responsible for the investigation into the assassination.

Five men - Zaur Dadayev, Anzor Gubashev, Shadid Gubashev, Temirlan Eskerkhanov and Khamzat Bakhayev – were arrested, beginning in early March 2015. Zaur Dadayev and Anzor Gubashev initially confessed but later retracted their confessions. A sixth man, Beslan Shavanov, died from an exploding hand grenade during his attempted arrest in Grozny. In October the same year, Ruslan Mukhudinov was named as the organiser of the assassination.

In May 2015, MP Dmitry Gudkov initiated a parliamentary investigation into the assassination. The initiative was denied on procedural grounds.

In January 2016, the case against Ruslan Mukhudinov and other unidentified individuals who instigated and funded the assassination was severed from the original case against the five men arrested for executing the murder. Mr Mukhudinov was indicted in absentia and the main case was declared solved.

The trial began in October 2016 and finished in June 2017. The five men listed above were found guilty by a jury and sentenced to between 11 and 19 years in prison for involvement in the assassination. According to the verdict, they were hired to kill Mr
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6 The Guardian, *Mourners bid farewell to Boris Nemtsov, but fear their hopes have died with him*, 03 Mar 2015
Nemtsov for 15 million rubles by Mr Mukhudinov. Mr Dadayev was the one who shot Boris Nemtsov, while his accomplices assisted in planning and executing the murder.

Regarding the separate case against the instigators of the assassination, no arrests have been made and the case remains open. No motive has been confirmed. The question of who commissioned the assassination, and why, thus remains open.
3. INITIATIVES WITHIN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY

Since 2015, there have been a number of activities within the international community regarding the Nemtsov case.

- PETITION BY RUSSIAN ACTIVISTS

In an OSCE context, the case was first brought up during the 2015 OSCE Human Dimension Implementation Meeting session on the independence of judges and prosecutors. In a statement delivered by the organisation For Open Russia, based on a petition initiated by Russian activists and signed by 8,000 people, the OSCE, the Council of Europa and the UN were called on to establish special commissions to monitor and assist the investigation. The motive of Mr Nemtsov’s murder was said to have been political and the organisers and sponsors were said to likely belong to the inner circle of Chechen leader Ramzan Kadyrov. The statement also described how Boris Nemtsov prior to his death was subject to threats, public defamation, physical attacks and arrests based on trumped-up criminal cases. His appeals to authorities regarding the publication of illegally obtained material from his phone and the death threats made against him were not investigated and according to the statement, impunity and media attacks made the assassination possible. The investigators of Mr Nemtsov’s murder were said to be prevented from conducting effective investigation in Chechnya and the international community was therefore called on to act. The petition was delivered to the then OSCE Chair-in-Office, the incoming Chairmanship, the ODIHR Director and the leadership of the OSCE PA.9

- THE OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS (OHCHR)

Under the Special Procedures of the United Nations Human Rights Council concerning the investigation of Mr Boris Nemtsov’s killing in 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression, the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association and the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions issued a joint communication to the Russian Federation.10 They expressed concerns that Mr Nemtsov could have been killed because of his peaceful and legitimate political activity and that the impartiality and independence of the investigation may have been affected by public judgements by Government officials regarding the motives behind the murder. The three Rapporteurs also cited allegations that Mr Nemtsov had previously been arrested in connection with peaceful protests, that a number of political murders and attacks in the Russian Federation remained unsolved and that this exacerbated a climate of impunity and fear. They therefore requested information on the investigation and on the steps taken to ensure the safety of political opponents and activists in the Russian Federation. More specifically, they requested:
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9 For Free Russia, Statement on the need for international assistance to the investigation of the murder of the Russian opposition leader Boris Nemtsov, 02 Oct 2015
10 OHCHR, Joint Communication of Special Procedures of the United Nations Human Rights Council, UL RUS 1/2015, 06 Mar 2015
Additional information and comments on the listed allegations.

Details, and where available results, of any investigation and juridical or other inquiries carried out into the murder.

Detailed information about the composition, procedures and status of the body in charge of such investigation and how it complies with international standards of impartiality, effectiveness and independence.

Measures taken to ensure the safety of political opponents and activists and guarantee that they can carry out their activities, including meeting and assembling peacefully, without interference.

In response to this, the Permanent Mission to the United Nations and Other International Organisations in Geneva submitted a reply from the Russian Federation.11 This statement explained that the investigation had been assigned to the Chief Investigative Directorate of the Investigative Committee of the Russian Federation and that the five individuals identified by the investigation had been arranged on criminal charges and placed in pre-trial detention. Regarding the request for details of the investigation, the statement explained that the data of the preliminary inquisition could be revealed only with the permission of the investigator.

The statement further outlined the legal basis of the Investigative Committee, particularly Articles 5 and 6 of Federal Law No 403-FZ, which dictate that the Investigative Committee, including the Chief Investigation Directorate, operate on the basis of legality, independence, openness and inadmissibility of interference. Any attempts to exert pressure in any form on an officer of the Investigative Committee in order to influence a procedural decision or obstruct his procedural activities, the statement underlined, would be liable in accordance with Russian legislation.

Regarding measures taken to ensure the safety of political opponents and guarantee that they can carry out their activities without interference, the statement cited Article 31 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation on the right to peaceful assembly, as well as the sections of Federal Law and Criminal Code prohibiting illegal obstruction of the holding of a meeting. No information on any particular measures taken to ensure the safety of political opponents was provided.

Following this communication, the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association in his 2016 report restated his request for Russian authorities to publicly share the results of the criminal investigation and any relevant juridical inquiries. The Rapporteur also expressed that he would appreciate additional information about how the relevant investigation body operated in accordance with international standards of impartiality, effectiveness and independence, including in relation to its composition and procedures.12

11 OHCHR, Information provided by the Russian Federation in connection with the joint communication of the Special Procedures of the United Nations Human Rights Council concerning the investigation of Mr Boris Nemtsov’s killing, UL RUS 1/2015, 20 May 2015

According to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, no further activities have taken place in relation to Mr Nemtsov’s murder.

- **UNITED NATIONS HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE**

The allegations that the persons who confessed to the murder of Mr Nemtsov had been tortured were brought up in the United Nations Human Rights Committee in 2015, in connection with the seventh periodic report of Russia on its implementation of the provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. In its response, the Russian delegation replied that torture against detainees was prohibited, that any evidence derived through torture was not admissible in court and that all claims of cruel treatment were carefully investigated. The delegation informed that Mr Dadayev had not lodged any complaint with the Investigative Committee regarding torture and had been granted the opportunity to meet with the Public Civilian Oversight Commission.13

- **THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS (ECHR)**

Temirlan Eskerkhanov, Anzor Gubashev and Shadid Gubashev filed complaints to the European Court of Human Rights regarding their treatment before and during the trial. The complaints relied particularly on Article 3 of the European Convention, the prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment, and on Article 5 § 4; the right to have lawfulness of detention decided speedily by a court. The complaints concerned, among other things, the length of detention prior to the trial, overcrowding of the Moscow remand prisons and convoy cells, conditions during transfers to and from their hearings and excessively long proceedings during the trial.14 The court announced its judgment on 25 July 2017. The applications of the Gubashev brothers were ruled inadmissible since their lawyers had disclosed to the media the terms of the friendly-settlement negotiations, thus violating Article 39, Section 2 of the Convention and Rule 62, Section 2 of the Rules of Court.15 Concerning Mr Eskerkhanov’s application, however, the Court ruled that there had been a violation of Article 3 with regard to the conditions of Mr Eskerkhanov’s detention in the IZ-77/6 facility since May 2015 and the conditions of his transport and detention. The Court also concluded that there had been a violation of Article 5, Section 4 concerning the lack of a speedy review of the grounds for Mr Eskerkhanov’s detention. Mr Eskerkhanov was therefore awarded reparations of 6 000 euros.

Zhanna Nemtsova, daughter of Boris Nemtsov and recognised as a victim in the case, currently has a case pending before the ECHR. Ms Nemtsova’s application argues that inability and unwillingness by the Russian authorities to identify the contractors and organisers of the assassination constitute a violation of Article 2 of the European Convention concerning the right to life, including the obligation for the state to investigate murder.16
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16 Supplement application form, *Nemtsova v. Russia*, Application no. 43146/15, 10 Apr 2018
In 2016, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe appointed Lithuanian MP Emanuelis Zingeris as Special Rapporteur on the case. On 7 June this year, Mr Zingeris presented his report *Shedding light on the background of the murder of Boris Nemtsov to the PACE Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights.*

The Rapporteur has so far been unable to carry out his planned fact-finding mission to Russia due to a travel ban issued against him, and received no response from his multiple attempts to contact Russian authorities. However, based on a review of the case files, Mr Zingeris was able to conclude that “the available evidence shows that the Russian authorities did not investigate the murder thoroughly, effectively and in good faith.” The Committee therefore called for a reopening of the case.

The Rapporteur found a number of issues regarding the physical evidence and witness statements. This includes irregular treatment of evidence, inconsistencies in witness statements, vital potential evidence not obtained and a number of persons present near the scene of the murder never traced or interviewed.

Various aspects of the investigation and case against the accused, according to the Rapporteur, “appear implausible or even impossible”. Mr Zingeris also found “numerous irregularities in the judge’s conduct of the trial”, including bias favouring the prosecution, unreasonable rejections of requests from the defence and the Nemtsov family and a decision to “artificially limit the case to those immediately responsible” that “seems designed to prevent public inquiry into who might have ordered the killing.”

In March 2019, a bill was passed in the United States House of Representatives on the investigation into Mr Nemtsov’s death. In this bill, the Russian President and persons around him are said to have covered up the assassination of Mr Nemtsov, and the Russian Government is urged to allow an impartial international investigation into the case. The bill also calls for the American Secretary of State to produce a report on the assassination and to sanction those responsible under the Magnitsky Act. Such sanctions have been imposed on Ruslan Geremeyev for his alleged role in the assassination of Mr Nemtsov. In June 2019, the United States Senate passed a resolution which called for accountability and justice in the case of the assassination of Boris Nemtsov. The United States Government sanctioned Ruslan Geremeyev in May 2019 under the Magnitsky Act.
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for his role in organizing the assassination of Boris Nemtsov, adding that he was “acting as an agent of or on behalf of Head of Chechen Republic Ramzan Kadyrov”.

21 U.S Department of the Treasury. Treasury Targets Additional Individuals Involved in the Sergei Magnitsky Case and Gross Violations of Human Rights in Russia, 16 May 2019
During and following the investigation and trial, a large number of issues were raised by Mr Nemtsov’s legal representatives, independent media, political activists, independent investigators, Russian Human Rights officials and international observers regarding the impartiality, efficiency and independence of the investigation and legal proceedings.

It is not within the capacity of the Rapporteur to pursue a criminal investigation or to determine the guilt of the defendants. Thus, this section constitutes a summary of the criticism that has been publicly voiced against the investigation into the assassination of Mr Nemtsov and the trial that followed. The Rapporteur takes no stand as to the accuracy of the allegations.

• **CLASSIFICATION AND DELIMITATIONS OF THE CASE**

Several decisions made by the head investigator regarding the classification and delimitations of the case, as well as public commentary on the potential motive by high-ranking officials, have raised concerns over the independence of the investigation and led to allegations of undue steering and restrictions imposed upon the investigation.

The assassination of Boris Nemtsov was classified as ordinary murder, referring to Article 105 of the Criminal Code, rather than an attack on the life of a Statesperson or public figure under Article 277. The latter classification, in line with the previous notion that attacks on lawmakers and political activists are particularly harmful to society, constitutes an aggravated offence where no statute of limitations applies. Despite the fact that Mr Nemtsov was a member of the Yaroslavl Regional Duma and a well-known political figure – both in light of his previous positions and because of his prominent role in the opposition – the state prosecutor Viktor Antipov decided not to pursue the case under Article 277, going on to state that “We cannot allow for the murders of all sorts of opposition members to be classified under classifying Article 277.”

Antipov’s statement has been interpreted by some commentators to show that there was a lack of political motivation to investigate this crime in accordance with the letter and spirit of the law. The Nemtsov family’s motion to reclassify the case was rejected by the investigator and subsequently by the court on the grounds that the murder did not put an end to any official state function by Mr Nemtsov, and that it had been established by the investigation that the assassination was not connected with his political work.

The investigation into the instigators and financiers of the assassination was severed from the original case in January 2016. According to Ms Nemtsova’s representatives and PACE Rapporteur Zingeris there is nothing to suggest that any initiatives or meaningful action has been taken by the Investigative Committee of the Russian Federation in this second separate investigation. All requests made by Nemtsova’s representatives in this separate case have also either been fully or partially rejected by the Investigative
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Committee. The decision to separate the original case into two might be motivated by the wish to be able to formally close the case of Nemtsov’s murder without having to address motive and the identity of the initiators and organizers.

High-ranking officials publicly voicing their positions on the motives for the murder raised concerns about the impartiality of the investigation, as stated by three Rapporteurs under the UN High Commissioner on Human Rights.

The possibility that Mr Nemtsov may have been killed for his oppositional activities, which has been presented by his friends and allies, a range of experts as well as regular Russian citizens, was reportedly ruled out by investigators as early as the days after the assassination. President Putin stated that the murder was a provocation aiming to harm Russia’s reputation and a spokesperson for the President informed the media immediately after the murder that there were no political reasons for Mr Nemtsov to be killed, since he did not pose any political threat to the President. Investigative Committee spokesman Vladimir Markin informed the media days after the assassination that the investigators were looking into five possible motives — a provocation aimed at destabilising Russia, Mr Nemtsov’s opinions on the Charlie Hebdo attack in Paris, the war in Ukraine, Mr Nemtsov’s business activities and his personal life.

In September 2015, the head investigator informed media as well as the lawyers representing Ms Nemtsova that it had been established that Mr Nemtsov’s murder was “not in any way connected with his work as a state official, politician or public activist.” This reasoning has been challenged since up to the present date, no motive for the murder has been established and among the motives listed by the Investigative Commission spokesperson, all except Mr. Nemtsov’s business activities and personal life concern his political and public activities.

The decisions not to classify the assassination of Mr Nemtsov as murder of a public figure and to separate the instigators, organisers and motive behind the assassination from its execution, as well as public statements made regarding the potential motives, have contributed to allegations that the investigation was subject to outside influence and purposefully restricted to exclude investigation into persons responsible for initiating the crime, as well as certain potential motives, particularly Mr Nemtsov’s oppositional activities.

- LACK OF CLARITY REGARDING THE INVESTIGATIVE BODY

Commentators have pointed out a lack of clarity regarding the investigative body responsible for the investigation. While the Russian Permanent Mission to the United Nations informed the three Rapporteurs of the OHCHR that the Investigative Committee of the Russian Federation was the body responsible for the investigation into Mr Nemtsov’s murder, PACE Rapporteur Mr Zingeris in his report finds that inconsistencies in the dates in the case files suggest a parallel investigation took place. The
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arrests, he states, appear to have been made based on this parallel investigation, since they took place before the relevant evidence was processed by the official investigation.

The arrests were announced by Federal Security Service of the Russian Federation (FSB). Other independent investigators have concluded that the investigation was in fact conducted by the FSB and in several statements given by the defendants on the matter of torture and ill-treatment, the presence of FSB officials is mentioned.  

**MISSING EVIDENCE**

One important point of criticism concerns potential evidence and witness statements that the investigation allegedly did not attempt to obtain.

The site of the murder – Bolshoi Moskvoretsky Bridge – is located very close to the Kremlin and according to multiple sources, it is heavily surveyed by security cameras, traffic cameras and patrolling police units. A number of vehicles, including police cars and busses equipped with cameras, crossed the bridge close to the time of the murder. Despite this, video evidence from surveillance cameras, CCTV, the garbage truck and passing busses is missing from the case file.

Several conflicting statements were made by authorities regarding the footage from surveillance cameras. Representatives of the Federal Protective Service, FSO, informed investigators and journalists that the site, despite its proximity to the Kremlin, was not a zone of responsibility of the FSO and thus the FSO had no cameras aimed at the bridge. Queries from the Nemtsov family lawyers and MP Mr Gudkov received similar answers from the FSO. Checking this statement against the list of streets under FSO surveillance provided in a Government of Moscow decision, news site Gazeta.ru showed that the site was in fact listed as under FSO surveillance. Photos taken on the site at the time of the murder also reportedly show the existence of surveillance cameras. According to information given to one media outlet, the surveillance cameras on the site were turned off for maintenance the night or the murder. Other media reports, citing sources in the investigation, said that analysis of video footage from the surveillance cameras at the site of the murder was made by the investigators.

**VIDEO FOOTAGE AND PHYSICAL EVIDENCE**

A number of discrepancies in the physical evidence, critics have found, were not explained by the investigation and serious doubts have been raised as to whether the physical evidence is consistent with the verdict. Among other things, the injuries sustained by Mr Nemtsov, as well as traces of powder gases on his coat, have been found to be inconsistent with the scenario provided by the prosecution during the trial.
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and in Mr Dadayev’s confession. The only available video footage of the moment when Boris Nemtsov was shot down is from the weather camera of the TV Tsentr station across the river. This footage was released publicly by the TV station and is included in the investigation. The exact moment when Mr Nemtsov was shot is not visible on this video because for 2.5 seconds, he was obscured by a slowly passing garbage truck.

The PACE Rapporteur also raises a number of other issues concerning the evidence. The forensic treatment of the bullet casings, the Rapporteur states, was irregular and may have tainted evidence. Furthermore, the crime scene records were incomplete regarding details and well as photos of the location of bullets and bullet casings missing. The ballistics studies, of which one concluded that only one weapon had been used and another was inconclusive, lacked detailed information in support of their conclusions. Forensic medical experts, on the other hand, found that two different weapons may have been used.

A second video, recovered from the dashcam of a car reportedly passing by the scene minutes after Mr Nemtsov was shot, was released to the public by a journalist. This video has by independent investigators been claimed to show a second gunman shooting the wounded Mr Nemtsov.

- **WITNESS STATEMENTS**

Several of the existing witness statements, several of which were presented at the trial in support for the guilt of the defendants, have been said to be problematic.

Anna Duritskaya, Mr Nemtsov’s girlfriend who was with him when he was killed, was initially not allowed a lawyer when giving her statement. The statement she gave was incomplete and inconsistent when compared with other evidence, such as the video footage from the TVT camera, and she refused to sign the statement. Several witnesses, such as Mr Molodykh, who was present at the bridge, the person who sold the getaway car and the cleaner of the apartment where the defendants stayed, were initially unable to identify one or several of the defendants but later changed their positions and stated during the trial that they were able to do so.

- **POTENTIAL WITNESSES AND SUSPECTS**

Video footage from the TVT camera, as well as other cameras close to the bridge, shows a number of people present at or near the site of the murder, as well passing cars, that were never traced or identified. This leaves a large number of potential witnesses whose statements were not taken.

Commentators who propose the theory that the assassination was a larger operation, conducted by security services and involving a second shooter, have also pointed out persons present on the bridge as potential suspects. This includes several unidentified.
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persons present on Bolshoi Moskvoretsky Bridge and the witness Mr Molodykh, who is suggested to be the person standing over Mr Nemtsov in the dashcam video, allegedly firing a gun.  

Commentators and media sources have assessed that Mr Nemtsov was most likely under surveillance by security service operatives at the time of his death. If this is correct, security service operatives may be important witnesses.

The way the assassination was carried out has also led experts to emphasize security agencies as suspects in the case. The argument goes as following: Carrying out an assassination in this heavily monitored area would only be possible with at least the prior approval of the security services in charge of video surveillance and patrolling. For the assassination to have been carried out the way it was – a shooter appearing on the bridge and a get away car ready nearby – the organizers must also have known that Nemtsov and Duritskaya would take this route. The couple decided to walk from the restaurant and taking a detour over the Bolshoi Moskvoretsky Bridge despite the late hour and bad weather, instead of returning home with Mr. Nemtsov’s private driver or choosing the shortest route home via the subway. This decision would have been impossible to predict without listening in on their conversation or hacking Mr. Nemtsov’s phone. Such advanced surveillance, and such a well-coordinated operation, some experts assess, could not have been conducted by the five men convicted — it could only have been done by the security services and would have involved a larger number of personnel.

The suspected mastermind of the assassination, Mr Mukhudinov, has so far not been apprehended. His motives for allegedly initiating the murder remain unclear, as does how a soldier and driver would have obtained the 15 million roubles.

Given the structure of Chechen society, a number of observers have inferred that the five men convicted for the murder of Mr Nemtsov would not have taken on the murder of a prominent public figure and executed it next to the Kremlin without orders or at least consent from higher-ranking persons. This notion is also backed by the fact that the identified defendants and suspects in the case had professional and family ties to high-ranking officials in Chechnya and that several such officials were linked by evidence to the defendants’ activities before the murder. Requests were made by the Nemtsov family for several persons to be questioned in relation to the murder based on their ties to the defendants and, in some cases, evidence tying them to the defendants’ activities in Moscow. Nearly all these requests were denied.

Mr Dadayev, Mr Shavanov and Mr Mukhudinov all served in the Sever Battalion, a part of the Russian Interior Troops, under Ruslan Geremeyev, He was their immediate superior and Mr Mukhudinov was his driver, while Mr Eskerkhanov served as a police officer under a relative of Mr Geremeyev’s, Vakha Geremeyev. The apartment in Moscow where the defendants stayed prior to the murder was rented by Ruslan Geremeyev. He also travelled to and from Moscow with Mr Dadayev and according to
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media sources he travelled in one of the cars used to follow Mr Nemtsov and was repeatedly seen with the defendants before the assassination.\textsuperscript{46} A nephew of Mr Geremeyev, Artur Geremeyev, owned a second apartment in the same building, which was also used by the defendants, and (he) was seen in their company on surveillance footage. In this apartment, a key card for a hotel room where uncle of Mr Geremeyev and member of the Russian Federation Council, Suleyman Geremeyev, had previously stayed was found.\textsuperscript{47}

The Commander of the Sever Battalion, Alibek Delimkhanov, was both the superior officer of Mr Dadayev, Mr Shavanov and Mr Mukhudinov and a relative of Mr Geremeyev. He has close ties with the Chechen leadership, including Ramzan Kadyrov. Mr Delimkhanov had also in September 2014 signed permits for Mr Dadayev and Mr Geremeyev to carry arms in Moscow and Ingushetia, respectively, on dubious travel assignments.\textsuperscript{48}

Aside from the persons listed above, requests were also made by the Nemtsov family to question former Deputy Director of the Federal Protective Service (FSO) and Commander-in-Chief of the Interior Troops, Victor Zolotov; Aslanbek Khatayev, Chechen police officer who met with the defendants the day before the murder and was in Mr Geremeyev’s apartment; Shamkhan Tazabayev, former head of riot police under the Chechen Ministry of the Interior who visited the apartment right after the murder; Dzhabril Makhmudov who frequently visited the Moscow apartment where the defendants stayed, including right after the murder had taken place, and who has been said to be an FSB employee; and Ramzan Kadyrov, leader of the Chechen Republic who publicly praised Mr Dadayev and had previously threatened Mr Nemtsov.\textsuperscript{49}

The Nemtsov family lawyers provided a witness statement by Chechen politician in exile, Akhmed Zakayev, who states that in 2012 he was made aware, by his contacts in Chechnya, of a plan by persons among the Russian leadership to kill two opposition politicians, one of them Mr Nemtsov. Mr Zakayev stated: “It was in early February 2012 that I learnt about reprisals being prepared against the leaders of the Russian opposition. The source of that information was the inner circle of Mr. Ramzan Kadyrov and Mr. Adam Delimkhanov. We remember that, at the end of 2011, following mass protest manifestations in Moscow, Mr. Putin, then-head of the Russian Government, and the head of his security service Gen. Viktor Zolotov both flew to Chechnya… Some two or three weeks after Mr. Putin and Gen. Zolotov left Chechnya, I got reports directly from Chechnya that the senior officials of Russia had worked out a plan to remove the leaders of the Russian opposition. In particular, they were planning to kill Mr. Boris Nemtsov and Mr. Garry Kasparov…” \textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{46} Novaya Gazeta, 24 Feb 2016  
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\textsuperscript{48} Notice of Violation addressed to General Zolotov from General Tutevich 27 Jan 2016, as quoted by Prokhorov, V. in Complaint from Decision refusing interrogation of Generel Zolotov as a witness in criminal cases 201/403114-15 and 4160200770100004, 1 May 2017  
\textsuperscript{49} Zingeris (2019) and Dunlop (2019)  
\textsuperscript{50} Record of voluntary interview of Mr Akhmed Kh. Zakaev, conducted by Vadim Prokhorov, 04 Oct 2018
Andrey Piontkovskiy has confirmed that this information was given to him and Mr Nemtsov in 2012 and that a simultaneous TV appearance of President Putin, in which he warned that the opposition planned to sacrifice one of their own in order to destabilise the country, made them take this information seriously. These witness statements were accepted into the case file but requests for them to be further investigated were denied.

Among the persons listed above, Ruslan Geremeyev, Artur Geremeyev and Alibek Delimkhanov were summoned to the court. Alibek Delimkhanov did appear before the court. The one attempt to bring Ruslan and Artur Geremeyev before the Investigative Committee failed because neither were found at their respective homes. Previous attempts by investigators to indict Geremeyev in abstensia in relation to the murder were reportedly blocked twice by General Aleksandr Bastrykin, head of the Investigative Committee. According to media sources, the attempt to obtain Ruslan Geremeyev was hindered by Chechen law-enforcers. If true, this implies undue involvement from officials both within the federal and Chechen authorities in the investigation.

- TORTURE AND ILL-TREATMENT

Another issue raised in relation to the investigation is accusations of torture. Member of the Civic Supervisory Commission Andrey Babushkin voiced these concerns after a visit to the pre-trial detention centre where he found Mr Dadayev and the Gubashev brothers physically injured. Mr Dadayev told Mr Babushkin that he, upon arrest, had been starved and hooded. He also told him that a former subordinate of his, Rustam Yusupov, had been detained with him and that he had confessed so that Mr Yusupov would be released unharmed. Shadid Gubashev told Mr Babushkin that his brother Anzor had confessed after torture, while Anzor Gubashev did not voice any complaints at the time. During the trial, both Anzor and Shadid Gubashev stated that they had been tortured after their arrest, that investigator Krasnov had been present at the time and that he also had threatened them.

The treatment of the defendants during the court hearings has also been subject to suspicions of torture. Temirlan Eskerkhanov complained during the trial that he and the other defendants were not allowed to eat or visit the bathroom during the long court proceedings and Anzor Gubashev claimed that he had been ill-treated and threatened by the convoy guards during transport, with the consent of the investigator present.

Allegations of inhumane treatment and torture of three of the defendants have been brought before the European Court of Human Rights. The conditions at the detention facilities and transfers and excessively long proceedings were found to violate the European Convention on Human Rights regarding prohibition of inhuman or degrading
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treatment and the right to a speedy decision by a court on the lawfulness of detention in the case of Mr Eskerkhanov.

Beslan Shavanov’s death due to an exploding hand grenade during the attempted arrest, which according to media sources happened in the presence of a deputy minister of the Chechen Interior Ministry, have also raised suspicions that he was killed.  

- THE TRIAL

A point of concern for critics of the trial, including one of the jurors, is that judge Zhitnikov appeared to be biased in favour of the prosecution, including by letting the prosecution speak at length while allowing and contributing to the defence being overly interrupted.

Commentators also question decisions made by the judge in regard to what evidence to rule admissible, such as ruling inadmissible surveillance footage of Mr Dadayev that the defence claimed provided an alibi for the murder and the dashcam video allegedly showing the crime scene minutes after Mr Nemtsov was shot, while allowing allegedly irrelevant evidence discrediting the defendants to be presented.

Representatives of Ms Nemtsova maintained that the judge purposefully restricted the range of evidence and testimonies to exclude potential instigators and organisers of the assassination and any focus on Mr Nemtsov’s political work. Professor John B. Dunlop also finds that all attempts to discuss the FSB operatives allegedly shadowing Mr Nemtsov were averted by the judge.

Several jurors were removed over the course of the trial, including close to the verdict. Jurors interviewed by the media have criticised some of these rulings as unfair and interpreted them as attempts to remove jurors who were critical of the trial and of the prosecution’s case.

Commentators have also noted irregularities in witness appearances during the trial. Anna Duritskaya, who was with Mr Nemtsov when he was killed, was not allowed to participate in the trial through a video link. Instead, her initial statement, which contained inconsistencies and was never signed, was ruled admissible. Witnesses who were previously said by the prosecution to be inaccessible were unexpectedly presented to the court and witnesses were able to identify the defendants despite previously having told investigators they could not.

The judge also attempted to impose a second lawyer on Mr Bakhaev against his will. The new lawyer was appointed despite protests from the defendant, his legal representative and the new lawyer herself, and allowed to withdraw only because court proceedings would have been delayed by the move. The existing legal representative of Mr Bakhaev,
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Mr Sadakhanov, was repeatedly threatened and attacked due to the claim of having requested an interrogation of Vladimir Putin and has since left Russia in fear for his safety. In fact, Mr Sadakhanov never requested such an interrogation, but later falsely claimed he had to receive asylum in Austria. The attacks included having his material related to the case stolen and being physically assaulted by perpetrators who explicitly spoke about his request to interrogate the President.

- **SUMMARY**

To summarise, the criticism against the investigation and trial concerns allegations of:

- An incomplete investigation leading to a criminal case with numerous inconsistencies, raising suspicions that certain elements in the case – in particular, a political motive and involvement of high-ranking officials – were purposefully excluded, and to alternative theories of how the assassination was executed

- A judicial process in which the defendants were subject to torture and denied a fair trial, and which failed to provide justice for the victim

- An unclear role of the security services in the investigation

- No answers as to who ordered the assassination of Boris Nemtsov, and why.
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5. CONSEQUENCES OF THE ASSASSINATION

In order to provide context to the assassination of Boris Nemtsov, and to better understand the potential motives for his murder, the Rapporteur has sought information on the perceived consequences of Mr. Nemtsov’s death.

- MR. NEMTSOV’S WORK

The obvious consequence of the assassination was of course the ending of Boris Nemtsov’s own work. The protest march against the Russian involvement in Ukraine, one day after the assassination, of which he was one of the organizers, was cancelled. Instead, it was turned into a mourning march, gathering up to 50 000 people.

Following Mr. Nemtsov’s death, a public conflict over his role and legacy has played out. Some commentators, typically quoted in pro-Kremlin media, have described Mr. Nemtsov as a marginal figure and pointed to his low electoral support, while others have described him as the most prominent opposition leader with a unique ability to mobilize large protests. Some have even seen him as a potential future competitor for the presidency. Assessments of Mr. Nemtsov’s role within the Russian liberal opposition have described him as a unifying figure, whose death contributed to disruption and infighting.

Mr. Nemtsov had published a number of investigative reports focusing on corruption within and around the Putin government, including the President’s own wealth. While government representatives, as well as some commentators have described Nemtsov’s work as having little impact, others assess that the corruption reports posed a threat to the government’s public support. At the time of his death, he was working on a report to present proof that Russian soldiers – contrary to claims from the Kremlin – were in fact participating, and dying, in the war in eastern Ukraine and that the Russian authorities had sent them there. The report, which Mr. Nemtsov worked with together with families of Russian soldiers killed in Ukraine, was published posthumously after being delayed by Mr. Nemtsov’s death. The families that had made demands to Russian authorities - and that had been promised payments - for their sons killed in action withdrew their demands because of Mr. Nemtsov’s death.

- IMPACT ON THE POLITICAL CLIMATE

Researchers and commentators have stressed that Mr. Nemtsov’s death had a strong impact on the political climate in Russia by signaling to dissidents that oppositional activity is entailed with risk. They underline that the assassination of such a well-known public figure - who many had thought to be protected from attacks due to his fame and connections - in such a public place, right next to the Kremlin, was taken by many as a warning to other oppositional persons. Several commentators have pointed out that
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Mr. Nemtsov, who often travelled by foot at night, could more easily have been attacked in an alley, and the choice of killing him on the Bolshoi Moskvoretsky Bridge is therefore interpreted as a deliberate move by the organizers.\textsuperscript{73}

The effect of the murder, researchers have found, was that being a part of the opposition was seen as dangerous in a new way, and as a result, people refrained from oppositional activities.\textsuperscript{74} The comment by the legal representative of families of Russian soldiers killed in Ukraine, whom Mr. Nemtsov worked with at the time of his death, illustrates this view:

“If Nemtsov was shot in front of the Kremlin walls, then anything at all can be done to our clients in Ivanovo.”

According to the report, the families chose to withdraw their demands to authorities in part precisely because Mr. Nemtsov’s death made them fear for their own safety.\textsuperscript{75}

One interpretation among researchers is that the demonstrative assassination of Boris Nemtsov, regardless of who ordered the murder, should be seen as part of a “politics of fear”, where individual persons and organizations are targeted with repression and attacks in order to spread fear among broader sections of the population, thereby pre-empting oppositional activities.\textsuperscript{76}

Impunity in the Nemtsov case, experts emphasize, has served as a signal to other perpetrators and initiators of attacks on the opposition, contributing to more attacks. It has also been argued that the lack of consequences for high-ranking officials implicated in the Nemtsov case, as well as for persons responsible for the interior forces, security services, and law enforcement bodies where failures have been exposed in relation to the Nemtsov case, have contributed to the deteriorating situation for human rights more broadly. Impunity for the assassination and lack of consequences for those responsible for this impunity, by this interpretation, set a standard for how the political opposition could be treated in the future. Citing apparent involvement of the Chechen leadership in the assassination, an expert working with civil society in Russia also estimates that the escalation of human rights abuses in Chechnya since 2015 have happened partly because impunity for his involvement in the murder of Mr. Nemtsov served as a green light for Ramzan Kadyrov.\textsuperscript{77}

Another view on the impact of the assassination has been voiced by president Putin and persons affiliated with the Russian government, as well as the spokesperson for the Investigative Committee who have pointed to Western and Ukrainian spy agencies as likely perpetrators and stated that the motive for the assassination was likely to create instability in Russia.\textsuperscript{78} By this perspective, the most significant effect of Mr. Nemtsov’s murder is the harm that has been done to president Putin’s and Russian authorities’
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reputation. This view has been rejected by other commentators, who have stated that no instability has been created by the assassination – except within the opposition.79

- **BORIS NEMTSOV’S LEGACY**

Aside from the fear generated by Mr. Nemtsov’s assassination, he has also remained a unifying figure for dissidents in Russia. The annual march in his memory in Moscow, which in 2019 gathered between 6 000-10 000 participants, brings together representatives from different sections of the fragmented liberal opposition. Marches are also held in other Russian cities.80

At the site of the murder, a makeshift memorial has been set up where supporters continue to leave flowers. After it was repeatedly removed by authorities and destroyed by right-wing activists, a group of people formed the “Nemtsov Bridge”, arranging a 24-hour watch of volunteers to protect the memorial. The memorial has been described as a “rallying point for government critics”. 81 Volunteers have expressed that despite not having personally known Mr. Nemtsov or being supporters of his party, they see the work of guarding his memorial right next to the Kremlin as a way to express support for the democratic values he represented, and a form of resistance against the government.82

Activists who work to keep Mr. Nemtsov’s legacy alive have reported resistance from authorities. This includes attempts by the mayor to move the memorial march from central Moscow to the outskirts of the city,83 refusals to rent a site for the memorial concert, which has been interpreted as the product of political pressure.84

Volunteers have been repeatedly attacked and arrested at the memorial site.85 In August 2017, an unidentified man approached Ivan Skripnichenko, who was guarding the memorial, asking him if he did not love president Putin. At Mr. Skripnichenko’s biting answer, the man hit him in the face, breaking his nose. After Mr. Skripnichenko had fallen to the ground, hitting his head, he was kicked. He was released from hospital and appeared to be recovering, but died suddenly a week later. While the preliminary conclusion was that he died from heart problems, the family voiced doubts since he had not previously shown any signs of heart problems, and proposed that his death may be related to injuries from the attack. No criminal investigation into the assault was opened. Investigators said there was no surveillance footage of the attack, which was met with disbelief by the family lawyer.86

Since 2018, on the initiative of Mr Nemtsov’s friends and supporters, city councils in four world capitals – Washington D.C., Vilnius, Kyiv, and Prague – have enacted legislation to
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name squares or parks near Russian Embassies in his honour. Similar initiatives have been proposed in London, Warsaw, Tallinn, and Toronto.\footnote{D.C. ACT 22-276, 08 March 2018; Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, Boris Nemtsov Plaza Unveiled In Washington, 27 February, 2018; Delfi, Nepaisant Rusijos nepasitenkinimo Vilniuje atidarytas Boriso Nemcovo skveras, 24 August 2018; ERR, Reform city council member proposes Tallinn street rename to honor Nemtsov. 31 May 2019 and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, Prague To Rename Square By Russian Embassy After Nemtsov, 07 February 2020.}

The Boris Nemtsov Foundation was established in Mr. Nemtsov’s memory in 2015. Its’ activities include the annual Boris Nemtsov Forum for EU-Russia dialogue, the Boris Nemtsov Prize for Courage, as well as monitoring political repression in Russia and supporting Russian journalists and students.
6. THE DISCUSSION REGARDING THE MASTERMINDS

There have been many disparate theories as to the likely perpetrators and masterminds of the assassination of Boris Nemtsov. This report will not elaborate on all of them. While the Rapporteur cannot draw any conclusions as to who killed Mr. Nemtsov, she notes that theories such as the murder being committed by nationalist extremists returning from Ukraine, which was initially suggested by some experts, the so-called “Ukrainian trace” discussed in Russian media or the Russian government’s suggestion that Kremlin-critics assassinated Mr. Nemtsov as “sacrifice”, appear not to have been elaborated on by independent experts based on the concrete evidence. A theory much spread by officials, on the murder being motivated by revenge for Mr. Nemtsov’s comments on Charlie Hebdo, has been dismissed by analysts on the basis that the convicts, who supposedly carried out the assassination for this motive, had started their surveillance of Mr. Nemtsov before the Charlie Hebdo attack.

Several independent experts and commentators have concluded from the available evidence that the organizers of the assassination of Boris Nemtsov are likely found either among high-ranking officials in Chechnya, in the higher ranks of the security agencies, or both. In either case, these findings have grave implications and are naturally followed by the question of how high up in these respective structures responsibility would have to go. While this is of course a very large subject, here follows a brief summary of the discussion which takes into account also the larger context, including patterns emerging from other killings and suspected killings in Russia.

• ASSASSINATIONS OF PUTIN CRITICS

The large number of assassinations of President Putin’s critics, taking place mainly in Russia but also in places such as Qatar, the US and the UK, is a widespread subject of debate. While involvement of the Kremlin has not been proven, historian and expert on Russian security services Amy Knight concludes that “vast amounts” of available evidence, albeit circumstantial, as well as motive, points to Kremlin involvement in a number of assassinations, including Mr. Nemtsov’s. This type of analysis has been met with protests in pro-Kremlin media.

The assassination of Boris Nemtsov shares many characteristics with other killings. Many have in particular found distinct similarities between Mr. Nemtsov’s death and the murder of journalist Anna Politkovskaya in 2006. In both cases, current or previous employees of the security sector – military and police - were found guilty for carrying out the assassination for money, while organizers and initiators remain unidentified. Both investigations were marred by irregularities such as missing evidence, went to court with poorly prepared cases and during the trials, jurors quit or were forced to withdraw.
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both cases, the question of who initiated the killings was transferred to a separate case where no progress appears to have been made.\textsuperscript{93}

Looking at the context of the assassinations, both Mr. Nemtsov and Ms. Politkovskaya are believed to have been under surveillance by security services at the time of their deaths. Potential involvement of Ramzan Kadyrov was brought up in both cases as Chechens were charged with the killings and named organizers. Both victims had been committed to the situation in Chechnya and the Chechen dictator had personally met and shown hostility towards them. Further, the public statements made by government representatives in response to the killings were strikingly similar – in both cases, the impact of the victim’s work on those in power was downplayed, claiming that their deaths were more harmful to the authorities than their oppositional activities and journalism, respectively, and statements suggested that they may have been killed as a form of sacrifice by enemies of the Russian leadership in order to create instability in Russia.\textsuperscript{94}

- \textbf{RAMZAN KADYROV}

Ramzan Kadyrov takes on a role of defender of President Putin, launching aggressive public threats against the Russian opposition. He has previously been implicated in a number of high-profile assassinations both inside the Russian Federation and abroad, particularly of his own Chechen adversaries but also of Putin critics. Among the most well-known assassinations are the murder and attempted murder of the Yamadayev brothers, rivals for power in Chechnya, and the murder of human rights activist Natalia Estemirova.

Ruslan Yamadayev, leader of the oppositions against Kadyrov in Chechnya, was shot and killed in Moscow. Attempts to murder his brothers, Isa and Sulim, failed. The investigation and trial in the United Arab Emirates, where the assassination attempt on Sulim Yamadayev took place, convicted two persons, of which one was a former employee of Ramzan Kadyrov, and named Adam Delimkhanov as organizer. After the attempted assassination of Isa Yamadayev, the man who was caught carrying out the attempt testified that his orders came from Ramzan Kadyrov, who he stated had also confessed to having ordered the assassination of Ruslan Yamadayev.\textsuperscript{95} Natalia Estemirova, head of human rights NGO Memorial’s Chechen branch, was abducted and killed in 2009. While the official investigation concluded that a rebel leader who had already been killed by security forces was behind the murder, a research team from Memorial, NGO International Federation for Human Rights and newspaper Novaya Gazeta found the evidence to be fake. Experts and activists have instead concluded that security forces were likely involved in the murder and that Kadyrov, who was known by many to be furious about Estemirova’s work and had personally threatened her shortly before her death, likely ordered it.\textsuperscript{96}
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This pattern provides context for the demands by particularly the Nemtsov family’s legal representatives Vadim Prokhorov and Olga Mikhaylova to investigate the ties between the five convicts and the Chechen leadership, and to question Ramzan Kadyrov in relation to Mr. Nemtsov’s murder. Persons with insight into the situation in Chechnya have emphasized that in this repressive society, where collective punishment of relatives is used by authorities against those who displease the leadership, no-one would initiate such an action as the assassination of Boris Nemtsov without approval from the top.  

The assassination of Mr. Nemtsov, and the investigation that followed, has been interpreted by some analysts in the light of rivalries among President Putin’s key allies, particularly an ongoing conflict between the FSB and Kadyrov. The arrests of the five Chechens days after the murder by FSB, before the official investigation had done the analysis, has been interpreted as a move by the FSB to incriminate Ramzan Kadyrov.  

Some analysts go as far as stating that the role of the Chechen convicts was no more than a cover operation.  

- **SECURITY AGENCIES**

One issue in the Nemtsov case is the lack of clarity regarding the role of the security services, both in regards to the investigation and to the crime itself. 

If the shadowing and assassination of Mr. Nemtsov was carried out by the defendants despite such surveillance, this failure to raise the alarm or intervene ought to be scrutinized. The conduct of the security services is ultimately the responsibility of their leadership. If the FSB was indeed responsible for surveilling Mr. Nemtsov, inquiries into their conduct should be addressed to FSB chief Aleksandr Bortnikov. Experts and commentators have also pointed to the security agencies as suspects, for reasons described under “Witnesses and suspects” above. Without taking a stand as to the accuracy of these conclusions, these factors do make the apparent involvement of security services in the investigation troublesome. 

Aside from their alleged involvement in the assassination of Mr. Nemtsov, it should be noted that security agencies have been implicated in a number of assassinations and numerous other crimes. One such case is the killing of Chechen politician Zelinkhan Yandarbiev in Qatar in 2004, where three operatives of the Russian military intelligence were arrested. Another is the 2006 poisoning of Alexander Litvinenko in London. While lack of cooperation from Russian authorities made it impossible to fully investigate the role of the FSB, the inquiry was able to conclude that two former employees of the Russian security services and military forces, respectively, had carried out the crime. The use of polonium 210 as well as statements made by the suspects and the high-level protection they appeared to receive by Russian authorities, among other factors, led the inquiry to conclude that they very likely carried out the murder on FSB orders.  
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There are also numerous cases where involvement of security services has been discussed but not investigated. Another murder that spread fear among the opposition and among journalists, and which shares certain characteristics with the murder of Mr. Nemtsov, was the 2009 shooting of lawyer Stanislav Markelov and journalist Anastasia Baburova in Moscow. While right-wing extremists were convicted for the crime, suspicions about the involvement of security services have been voiced. As in the assassination of Mr. Nemtsov, some experts find that carrying out the attack would have required a type of surveillance that only security services could have access to, and that the location in central Moscow would have at least required for the agency in charge of surveillance of this area to look the other way. The weapon used in the attack was also a model that was legally only available to military and security service personnel.\footnote{Knight (2017)}

Multiple expert sources have informed the Rapporteur that the power of security services, particularly the FSB, is growing and that they currently make up a crucial part of the power structure in Russia.\footnote{See for example Andrei Soldatov (2017) From the “New Nobility” to the KGB, Russian Politics & Law, 55:2, 133-146.} Apart from other concerns this might raise, experts describe the security services as particularly opaque and inaccessible for public scrutiny.\footnote{Soldatov (2017)} Besides the President and his closest allies, there are no other actors who exercise control over the FSB.\footnote{Knight (2017)}

- **THE PRESIDENT**

An important part of the discussion regarding the case is reasoning regarding the likely initiators of the assassination – in particular, the potential involvement of president Putin.

There are commentators who have argued that the assassination could have been initiated on a lower level, by persons acting on a general climate of hatred towards the opposition and on the assumption that such actions were in line with the leadership’s wishes,\footnote{Stanislav Belkovsky, quoted in CBS, Russian opposition leader Boris Nemtsov shot dead in Moscow, 27 Feb 2015} or even as a way to undermine the President’s policies.\footnote{Dmitry Oreshkin, quoted in Foreign Policy Magazine, Boris Nemtsov and the Convenient Chechen Connection, 12 Mar 2015}

While Mr. Kadyrov declares his absolute loyalty to President Putin, Putin’s level of control over the Chechen leader and Kadyrov’s freedom to act are subject to discussion. Exiled Chechen politician Akhmad Zakaev have stated that Kadyrov is under Kremlin control and well knows not to overstep his mandate, and would never initiate an attack on an internationally known person outside of Chechnya without the approval of Mr. Putin. Others also support this assessment. Historian and expert on Russian security services Amy Knight, for example, describes Kadyrov as Putin’s “hatchet man” who likely arranges assassinations of Putin’s critics on the President’s orders.\footnote{Knight (2017)} Others, such as political analyst Stanislav Belkovsky, have argued that while Kadyrov is likely responsible for the assassination carried out by his men, he likely did so without direct instructions from the Kremlin. Rather, Kadyrov would have followed a general campaign initiated by
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the Kremlin against its’ critics, labelled “enemies of Russia”.109 By this interpretation, the Chechen leader is something of a “loose cannon”, useful but also a potential liability, among president Putin’s allies. Politician Ilya Yashin similarly argues that the Chechen leader has secured a position where he can exert substantial pressure on the Russian leadership and is no longer under the President’s control.110

John B. Dunlop on the other hand concludes that the President was the one to order the assassination. Others who have analyzed the case, such as Amy Knight and formerly high-ranking Russian official Vladimir Milov, have come to similar conclusions. These commentators emphasize the likelihood of active involvement of security services in the assassination, and their conclusions are based particularly on their insight into the structure and functioning of the Russian security agencies.111

Analysis of assassinations where Russian security agencies have been identified as suspects, such as the assassination of Alexander Litvinenko in 2006 in the UK, have found a number of arguments for the active involvement of the President in such cases. One of them is that traditions within the Russian security services dictate that the chief of a security agency seek the approval of the President before initiating an operation such as a high-profile assassination. This would be particularly important in cases such as the assassination of Mr. Nemtsov, where there was a longstanding relationship between the victim and the President, making the issue personal. President Putin’s own public comments are also taken by experts as indication that he prefers to personally oversee important and/or sensitive issues.112

The discussion regarding the likely masterminds is also linked to the perceived consequences of the assassination and an assessment of Mr. Nemtsov’s role. Some experts have argued against president Putin’s direct involvement based on the assessment that Mr. Nemtsov did not pose a political threat to him, even if they estimate that the climate incited by the Kremlin may have had an impact.113

Prime minister Dmitrij Medvedev stated a year after Mr. Nemtsov’s death that investigating this case was a matter of the reputation of Russian justice and the state.114 Considering the findings of the PACE Rapporteur, who concluded that the case presented by the prosecution and accepted by the Moscow Military Court was in parts “implausible or even impossible” and that the conduct of the trial appeared to be “designated to prevent public inquiry into who might have ordered the killing”,115 the different theories as to the masterminds of the assassination can neither be dismissed based on findings of the official investigation. The discussion above illustrates the ramifications of such shortcomings. Only an investigation conducted thoroughly,
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effectively and in good faith can settle the discussion, which is why a renewed investigation into the assassination of Mr. Nemtsov is necessary.
Reports from researchers and NGO:s show that the situation for the political opposition, activists of different and independent journalists in Russia is worsening – Human Rights Watch, for example, describes Russia as “more repressive than it has ever been in the post-Soviet era.”\textsuperscript{116} While freedom of expression and of association are enshrined in the Constitution of the Russian Federation, these rights are de facto disabled by additional legislation.\textsuperscript{117} These rights are also undermined by harassment by law enforcement and violations of existing rights, such as disruptions of meetings on fabricated grounds, police searching homes and workplaces or pressure on employers and landlords to fire dissidents or refuse to rent out venues for their activities. Further, threats and violent attacks against activists and journalists contribute to self-censorship and political inactivity, which also de facto disables fundamental rights.\textsuperscript{118} Violent attacks on opposition activists, such as the assassination of Boris Nemtsov, thus need to be seen in the broader context of repression in Russian society.

- **RECENT DEVELOPMENTS**

A recent report by the Boris Nemtsov Foundation on political repression in Russia finds that repression is becoming more systematic. Repression, it concludes, appears to be aimed at suppressing not only the political opposition, but all independent “unauthorized” civil activity. The main targets of repression campaigns are those organizations identified as “enemies” of the current leadership, but repression also targets a range of previously less controversial activities, such as environmental activism, and certain religious groups. The methods of repression of these different types of targets, the report finds, are strikingly similar: Repression campaigns typically include everything from prosecution under criminal and administrative codes, fabrication of cases, rights violations and harassment by law enforcement to outright attacks – threats, beatings, torture and murder.\textsuperscript{119}

- **LEGISLATION**

The Law on Foreign Agents from 2012 requires all non-commercial organizations engaging in “political activity” and receiving any foreign funding to register as foreign agents. Organizations in this register face more extensive state control via reporting requirements and forced to label any material they publish “NCO performing the function of a foreign agent”.\textsuperscript{116}

This law, according to the Council of Europe Commissioner of Human Rights, harms the reputation of organizations and has been accompanied by smear campaigns from authorities and state-controlled media, contributing to harassment and attacks on persons active in civil society. The law has also led to high administrative costs and difficulties for NCO:s and human rights defenders in securing funding, which has forced
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organizations to shut down. Over all, the Commissioner finds that the law has had a “major chilling effect” on civil society organizations and is “incompatible with international and European human rights standards”. This legislation has since been expanded, and since 2018 media outlets can be declared “foreign agents” and subject to restrictive administrative requirements. In December 2019, Russian President Vladimir Putin signed yet another law which allows the government to label individual Russian citizens as “foreign agents”.

The law on “Undesirable Organizations”, introduced in 2015, gives prosecutors the authority to declare international or foreign organizations “undesirable”, thereby banning them from activity in Russia and shutting them down. The grounds for declaring an organization “undesirable” has since been broadened by additional legislation.

Anti-terrorist legislation and vague anti-extremism legislation, further, are used arbitrarily to stifle free speech and to target bloggers and activists. Members of Islamic organizations in particular have been prosecuted under this legislation.

- **VIOLENCE AGAINST THE OPPOSITION**

While the exact number of violent attacks are difficult to assess, analysts find that the numbers of attacks have increased, particularly since 2014. Most of the victims of these attacks are not, like Mr. Nemtsov, well-known public figures residing in Moscow, but unknown local activists and journalists active in the regions. They are targeted for their political views or over their activities in relation to local issues. Attempting to solve concrete local problems, a report on political violence between 2012 and 2016 concludes, is the most dangerous type of activity.

Some recent examples of attacks can be mentioned. Boris Ushakov, project coordinator of Gulagu.net, was shot in March 2019 but survived the attack. Mr. Ushakov had previously contacted the police repeatedly over death threats, but no investigation had been initiated. Vlogger Vadim Kharchenko received multiple bullet and knife wounds when he was attacked by two unidentified men. In July 2019, LGBT and human rights activist Elena Grigorieva was found murdered after previously being threatened and attacked.

The issue of impunity for such attacks has been persistently brought up by NGO:s and in international fora. In particular, human rights defenders and researchers emphasize that
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impunity for instigators of attacks guarantees that these crimes will continue, since there are always people willing to carry them out.\textsuperscript{129} 

\textsuperscript{129} Ognianova (2012), and Oleg Kozlovsky in appendix 3
8. EXPLAINING IMPUNITY – THE CONTEXT OF THE NEMTSOV PROBE

The alleged flaws of the investigation into Mr. Nemtsov’s assassination need to be seen in the larger context of impunity for attacks on the opposition and on journalists. A reoccurring pattern is that authorities show unwillingness to investigate crimes where the opposition, or journalists, are victims – or even to intervene in ongoing attacks on activists.\textsuperscript{130} When an investigation is conducted, political motives are typically excluded.\textsuperscript{131}

In many of these cases, no one is prosecuted. When someone is prosecuted, it is for carrying out the attack, while organizers and instigators are rarely identified. Lack of transparency, evidence gone missing and cases that are forwarded to court with insufficient evidence are reoccurring problems.\textsuperscript{132} Important work has been carried out by researchers and NGO:s such as the Committee to Protect Journalists in mapping out the factors, on a systemic level, that cause these problems and ultimately lead to impunity.

Activists and analysts assess that the smear campaigns from state-controlled media against oppositional persons and independent NGO:s contribute to the attacks. The public discourse incites hatred and signals to potential perpetrators and law enforcers that the rights and safety of these persons are not backed by the state.\textsuperscript{133}

- LAW ENFORCEMENT

A key problem of impunity, analysts of investigations into attacks on journalists conclude, is that of many of those who carry out the attacks have ties to high-ranking persons.\textsuperscript{134}

Several of the men sentenced for Mr. Nemtsov’s and journalist Anna Politkovskaya’s murders were current or previous members of the military forces, security officials or police.\textsuperscript{135} While the majority of attackers remain unidentified, many are believed by NGO:s to be security officials or “acting in collusion with them,”\textsuperscript{136} as well as members of militia or organized crime with connections to oligarchs, local political officials and other powerful persons.\textsuperscript{137} An analysis of attacks on the opposition between 2012 and 2016 finds that in cases where attackers have been identified, they typically are private security personnel or members of “security” and ultra-conservative pro-government organizations.\textsuperscript{138} Motives and circumstantial evidence in a number of high-profile assassinations have also been found by researchers to implicate the Kremlin itself.\textsuperscript{139}

Possible involvement of high-ranking persons and a general pattern of close ties between organized crime, high-ranking officials and law enforcement makes it disadvantageous
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and potentially dangerous for investigators to pursue the organizers and instigators, and this pattern has been persistent over time. Potential political motives are therefore omitted to avoid having to follow such paths towards organizers and instigators. Hierarchal organizational structure, wide-spread corruption and strong interdependence between agencies means that investigations are often subject to interference and pressure from within or outside the agency. Corruption and organizational structure produce a general incentive structure for investigators which discourages them from pursuing impartial and effective investigations.\textsuperscript{140}

The Committee for the Protection of Journalists have also found that investigations into journalist attacks are often hampered by conflicts of interest within the investigative authorities.\textsuperscript{141} Law enforcement themselves also take part in violence against the opposition, such as violent dispersals of peaceful protests.\textsuperscript{142} A recent report by the Boris Nemtsov Foundation outlines the part played by law enforcement, such as police and the FSB, in repressive campaigns. These campaigns, the Foundation finds, also include violent attacks.\textsuperscript{143} With that perspective in mind, a conflict of interest is clear. Another problem brought up in relation to failed investigations is the general mistrust towards law enforcement from potential witnesses.\textsuperscript{144}

- **THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM**

The inadequacies identified in the trial that found five men guilt of executing the assassination of Mr. Nemtsov illustrate the systemic problems of the Russian judicial system.

At the core of the issue of impunity, according a human rights lawyer working on journalists’ cases, is the lack of independence of the judiciary.\textsuperscript{145} Judges are under heavy pressure from above and outside due to the bureaucratic structure of the judicial system.\textsuperscript{146} They are also said to be vulnerable to corruption and pressure due to their relatively low wages.\textsuperscript{147}

The alleged bias shown in favor of the prosecution during the trial in the Nemtsov case follows a larger pattern of “accusatorial bias” in Russian courts, where the institutionalized advantage of prosecutors over judges and defense leads to extremely small numbers of acquittals (1 out of 500 cases).\textsuperscript{148} While the law formally prescribes a judicial process where prosecution and defense are adversaries of equal standing, a lack of laws that in practice guarantee an equal process leads to frequent violations of these
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principles.\textsuperscript{149} Lack of transparency and accountability gives little possibility to address these issues.\textsuperscript{150}

- **TORTURE**

While not directly being related to the discussion on impunity, the issue of torture should also be mentioned. While the Rapporteur cannot take a stand on the claims that confessions in the Nemtsov case were extracted by torture, she notes that the problem of torture in the Russian legal system is widely known. During the latest Periodic Review of the Russian Federation, the UN Committee Against torture for example expressed its’ concerns over “numerous reliable reports” of torture and ill-treatment in Russia, including “as a means to extract confessions”.\textsuperscript{151}
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9. THE RAPPORTEUR’S ACTIVITIES

Since her appointment, the Rapporteur has gathered information on the investigation into the assassination of Boris Nemtsov and held meetings with persons with insight into the case. A special e-mail inbox, specialrep.mc@oscepa.dk, was created for the eventuality that someone wished to submit information anonymously.

- COMMUNICATION WITH RUSSIAN AUTHORITIES

The Rapporteur sought contact with Russian authorities by letter. Letters were sent on 29 May 2019 to the Moscow District Military Court, the Prosecutor General’s Office of the Russian Federation as well as the Speaker of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, Hon. Vyacheslav Volodin, with a request to review the material relating to the investigation, for the appointment of a contact person to facilitate communication with Russian authorities and an invitation to contact the Rapporteur with any questions or issues concerning her assignment.152

In late May 2019, the Rapporteur sought a meeting with the Russian Ambassador in Sweden. The meeting was later cancelled.

The Russian embassy in Copenhagen informed the Rapporteur by e-mail on 15 July 2019 that her request for access to the case files could not be met because, according to Russian criminal procedure legislation, only persons involved in criminal proceedings have the right to access case files. In addition, the e-mail stated, the case file contains secret information that falls under the law “On State Secrets”, which “is an obstacle for getting access to the case for a citizen of a foreign state”.153 In conversation with Rapporteur Cederfelt, Nemtsova’s legal representatives have stated that the mention of state secrets is used as a method to prevent insight into the investigation, pointing to the fact that there is no reference to any state secrets made in the protocols of any of the court hearings. This conclusion is underlined by the fact that all hearings at the Moscow District Military Court were held in open settings in the presence of journalists.

On 31 July 2019, the Rapporteur followed up the letters per telephone. Upon calling the Moscow Military Court, the Rapporteur was informed that the letter had been received and that the matter would be handled by the Supreme Court and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This was also confirmed by the Moscow Military Court by e-mail. A phone call to the Supreme Court confirmed that the Supreme Court had received the letter. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs informed the Rapporteur that the official reply, explaining the Russian position on the matter, had been sent via the Russian Embassy in Copenhagen.
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• COMMUNICATION WITH THE SWEDISH GOVERNMENT

An important part of the work of members of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly is to put pressure on their respective governments to act against violations of the OSCE’s founding principles. Therefore, the Rapporteur has taken the following initiatives in regards to the Swedish government.

The Rapporteur in August 2019 submitted a written question to the then Foreign Minister of Sweden, Margot Wallström, asking what actions the Minister intended to take in order to push for a reopening of the investigation into Mr. Nemtsov’s murder, and to address the issue of impunity for attacks on the oppositions in Russia. The Foreign Minister informed the Rapporteur that human rights and the rule of law are addressed in bilateral contacts with Russian representatives, as well as in multilateral fora. She also emphasized the importance of support to and contact with Russian civil society. Further, the Minister informed the Rapporteur that the Swedish embassy in Moscow monitors the Nemtsov case and acts to keep his memory alive by for example participating in the yearly remembrance ceremony.

On 19 November 2019, The Rapporteur submitted an interpellation to the Foreign Minister Ann Linde, asking to elaborate on how she works to build coherence among states in relation to the human rights situation in Russia, particularly within the European Union. The Rapporteur also asked the Foreign Minister if the Minister would be prepared to promote an independent investigation into the Nemtsov case within the EU framework. In a response to the interpellation, the Foreign Minister informed the Rapporteur that Sweden will continue to address the human rights situation in Russia in bilateral contacts and in The Council of Europe (CoE), The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and the European Union (EU). The foreign minister explained that Sweden approve of the appeal laid by EU to further investigate the murder of Boris Nemtsov. Regarding the issue of the human rights situation, the Foreign Minister expressed concern on the shrinking space for democracy, which has led democracy activists and NGO:s in Russia to cease their efforts.154

• HEARING IN THE NEMTSOV CASE, OSCE PA SUMMER SESSION

During the Annual Session in Luxembourg, on 7 July 2019, a first hearing was held. Aside from a presentation of the Rapporteur’s preliminary report, the PACE Special Rapporteur presented his final report on the case and experts on human rights discussed the assassination of Boris Nemtsov in relation to the situation of the Russian opposition and the international framework for human rights. Representatives of Mr. Nemtsov’s family also provided commentary. An open invitation for a representative of the Russian Federation to join the panel was sent to the Russian delegation to the OSCE PA for further distribution. There was no response to this invitation.

A complete transcription of the hearing can be found in the appendix.155 A summary follows below.
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The participants in the hearing underlined the importance of protecting the political opposition in order to ensure democracy and political freedom. The Nemtsov case, they argued, should be seen in the context of a pattern of impunity for attacks on the political opposition in an increasingly authoritarian Russia. Several participants also spoke about Mr. Nemtsov’s role as a symbol of a more democratic and European-oriented Russia. They expressed their dedication to cooperation and common efforts within the international community. Several speakers emphasized the efforts by Russian activists in keeping Mr. Nemtsov’s memory alive and expressed their solidarity with the Russian opposition. The aim of the international oversight process, the participants stated, is to ensure political freedom and rule of law of all people in Russia.

OSCE PA President George Tsereteli outlined the background of the decision to appoint a Special Rapporteur on the Nemtsov case, underlining the safety of politicians and lawmakers as a prerequisite for a functional democracy and expressing his worries for the attacks against politicians and lawmakers in an increasingly polarized political climate. He pointed to the shared efforts of the OSCE PA, national parliaments and the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe and the potential for further cooperation regarding the Nemtsov case.

Mr. Roger F. Wicker, Head of the US delegation, in his opening remarks gave a personal account of Mr. Nemtsov and the vision of Russia he represented. The international efforts for a new investigation into the Nemtsov case, he underlined, ultimately aim to make sure that the Russian people in the future will enjoy all the principles of the OSCE Final Document.

Ms. Margareta Cederfelt, OSCE PA Special Rapporteur, presented her preliminary report, explaining the premises of her work as Rapporteur and providing an overview of the case, activities within the international community and the criticism against the investigation and judicial process. All OSCE member states, she underlined, have committed to the principles of democracy and rule of law as a part of the third dimension of security and this includes the protection of the political opposition.

Mr. Emanuelis Zingeris, Special Rapporteur of the PACE, presented his report on the Nemtsov case. An overview of the Rapporteur’s mandate within the PACE framework and the findings of the report was given by Mr. Günter Schirmer, Head of Staff of the Legal Affairs Committee. Russian authorities chose not to cooperate due to the Russian boycott of the Assembly, but case material was made available for the Rapporteur by the legal representatives of Ms. Nemtsova and based on this material the Rapporteur was able to conclude that the investigation did not meet the standards set by the European Convention of Human Rights. The resolution adopted by the PACE outlined detailed and concrete steps by which the failures to investigate could be remedied and the Rapporteur, Mr. Schirmer explained, was mandated for follow-up for the next 12 months. Mr. Zingeris established that the results of the murder investigation and the court proceedings were unconvincing. He described Mr. Nemtsov's political life, stating that Mr. Nemtsov represented a European and democratic path for Russia. His own decision to take on the role as Special Rapporteur, Mr. Zingeris explained, was motivated by his belief in Russia and its place among the democratic states. Regretting that his attempts to establish dialogue with Russian authorities and to invite the Russian delegation to participate in the oversight process so far had yielded no results, he
expressed hopes that Special Rapporteur Cederfelt would be able to obtain cooperation from the Russian authorities.

Ms. Claudia Monti, Ombudsman of Luxembourg, placed the murder of Mr. Nemtsov in a broader context of a deteriorating human rights situation in Russia under Mr. Putin’s leadership. She pointed out that while Russia has signed the European Convention on Human Rights, a decision from 2015 gives the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation the mandate to ignore verdicts by the European Court of Human Rights.

Mr. Oleg Kozlovsky, Researcher at Amnesty International, further stressed that the Nemtsov case is part of a pattern of violence towards the opposition in Russia, and impunity for those who commit it. He emphasized that the well-known cases constitute only the tip of the iceberg and presented a number of less known activists and peaceful protestors that have been attacked or murdered in the past years, with little or no action taken by law enforcement. He especially underlined the need to bring to justice not only the perpetrators but the organizers of these attacks in order to make them stop.

Mr. Vladimir Kara-Murza, Russian opposition politician and friend of Mr. Nemtsov, provided an account of the shortcomings of the official investigation, which he characterized as a cover-up. Stating that Russian authorities want the Nemtsov murder to be forgotten, he thanked the OSCE PA and the PACE for preventing this by initiating international oversight of the case.

Further, Ms. Zhanna Nemtsova, journalist and daughter of Mr. Nemtsov, and Mr. Vadim Prokhorov, lawyer of Ms. Nemtsova and previously of Mr. Nemtsov, provided commentary. Ms. Nemtsova expressed her regrets over the Russian authorities’ refusal to cooperate with the international oversight process. This refusal, she stated, gives the impression that they do not wish to find the truth, which leads to even more suspicions and speculation regarding their role in the crime, and she urged the Russian delegation to cooperate. Mr. Prokhorov underlined that the international oversight process is one of the very few tools currently available for pushing towards further investigation into the murder. He also pointed in particular to witness statements regarding Kremlin plans to assassinate Mr. Nemtsov.
The assassination of Boris Nemtsov and the judicial process that followed relates to what the OSCE calls the third dimension of security - democracy and the rule of law. Impunity for attacks on the opposition and its’ impact on political rights illustrate how democracy and rule of law, principles to which the OSCE participating states have committed, are intertwined.

As stated in the document of the Moscow Meeting, such matters are of ”direct and legitimate concern to all participating States and do not belong exclusively to the internal affairs of the State concerned”. The conduct of the investigation into Boris Nemtsov’s murder, and other investigations into violent attacks on members of the opposition, is therefore not an internal affair. It is the duty of the OSCE PA to uphold its’ principles and to act when they are undermined in participating states. As the participants of the preliminary hearing in July 2019 stated, the aim of this international oversight process is to help ensure political freedom and rule of law of all people in Russia.

Boris Nemtsov’s work to promote democracy and fight corruption has been highlighted by pro-democracy activists in Russia, as well as internationally. His death was a tragedy for Russia and had a strong impact on the political climate, spreading fear and possibly opening up for further attacks and repression. Celebrating his memory has become a way to honor Russian democracy, and not allowing for his murder to be forgotten a way to counter the wide-spread impunity for political violence.

Despite calls both from within Russia and from other countries and from the international community to make sure Mr. Nemtsov’s murder was thoroughly, effectively and transparently investigated so that both perpetrators, organizers and initiators were held accountable, the official investigation and the following trial has been subject to severe criticism. To summarize, this criticism concerns allegations of:

- An incomplete investigation leading to a criminal case with numerous inconsistencies, raising suspicions that certain elements in the case – in particular, a political motive and involvement of high-ranking officials – were purposefully excluded, and to alternative theories of how the assassination was executed
- A judicial process in which the defendants were subject to torture and denied a fair trial, and which failed to provide justice for the victim
- An unclear role of the security services in the investigation
- No answers as to who ordered the assassination of Boris Nemtsov, and why

Aside from the official investigation, important work has been carried out by a number of researchers and experts in filling out the blanks. They have particularly pointed to the potential involvement of the Chechen leadership and/or security services, even suggesting that the Russian president may be the initiator. Looking at the criticism against the official investigation, particularly the shortcomings identified by the PACE Special Rapporteur, such arguments can neither be dismissed nor confirmed. While no answers can be given without a reopened criminal investigation, the implications are extremely worrisome. In this regard, a full investigation is also in the interest of Russian authorities.

Looking at the Nemtsov investigation in relation to the systemic problems behind impunity makes clear the difficulties in establishing a thorough, fair and transparent
investigation. On the other hand, it has also been said by analysts that the main issue for addressing impunity is not the capabilities of the Russian law enforcement, but political will. Mobilization of political will is something that all parliamentarians in the OSCE participating states can contribute to.

A new and full investigation into the assassination of Boris Nemtsov, clarifying what took place on Bolshoi Moskvoretsky Bridge, and on whose orders, would be a first step to address the climate of impunity. As much as Mr. Nemtsov’s death installed fear, the Rapporteur wants to emphasize that holding his killers, including organizers and instigators, accountable in a fair judicial process could also install hope among those in Russia who continue to risk persecution and attacks to fight for democracy and the rule of law.

The United States and Lithuania have used legislation on targeted sanctions against human rights abusers (“Magnitsky Laws”) to sanction individuals involved in organizing the assassination of Boris Nemtsov, as well as those responsible for the failure to investigate it. Similar recommendations have been adopted by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. To end the spiral of violence, the Rapporteur considers the use of such restrictive measures to be an appropriate response, and calls for the European Union to agree on and impose targeted sanctions upon governments, individuals and non-state entities involved in human rights abuses.
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APPENDIX 1

Moscow District Military Court
Arbat St. 37
119002 Moscow
Russian Federation

Stockholm, 20 May 2019

Dear Sir/Madam,

On March 8 this year, I was appointed by the President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly as Special Rapporteur on the investigation of the assassination of Mr. Boris Nemtsov, with the task of overseeing issues relevant to this case and report back to the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly. I very much look forward to working together with representatives of the Russian Federation on this important issue.

I would therefore like to ask for access to any material related to the investigation into the assassination of Mr. Boris Nemtsov. I also believe my cooperation with the Russian authorities would be greatly facilitated by the designation of a contact person, and kindly ask for your assistance in establishing such a connection.

If there are any questions or issues you would like to discuss, please do not hesitate to contact me. I look forward to hearing back from you.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Margareta Cederfelt
Member of the Swedish Riksdag
Vice-President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly

Torvoldjestudygade 1, 1055 Copenhagen K, Denmark
Phone: +45 33 37 80 69 - Fax: +45 33 37 80 30 - osce@oscepa.dk - www.oscepa.org

44
APPE N D I X 1

Prosecutor General’s Office of the Russian Federation
Bolshaya Dmitrovka, 15a GSP-3
125993 Moscow
RUSSIA

Stockholm, 20 May 2019

Dear Sir/Madam,

On March 8 this year, I was appointed by the President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly as Special Rapporteur on the investigation of the assassination of Mr. Boris Nemtsov, with the task of overseeing issues relevant to this case and report back to the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly. I very much look forward to working together with representatives of the Russian Federation on this important issue.

I would therefore like to ask for access to any material related to the investigation into the assassination of Mr. Boris Nemtsov. I also believe my cooperation with the Russian authorities would be greatly facilitated by the designation of a contact person, and kindly ask for your assistance in establishing such a connection.

If there are any questions or issues you would like to discuss, please do not hesitate to contact me. I look forward to hearing back from you.

Yours sincerely,

Margareta Cederfelt
Member of the Swedish Riksdag
Vice-President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly

Tordenskjoldsgade 1, 1055 Copenhagen K., Denmark
Phone: +45 33 37 80 40 - Fax: +45 33 37 80 30 - osce@oscepa.dk - www.oscepa.org
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Hon. Vyacheslav Volodin  
Speaker of the State Duma of the  
Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation  
Chketnyi Ryad 1  
103265 Moscow, Russia

Stockholm, 20 May 2019

Dear Mr. Speaker,

On March 8 this year, I was appointed by the President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly as Special Rapporteur on the investigation of the assassination of Mr. Boris Nemtsov, with the task of overseeing issues relevant to this case and report back to the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly. I very much look forward to working together with representatives of the Russian Federation on this important issue.

I would therefore like to ask for access to any public material related to the investigation into the assassination of Mr. Boris Nemtsov that the Parliament may have. If there are any questions or issues you would like to discuss, please do not hesitate to contact me. I look forward to hearing back from you.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Margareta Cederfelt  
Member of the Swedish Riksdag  
Vice-President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly

Toordenig 4, 1116 Copenhagen K, Denmark  
Phone: +45 33 37 80 40  
Fax: +45 33 37 80 30  
osce@oscepa.dk - www.oscepa.org
Уважаемый Семен Александрович,

В соответствии с договоренностью, направляем поступивший из Москвы ответ по запросу г-жи Седерфельт.

It will not be possible for Ms. Cederfelt to have an access to the materials of the criminal case in respect of the death of Boris Nemtsov. In accordance with the criminal procedure legislation of the Russian Federation, only persons involved in criminal proceedings (Ms. Cederfelt is not among those) have the right to access the materials of criminal cases. In addition, the case file contains secret information that, in accordance with the Law of the Russian Federation “On State Secrets”, is an obstacle for getting access to the case for a citizen of a foreign state.

С уважением,
Anna Tkachenko
Второй секретарь
Посольство России в Дании
Personal security and State support to threatened lawmakers in the OSCE region:
Hearing on the Nemtsov case

OSCE Parliamentary Assembly Annual Session
Luxembourg, 7 July 2019 13:30-15:00

Mark Pritchard
Welcome Ladies and Gentlemen!

Just some housekeeping points to begin with, the session will end at 2:55 given the Rapporteur, Margareta needs to chair the plenary session. As far as the preliminary report is concerned, copies are available at the end of the meeting, there will be a place by the water behind me, to the left. If people need it mailed or emailed, that can be requested as well. The running order, if you have not got one of these, just put your hand up, so that clerks will help. The running orders before us there’s been some slight changes which I’d like to mention. Delighted that Senator Wicker will be making some remarks after George Tsereteli, the President and also, we will be hearing later on from Zhanna Nemtsova and also from Vadim, the family’s attorney, that will be from the floor at the end of the other remarks.

I just wanted to say, from the outsets, that this hearing on the murder of Boris Nemtsov fits very much within the third dimension of the work of the OSCE, and of course that is, you will all know, security, democracy and the rule of law. So that is why this hearing is happening here today, at the OSCE PA.

So, welcome again, and I’d like to, now, ask George Tsereteli, President of the Parliamentary Assembly, to give some opening remarks. Thank you.

George Tsereteli
Thank you very much, dear Mark, dear guests, I am happy to see in this hall, the daughter of Boris Nemtsov, Zhanna, and of course Vadim and our dear friend, Vladimir Kara-Murza and also people who are really driving forces of this process and I am very happy that many politicians sitting at the hall, in this hall at the OSCE and beyond, in many other places, in the Parliaments, in the Senate of US, and Congress of the US, they are supporting, to, let’s say, follow the investigation and scrutiny and to keep in, let’s say, an account, an accountability of people who are in charge of those... unfortunately, of this crime and other crimes in times of this increased polarization in our societies, in our political discourse.

We have seen very aggressive rebel attacks against politicians online and in the real world. This has had sometimes very tragic implications, we will remember the brutal assassination of British MP, 3 years ago, we will also recall our American friend’s brutal attack against [3:04] and Steve’s colleagues in the United States. A fully functioning democracy of course requires
that politicians, officials and activists be able to work without fear for their lives, no fear of being imprisoned for their beliefs. Attacks on politicians or activists are nothing less than attack on democracy, this is why it is so important that any political attack being investigated thoroughly, independently and transparently.

The murder of Boris Nemtsov 4 years ago took place in a context of crackdown and the opposition [3:45] and express opposition views. The investigation left many unanswered questions while five men have been found guilty, on the moment of this assassination, no more [3:56] have been confirmed. And we still do not know who commissioned the assassination and why.

So talking about this during our Berlin meeting, I also expressed my personal sentiments, also considering myself a good friend of Boris Nemtsov for many years and to me, it is also a personal issue, just to know that, and that’s why, and not of course because of only personal issues, I think we all have our own approach and our vision how grave crime it was and upon the quest of several members of the Russian civil society, I already mentioned names, Vladimir Kara-Murza and Vadim and others, members of civil society based on call by all Assembly members in Berlin, Laurynas and the group of Mark, and of course Margareta, and our American colleagues, I therefore declared to ask Vice-president Margareta Cederfelt to carry out a report on the investigation on the assassination of Boris Nemtsov.

I am thankful to US congress, I already spoke about this at the plenary session, for having adopted this very strong resolution on this topic where the work of our assembly is clearly underlined and I look forward to continue close cooperation with the US Helsinki Commission on this issue. Of course, I also look forward to hearing from Mr. Zingeris and very much thankful to our good friend, great friend, Emanuelis Zingeris that he conducted the similar [5:52], he started this process in cooperation with our American colleagues and Helsinki Commission. And there was similar work that was undertaken for the Parliamentary Assembly of Council of Europe and I think this really illustrates that we are one area where we can also reinforce cooperation between our Assemblies.

I hope that together of course we can apply sufficient pressure that will lead to the case being reopened to allow for a full and total investigation. This is important not only for the memory of Boris Nemtsov and for his loved ones - and once again I’d like to great Zhanna for being here and thank her -but also for the guaranty of the safety of politicians and lawmakers throughout the OSCE. So, I think we’ll have a fruitful side event, thank you all for coming because I think more people should join us as far as committee is going on and thank you Mark for chairing this meeting. I look forward to hearing from you more. Thank you.

Mark Pritchard

Thank you Mr. President. Before I call Senator Wicker, can I just ask a member of the staff to bring some water for the panelists, thank you very much. I just notify everyone that this meeting will be minuted and you’ll notice that we do have the international media here with us, thank you, and we are grateful for the media’s presence. Senator Wicker...

Senator Wicker

Yes, we are grateful for the media to be here and shine a light on what we will learn today and I thank you Mark Pritchard for chairing this, President Tsereteli for your leadership and
bringing this to where we are today, beginning last winter in Vienna, and to my friend Margareta Cederfelt for courageously agreeing to step forward and take the point on this disturbing issue. Thank you also Mr. President for acknowledging the presence of Ms. Nemtsova, our hearts are with her always and of course I am delighted to acknowledge the presence of a good friend Vladimir Kara-Murza, who God has miraculously saved on 2 occasions from very desperate poisoning attempts and we’re just always thrilled, reminding, whenever we see him.

I was a young representative, very junior representative, in the House of Representatives from the 1st district of Mississippi when I joined my partisan congressional delegation to Moscow. And it was an optimistic time for Russians, it was an optimistic time for Europeans, it was an optimistic time for friends of Russia, and friends of freedom in the United States of America. There was a vibrant multiparty system going on in Russia at the time of this visit. And as we visited around, we did it with various advocates of different points of view, various candidates for a leadership to perhaps succeed President Yeltsin at some point in the future, we had the opportunity, as a delegation, to meet a young dynamic Deputy Prime Minister, named Boris Nemtsov. And I think I was not the only, I certainly was not the only member of that partisan congressional delegation to sit there in that room and think “This could be the future of a prosperous market-oriented free Russia”, this young Deputy Prime Minister. And of course, that was not to be, and we know what has happened since then, but still, through the decades, Boris Nemtsov was a voice that not only resonated around the world among friends who look for a better future in Russia, but also his name resonated around Moscow and around the former Soviet Union, not only just Russia, but the former Soviet Union. And the word impunity is tossed around in this regard when we talk about authoritarian leaders. I asked Boris about his fears for his own safety and I think many of us believe that perhaps because of his notoriety and because he was so visible and spoke for so many people in Russia, that he would be immune from this sort of thing that eventually happened to him, a brutal [11:32] murder on a bridge within the shadow of the Kremlin.

Why do we do this? And we’re going to get to the information as soon as I… we’ll end up to hush up and be quiet and get with the facts, we do it as a statement for the rule of law. And we do it, Vladimir, for the people of Russia as I hope that the information that will come to light today and further during the coming month there under the leadership of Margareta Cederfelt, that it will lead to a day for which I have a dream and that is a free Russian people who enjoy every benefit that the principles of the OSCE Final Document stands for. So, thank you to all of you from the depth of the bottom of my heart, I am with you and I appreciate you and I love you, thank you so much.

Mark Pritchard

Thank you Senator Wicker. You mentioned the word freedom, of course, freedom is often misrepresented as a Western construct when in fact you remind us that it is actually a universal right, wherever people might live and you mentioned [13:07] the rule of law and we’re here again raising this important case representing that rule of law in our organization. But of course, every single day, on that same bridge, flowers are laid. They are cleared away by the Russian authorities but new flowers come, every single day, since the assassination of Boris Nemtsov. So we’re doing it but also the Russian people are doing it, every single day.

Thank you for those comments.
Now, it gives me great pleasure to introduce Margareta who, as you all know, is the Vice-President of the Parliamentary Assembly but also the special Rapporteur on the Nemtsov case, who is going to present her preliminary report to us. Thank you, Margareta.

Margareta Cederfelt

Thank you very much Mr. Moderator, Mark Pritchard, and I do also would like to say thank you to our President, Mr. Tsereteli for appointing me to this duty as a Rapporteur of the murder of Mr. Boris Nemtsov. I also want to say thank you to Senator Wicker for his work that he has done for a long time, several years working hard for democracy, rule of law and also for ... to get an answer of what happened to Mr. Boris Nemtsov. Thank you very much. And I send also my regrets to Boris Nemtsov’s daughter, Ms. Zhanna Nemtsova, who is here today, thank you for coming. And, I need to speak a bit closer to the microphone so you can hear me. I’m sorry!

I have been tasked with reviewing the case of the murder of Mr. Boris Nemtsov, member of the Yaroslavi regional Duma in the Russian federation, and as we also have heard here, former party leader, also Minister, and at that time, he was also a political activist. And I will report back to OSCE PA. Today it’s just a short brief report because I was appointed in February this year and my plan is to have a final report next summer, in July 2020, when we have our summer meeting in Vancouver. But I want to share with you what I have found so far and first of all, why was I appointed.

Yes, for me it is obvious that it could be somebody else but for OSCE PA it’s important that we work to support democracy, we support the rule of law because all states, all member countries of OSCE have committed to, as a part of the third dimension of security, to work for democracy, for the right of freedom of speech, for the right to be political active, for the right to have an opinion that’s different from the majority and of course, this is an issue also for the state to protect the people who are of another opinion than the majority and democracy requires that there is an opposition, with politicians and activists who are able to act without fear. When politicians and activists are attacked, an impartial and true investigation must be conducted. And this is to achieve justice for the victim and of course it is also to establish how such an attack was possible and what needs to be done to protect politicians and activists from similar attacks in the future in order to ensure a functioning democracy. It’s also important for people to rely on politics, to have a trust that the work done by politicians is fair, is transparent, is open and also for people to be active in politics, otherwise there will be a fear to take part in the political life, to take part in the civil society.

And I will also mention that the assassination of Boris Nemtsov in 2015 has provoked a widespread attention and is continuing to gather attention and this is because of Mr. Nemtsov’s leading governmental official turn to democracy, anticorruption activism. And in part, because of what the assassination indicate about the situation of democracy, human rights and the rule of law in the Russia federation.

The situation in Russia has been marked by increasing political oppression, attacks on the opposition and a judiciary which is not independent and impartial. A number of issues concerning the investigation into Mr. Nemtsov murder indicate that the process of finding those responsible and ensuring the future safety of the oppositional politicians and activists can’t be guaranteed at a national level. I think this is very important to mention because, as I said earlier, the opposition needs to be guaranteed security and safety in the democracy.
APPENDIX 3

The criticism against the investigation and trial that followed the murder of Mr. Nemtsov can be summarized as follows: an incomplete investigation leading to a criminal case with numerous inconsistencies, a judicial process in which the defendants were subject to torture and denied a fair trial and which failed to provide justice for the victim, an unclear role of the security service in the investigation, no answers to who ordered the assassination of Boris Nemtsov and why. This has led to suspicions that certain elements in the case particularly a potential political motive and involvement of high-ranking officials were intentionally excluded. It has also led to alternative theories of how the assassination was executed.

Because of all these concerns there has been a number of activities in the international community regarding the Nemtsov case. Concerns have been raised through several institutions like intern UN different bodies, on the rule of law and the political freedom in Russia in relation to the case. The European Court of Human Rights has dealt with the case and ruled in favor of one of the defendant in the case. The conduct of the investigation into the murder is subject to a separate, still undergoing case. And the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe appointed Mr. Zingeris - so I’m very happy he is here on my right-Special Rapporteur on the case. He is here with us today to share his conclusions which can also be found in his recent report.

It is most important that the international attention does not dwindle on the case of the murder of Mr. Nemtsov. The safety of oppositional forces into the OSCE member countries must be guaranteed as it is a pre-request for freedom of expression and assembly.

And I would also like to mention that in my capacity as a Rapporteur of the OSCE PA, it is not to make a criminal investigation, it is not an intent of mine to determine the guilt of the defendants, my mandate is to bring attention to the existing information regarding the Nemtsov case, to continue to build the political will which is necessary for a judicial investigation.

I have sought contact with the Russian authorities by letter and I have sought also to get a meeting with the Russian ambassador in Sweden, of this there has been no result. We have invited Russians to take part here in the panel, we have not gotten any answer to the invitation. We have invited Russians to be here with us today, also, to listen if they don’t want to sit in the panel, I have not heard anything at all. And by this, I would like to say that I will present more, next summer. The work is not ended but there are others who have presented their report and I look forward to take part of what they have found. Thank you very much Mr. Moderator.

Mark Pritchard

We thank you Margareta and we look forward to hearing and receiving the full report in Vancouver in July and I wish you every success.

Can I just ask if your phone is on line, if you could mute it I would be very grateful, it occasionally does disturb the speakers. Just on the time limit for speakers, I’ve got to be ... do a hard stop, courteously I hope, but we are on the clock and we do want to get through as many speakers as possible – bless you! – and we’re going to have 7 minutes, and it is a great pleasure to introduce Emanuels Zingeris, my good friend, from Lithuania having shared the Lithuanian [23:31] for 4 or 5 years in the UK parliament. We know each other very well, who is here, as you will see, the special Rapporteur for the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly. Welcome Sir, welcome!
Emanuelis Zingeris

Thank you, thank you dear Chairman. Actually, I have next to me my good friend, Head of our Legal Affairs Committee staff and he will talk, if you allow me, 2 words about our procedures to explain the Council of Europe parliamentary assembly differences from OSCE and probably our mandate if you allow, if you will be so kind to give 2 minutes for Mr. Günter Schirmer who is Head of staff of Legal Affairs Committee of the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly. Sir...

Günter Schirmer

OK, well, Mr. Zingeris has been for the last 2 years mandated as Rapporteur of the Legal affairs and Human rights committee in the plenary parliamentary assembly of the Council of Europe, shedding light on the murder of Boris Nemtsov. Clearly the purpose again of our Assembly is not to investigate the murder in lieu of the competent authorities in Russia, but to assess the quality of the investigation based on the human rights, standard of ethical [24:54] of the European Convention of Human rights where there is, in the case of a death, a duty to investigate. [25:03] of human rights, what kind of investigation is required in order not to have a violation.

During his Rapporteur mandate, Mr. Zingeris got no cooperation from the Russian authorities, for reasons not linked to his mandate because the Russian delegation has been boycotting the assembly for reasons of sanctions, after the annexation of Crimea, but Mr. Zingeris, and I would like to thank on his behalf, and also on mine, as I was working on the file, he received a lot of official materials from the court proceedings from Zhanna Nemtsova’s lawyer, Vadim Prokhorov, and we were able to analyze the quality, or lack of quality of the official investigations on the basis of the materials kindly put at our disposal by Mr. Prokhorov and the conclusion was, as you can see in the resolution that was adopted last Thursday unanimously in the parliamentary assembly, unanimously, the Russian delegation which had just returned decided to remain neutral. Mr. Bashkim, a Russian member of our committee, Senator from Moscow, explained that he wanted to remain - or the Russian delegation decided to remain - neutral because he has not participated in the elaboration of the report. That was their choice, and Mr. Zingeris and also President of the Assembly and many of us have invited, at numerous occasions, the Russian delegation to participate in the inquiry but they refuse to do so.

In any case, the resolution that was adopted, in some details I must admit pointed out numerous inconsistencies in the official findings and failures to investigate within the meaning of Article 2 of the European Convention of Human Rights, and it called for a whole list of steps, concrete steps, by which these failures to investigate these inconsistencies can be remedied, could be remedied, and then it called on all member states and observer states of the Council of Europe to keep recalling the need to identify the real organizers and instigators. And interestingly, the Assembly, on the initiative of Mr. Zingeris, referred to the Magnitsky laws which a number of Council of Europe countries have adopted, like the United States and Canada, a number of European countries have also adopted such laws to include persons found to be responsible for the failure to investigate the murder of Boris Nemtsov on the targeted sanctions list under the Magnitsky laws in order to increase the motivation to carry out a proper investigation.
Mr. Zingeris, this is now my last remark, mandated as Rapporteur for follow-up for the next 12 months after the adoption of the report in the plenary and he will use this mandate office to continue pushing for the implementation of the list of recommendations addressed to the Russian authorities in order to come closer to the truth in terms of who organized and ordered this terrible murder, and he will of course cooperate with your Rapporteur, your Special Rapporteur on the same case to the best of his ability and his secretariat will help and I will be very pleased to do the same. And I wish you more luck than we had in obtaining cooperation from the Russian authorities because it would certainly help direct links, not only through documents received from lawyers but also directly comments and questions and answers from the persons responsible for the investigation. Thank you very much for your attention.

Mark Pritchard
Thank you. Emanuelis.

Emanualis Zingeris
Thanks a lot. First of all I would like to say how thankful we are for your Parliamentary Assembly being on the file related to Boris Nemtsov. Boris Nemtsov means for us a European future of Russia.

He was my friend from the 90’s. I was in the committee to negotiate independence for Lithuania to Boris Yeltsin’s team and to the Kremlin and I met first, in the beginning of the 90’s, Boris Efimovitch Nemtsov and he was always for us European democratic option of Russia. [30:23] in the beginning of the 90’s facing huge demonstrations [30:28] and in other places that Russian people are trying to restore democracy and we started to believe in that. And Nemtsov was the main, main leader for peace in Europe, for democracy in Russia, against ... to have political prisoners inside of Russia and he was announced by ... Boris Yeltsin liked to be inherited and to be a possible president of Russia. Mr. Putin came later but Boris Nemtsov was the first option to become president and Vladimir Kara-Murza who has not presented, he was a colleague of Mr. Nemtsov for years and years, Mr. Kara-Murza, and his film I recommend to see this film, you can see about us 2 options: to be a president for Mr. Nemtsov and to be a president for Mr. Putin.

And then Russian turned to a totalitarian regime after 2000. Boris Nemtsov started to do his reports. I would like to announce the reports of Mr. Nemtsov: Putin, Vladimir Putin summarizing it, it was 2006. “Putin and Gazprom”, “Putin and crisis”, “Putin and corruption”. I am talking about the reports of Mr. Nemtsov. “10 years of ruling of Mr. Putin”. Putin the life of the slave, yachts, cars and other things inside of Putin team and the last report, I just mentioned for you few names, “Putin. War.” And he did not succeed to hand this last report.

So probably, I have no matter to be extremely balanced and objective for the reason that Mr. Nemtsov was a close friend of me but the feelings that drove me to do this report in the Parliamentary Assembly was related to the belief in Russia. I believe that Russia belongs to the circle of democratic states and this fact of totalitarian Russia today and the new cold war declared by Mr. Putin is related to monopolization of power.

So, we came here, scrupulously trying to cooperate, with Russia authorities at the beginning and Mr. Kara-Murza and especially Vadim Prokhorov who presented to us all materials, encouraged us for this cooperation and we get such answers: the building of Senate, answers
the post of Russia on the request to cooperate, the building of Senate is not found in Moscow, the answers of the Russia post for cooperation from all committees and the reportership and in other occasions, it was at all no answer. So, you can see on the screen, but probably we have no translation, the last first day meeting of Parliamentary Assembly and the Russian delegation made official statement about this report. The statement about this report was that it has no juridical power over Russia for Russia was outside, and the report had sign of intervention... of interference (thank you for the English) of internal affairs of Russia.

We still think that this report will be the first step and I’m so glad, Madam Cederfelt, that you are starting next stage and we hope there will be lot of stages. People who are trying to sully democracy in Russia think that the biggest murder in the history of political assassination in Russia in the 20th century and in general probably at all in the world was killing of Boris Nemtsov. And they think that we will give up the idea that Russia will become democratic and we will give up on the memory of Boris Nemtsov and his democratic stand inside of Russia and peaceful policy outside of Russia.

He was 5 times elected, can you imagine, 5 times elected, he has hundreds of thousands of voters behind him, trying even when all zone B TV cameras have been monopolized, the Russian government was out of his focus, he was trying to reach people going from door to door in Yaroslavl, in small towns, he became a member of parliament.

So, I am proud that we will be starting a big way, our big way to not let forget the great leader of Russia’s opposition, former deputy Prime minister of Russia, to be forgotten and we are starting our work for the truth inside of Russia. Until now being outside of Russia but we hope that probably Madam Cederfelt or other Rapporteurs and probably the other rapporteurs who have been announced by American Congress, I hope so, to be our colleagues, but as a Rapporteur, [36:33] to force Russia for cooperation and open the possibilities, to at least understand all these things related that not one TV camera records from Kremlin walls were presented to public opinion, excluding 2 or 3 occasional cases but people related to evidence, there is only few of them, were invited to the Court. So I have here our resolutions, points after points. You can see that when you will be opening up my report, but the key case is that 5 Chechens were accused, no master mind behind found, even not tried to find, and the court procedures were, from our point of view, not relevant.

So that is ridiculous to say that few Chechen rebels are responsible, or few Chechen low-profile guys in Moscow, center of Moscow were behind the killing of the key leader of Russian opposition and our report presented these very heavy doubts and I am so glad that Zhanna is here, Zhanna representing her family of Boris Efimovitch Nemtsov, and we hope to go forward with the family and try to clarify this darkest chapter of the Russia history. That’s all. Thank you.

Mark Pritchard
Thank you very much, indeed, Emanuelis, thank you for your hard work and [38:21] as well. It has not been easy gathering the information that you have and what you’ve done is present the next report to the Council of Europe, and thank you for coming here today from Vilnius and presenting it to us and encouraging all of us and Margareta to continue to pursue justice and the rule of law. Can I now invite Mrs. Claudia Monti who is the Ombudsman for Luxemburg. In particular, we’d like to thank you for coming to this session which of course is
being held on a Sunday, so we are particularly grateful, Ombudsman, for your attendance here today. Thank you, welcome.

Claudia Monti

Hello everybody! It’s an honor also for me and I am very grateful having been selected to speak today before you and to participate at this very very important panel discussion.

First of all, my greatest respect goes to all the political opponents, I don’t know if I would have the courage and the compassion they have and it’s only throughout these persons that the democracy and human rights can go further.

It is a fact that while the Russian economy has recovered since the fall of the USSR and since the coming of Vladimir Putin, but it is also a fact that the human right situation has continually deteriorated over the last 15 years. In most of the cases, investigation did not allow for the designation of the actual responsible, the real responsible of this murder. I just had a little look throughout the different opponents in Russia and well, they had really really big problems over there. I only will nominate 3 or 4 persons: Garry Kasparov who had chosen to go to exile because he was fearing for his life, and they also were staying in Russia like Mikhail Khodorkovsky had been pardoned after 10 years of jail by the president Putin but in exchange he had to recognize his faults and he had to promise never go back and involve in political life, so I mean the deal was very hard for him. Others, unfortunately, like Mr. Nemtsov, did not survive it and unfortunately the procedure and the investigation that were made were nothing new in Russia as Ms. Anna Politkovskaya was also killed, assassinated and the designated assassinator was a former soldier who was sent in 2012 to 11 years of prison for organizing this murder but the real author that really commanded this murder still remains unknown. And I was looking for some quotes when Mr. Nemtsov has been killed and I think the words of the Lithuanian president, Dalia Grybauskaitė (I’m sorry for the pronunciation) as she said that the murder of Boris Nemtsov shows that Russia is sliding down into the darkness of terror against its own people. And I think these words are very clear.

The words of the Lithuanian president, Dalia Grybauskaitė (I’m sorry for the pronunciation) as she said that the murder of Boris Nemtsov shows that Russia is sliding down into the darkness of terror against its own people. And I think these words are very clear and very right.

Well, it is a fact that today and for decades, unfortunately now, political assassinations are often carried out by orders and with the complicity or with the consent of the authorities or under the. And even some assassinations had had very important political consequence in history and this type of crime highlights the forces that go through the society in question, in period of crisis and Russia is a very good example, unfortunately, for this visible targeting of journalists, scientists and political opponents at its large sense.

But unfortunately it is not the only country. Elections in Rio de Janeiro show that there is a dangerous link between politics and crime and in Tunisia there has been a period of internal political crisis and following the assassination of 2 leaders, sorry. But we will also speak about the English example but also in Germany who recently had a murder of a local pro-refugee politician Walter Lübcke, who was killed on the 2nd of June.
But to come back to Russia, I learned that Russia signed the European Convention of Human rights in the late 90’s but unfortunately, I learned also, and that makes it senseless to have not signed this convention, that a law passed in December 2015, that gives the Constitutional Court of Russia the right to decide whether Russia can enforce or ignore resolutions from the inter governor bodies such as the European Court of Human Rights.

Well, it is a fact that, from Vladimir Putin 2nd term as a president, onwards, there were increasing reports of human rights violations. And during his time as an Ombudsman of Russia, Mr. Vladimir Loukine invariably characterized the human rights situation in Russia as unsatisfactory while acknowledging that the building of a law government state and civil society in such a complex country as Russia would be a hard and long process. Actually, he is replaced by Mrs. Moskalkova who is a lawyer but also a professor with the rank of Major General in the Ministry of Internal affairs. I did not hear no such critic from Loukine from her side, but I never met her so I cannot talk about that.

Well, we have to consign that we are all responsible for getting the freedom and we have unfortunately to admit that violence is on the rise in all democracies and we have all to take caution to the [45:10] are respected. The defense of the values [45:14], human rights, freedom, democracy respect [45:16] must become the basis of our security. The quest of freedom must never be reserved to intellectual elites. The aspiration to our [45:24] social origins is really just boundaries and we must be able to point out that the preservation of security does not tolerate weakness in their right, no commercial or personal interest must limit our intervention for freedom.

And I will just conclude with a quote of Jean-Dominique, Haitian democracy activist: you cannot kill the truth, you cannot kill justice and you cannot kill what we are fighting for. Thank you very much.

Mark Pritchard

Ombudsman, thank you very much indeed, and we are grateful for you reminding us not only about the domestic law, but the European law and international flagrant breaches that this case brought about. It gives me pleasure now to introduce Oleg Kozlovsky who runs Amnesty International in Russia, out of their Moscow office. Sir, thank you!

Oleg Kozlovsky

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, thank you for your interest and your attention to the murder of Boris Nemtsov and to human rights in Russia. I would like specially to thank Vladimir, Vadim and Zhanna for their tireless campaigning for justice for Boris Nemtsov. Like many people in this room I knew Boris and I greatly respected him and his work. I will not be talking to tell about the case of Boris Nemtsov, I am sure Vladimir will do that much better than I could but I would like to talk about the context in which this crime was committed because unfortunately, the murder of Boris Nemtsov was not an isolated case, it was not a tragedy of one person or one family or one political group, it, in fact, highlighted and reinforced the pattern of violence and impunity of those who commit violence against political opposition, human rights after these journalists, peaceful protestors and Boris was all of this.

I will mention several cases, Mrs. Monti has already mentioned the murder of Anna Politkovskaya in 2006 and still know master minds and people who committed, who ordered
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this crime have been identified. This month also marks 10 years since Natalia Estemirova, the head of Memorial branch in Chechnya was abducted and killed, she was kidnapped in the middle of Grozny, and nobody has ever been charged with this crime and again the traces led to Chechnya. Vladimir, as Senator Wicker has mentioned, has been poisoned twice. First time soon after the murder of Boris Nemtsov, and after that authority failed to investigate this. He was poisoned again in 2017 and again, as far as I know, there is no proper investigation, no progress in it on the Russian side.

There are many other cases as well, [48:40] was assaulted and nearly killed in front of his house in Moscow, in 2010. Like in the case of other mentioned crimes, the authority failed to find the motive even though 2 people were charged with this crime, but never convicted, yet they named those who organized and those who ordered this crime but the person who they named is now a member of the Russian parliament and a high ranking official in the united Russian party. Another opposition activist, Alexei Navalny was attacked with an unknown chemical substance in 2017. His vision was damaged but again there has been no proper investigation even though the people who participated in this crime were identified several days later through an independent investigation, the police has failed to bring charges against them or anyone else.

It’s not only well known political figures who get attacked, in fact it’s just a tip of the iceberg. There are many people whose names neither of you will recognize, [50:03] Russian journalists or the general public like Ivan Skripnichenko, who was a guard at Boris Nemtsov memorial in Moscow and in 2017, he was attacked by an unidentified person and he died several days later and police, as far as we know, did not even open a criminal case, a criminal investigation. Environmental activist Mr. Andrey Rudomakha was also assaulted in 2017, beaten very badly and there has been no progress in this investigation. In St Petersburg, there has been an intense series of attacks on peaceful protestors and lawyers who helped these protestors between 2017 and 2019, when people like Vladimir [50:55] who was beaten and spread with pepper spray, Vladimir Ivanyutenko who was stabbed several times, and later he identified his assailants but the authorities did not really act on this, lawyer [51:15] was beaten twice over this period, Konstantin Sinitsyn who was beaten to death near his home, and the police denied any political motive behind this.

The failure to find, not just the hitman and the low-level perpetrators, but those that commissioned and organized the crime make the rest of the investigation all but meaningless because as long as initiators of the crime are sure of their impunity they could always find somebody who is willing to fulfill their order, who is willing to risk and to execute these plans. And this pattern illustrates Russia’s failure or/and willingness to protect rights to life, to security, to freedom of expression, to freedom of [52:12] other internationally recognized trials. It also undermines rule of law and political pluralism in Russia and, in the end of the day, it harms all people in Russia regardless of their political opinions. It is hard to think of a better way to start dealing with this problem and start restoring these rights than to proper investigate the murder of Boris Nemtsov. Thank you.

Mark Pritchard

Thank you. Oleg, spassiba. I’d like to introduce now my very good friend, known to many of you, Vladimir Kara-Murza. And Vladimir can I thank you for not only continuing to keep this case at the top of people’s agendas across Europe and in the United States but also what you’ve done for the Magnitsky legislation. All of Baltic States have now signed up, Canada, the
United Kingdom and other countries, so the resolution in march in the European parliament it would not have happened without your hard work and industry, so thank you for what you have been doing on that case, I look forward to hearing from you. Sir.

Vladimir Kara-Murza

Mr. Chairman, thank you so much, and I want to thank you for your long-standing principle position on the issues that are so important to us and you know, we would not be able to do anything without people of principles in Western politics and I am so grateful to be among so many of them in this one room, here this afternoon, in Luxemburg. [53:54] to begin by saying how happy and delighted I am to be here but I am not going to say that because the truth is, just as Zhanna, just as Vadim, just as so many of us, I’d give anything not to have had to spend these last few years seeking justice and accountability for the murder of my friend and my mentor, Boris Nemtsov. But because the reality is what it is, we are profoundly grateful to the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly and in particularly to its President George Tsereteli for making history by appointing the first ever Special Rapporteur in this Assembly’s existence, and we are profoundly grateful to Vice-President Margareta Cederfelt for accepting this mandate and for leading this unprecedented oversight process into the case of Boris Nemtsov. My sincere thanks to the Swedish delegation and to its secretary Fredrik Svensson for organizing this hearing and for my very good friend Mark Pritchard for agreeing to chair it.

Among the most fundamental principles of the OSCE is international jurisdiction about human rights matters. As the Moscow document put it, and I quote: “Issues relating to human rights, fundamental freedoms, democracy and the rule of law are of international concern, as respect for these rights and freedoms constitutes one of the foundations of the international order and do not belong exclusively to the internal affairs of the State concerned” (end of quote). Of all the rights and freedom protected in the framework of the OSCE, there is none more important than the right to life. And there can be no graver human rights violation than murder. In this case, a murder clearly motivated by political considerations, by desire to silence, the most clear, the most effective, the most prominent voice for democracy and the rule of law in Russia.

Boris Nemtsov was a statesman in the truer sense of this word. A four time member of Parliament, regional Governor, Deputy Prime Minister, leader of the opposition, whatever post or whatever status he held, everything he did was always motivated by the best interests of his country and his fellow citizens. He would not relent in the face of physical attacks, propaganda and a. He was silenced the only way he could be.

The Chairman mentioned a few minutes ago the memorial, the unofficial people memorial on Bolshoy Moskvoretsky Bridge in Moscow. I was on that bridge about 3 days ago, and there are major constructions going on there, you see barriers, you see cranes, you see constructions works, you hear deafening sounds. It’s very difficult to even walk there, but what we also see are fresh flowers every single day for almost 4,5 years now.

As brazen as the assassination itself in the shadow of the Kremlin, in the most protected area of Moscow, was a subsequent cover up laid by the Russian authorities at every stage and in every level of the official investigation and trial. The footage from the security cameras on the bridge, next to the Kremlin could not be located because, as the Federal Protective Service of the Russian Federation stated in its response to a request by an opposition MP, the bridge next to the Kremlin is not a protected object. A likely organizer in the assassination, Russian Interior
Ministry Major Ruslan Geremeyev, could not be questioned because as stated in the official report, when investigators turned up at his house they knocked on the door and nobody opened. On 2 different occasions, the Chairman of the Russian Investigative Committee, General Alexander Bastrykin, prevented his subordinates from issuing indictments against Mr. Geremeyev.

In fact, no one about the immediate perpetrators was brought to justice in this case. The convicted gunman, Lieutenant Zaur Dadayev was an officer of the Interior Troops of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Russian Federation, serving in the Chechen Republic under the command of Kremlin-appointed regional leader Ramzan Kadyrov and Interior Troops Commander General Viktor Zolotov are the closest people for many years to Vladimir Putin. Ramzan Kadyrov has publically called this convicted killer, I quote “a true patriot” (end of quote), and has referred to Boris Nemtsov also publically, and I quote again, as “an enemy of Russia”. Despite repeated requests by the Nemtsov family attorneys and Vadim Prokhorov who is present here, Kadyrov was not questioned by the investigators even once. Neither was his right hand man [58:18] State Duma member, Russian State Duma member [58:22] neither was General Viktor Zolotov, and when the former Deputy Prime Minister of Chechnya, Akhmed Zakayev offered to give sworn testimony about the information he had received from a source in Kadyrov’s entourage that the order to kill Boris Nemtsov came directly from the Kremlin, they refused to question him either.

In what was perhaps the most insulting development, the Russian authorities have deliberately refused to classify the murder of the opposition leader as a political crime. In the [58:52] statement, a Russian state prosecutor told the Moscow district [58:56] that the Russian government cannot allow for murders of opposition members to be classified as encroachment on the life of statesmen or public figures, which is a special clause in the Russian criminal Code. Throughout the investigation and trial, the discussion of political motives behind the murder of a political leader was strictly prohibited.

And so, with key evidence withheld, key persons of interest not questioned, the discussion of motives forbidden and with the organizers and masterminds unidentified and unindicted, the Russian authorities, through the mouth of the Chairman of The Investigative Committee, General Alexander Bastrykin, have declared the Nemtsov case to be solved. All they wanted to do is turn the page, forget and move on. I want to thank the OSCE and the Council of Europe for not letting that happen and for stepping in to exercise the right of oversight.

Last year, at its 27th annual session in Berlin, OSCE Parliamentary Assembly passed the resolution that urges the Russian authorities and I quote “to undertake a new, full and thorough investigation into the February 2015 assassination of Boris Nemtsov including the vigorous prosecution of those who ordered or facilitated the crime.” (end of quote).

Early this year, in March and in June, both houses of the United States Congress, the OSCE of course being a participating state, the US being a participating state in the OSCE, overwhelming the past resolutions H. Res. 156 in the House and H. Res. 81 in the Senate that outlined in great detail all the problems, the flaws, the restrictions and the deliberate inadequacies of the Russian investigation on the Nemtsov case and called for a full-fledged OSCE oversight. And I want to take this opportunity to thank the Head of the US delegation, Senator Roger Wicker for leading that effort back in Washington.

In May of this year, the United States Government used its authority under the Magnitsky Act to sanction Major Ruslan Geremeyev, the one who did not open the door, for his role in the
organization of the assassination of Boris Nemtsov. And the US Government took special care to state that Geremeyev was acting, and I quote again “as an agent of or on behalf of Ramzan Kadyrov” (end of quote), in effect making an unprecedented double designation of the human rights abuser under the Magnitsky Act.

Last week, as of course you just heard, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe unanimously passed resolution 2297 accepting the conclusions on the recommendations of Rapporteur Emanuelis Zingeris.

Today, this assembly is launching what I think is the most important oversight procedure in the Nemtsov case. The OSCE is the world’s largest security oriented intergovernmental organization, representing 57 participating states, one billion people, from Vladivostok to Vancouver. It will be in Vancouver a year from now, at the 29th annual session of the Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE when Vice-President Special Rapporteur, Margareta Cederfelt, will present her final report and submit a draft resolution with her conclusions and her recommendations for vote by the Parliamentary Assembly. We know that international oversight is a poor substitute for real justice, just as the Magnitsky sanctions are a pale shadow of real accountability. I know that there will come a day when all of those who have participated at every level in the planning, organizing and carrying out and ordering this assassination of Boris Nemtsov will stand before a court of law in Russia. But until that day comes it is for international organizations and primarily the OSCE and the Council of Europe to step in and not allow the Russian authorities to turn the page, forget and move on. And I am deeply grateful to everyone to make this hearing and this oversight procedure possible. Thank you very much.

Mark Pritchard

Thank you very much indeed, Vladimir. Before I call Zhanna Nemtsova to speak, I just want to put on record what we had all shared. I cannot be easy for Zhanna to listen to such testimony. But I want to recognize your dignity and your grace and your preparedness to sit through such testimony. We look forward to hearing your remarks, and your father would be very very proud of you. Thank you.

Zhanna Nemtsova

Thank you very much Mr. Chairman for your kind words and for your support. Thank you for all the panelists who contributed today to these hearings. Thank you for inviting me here.

I am going to keep it very very short because we are running now out of time but I want to remind the Russian officials while we are here today because I know they are highly critical of all our attempts to have international oversight over the investigation.

So we are here today for 2 reasons, 3 reasons. We have great problems with this investigation and Vladimir has just mentioned them and I want to repeat. One is that no motive has been so far identified though everybody, it’s like common knowledge, everybody thinks that only political motive could stand behind this assassination. No masterminds and no organizers have been found, so far. And no reclassification has been done, that’s what Vladimir Kara-Murza has just mentioned. And it’s very worrying as Mrs. Cederfelt said, that the Russian officials refuse to cooperate and it leads to even more suspicions regarding their role in this crime. And it leads to alternative conspiracy theories that were brought about in the report of Mr.
Zingeris. And because these hearings are on the record, I want to put on the record, I want to urge the Russian officials at all levels to respond to your requests to cooperate, otherwise it seems to me that they do not want to know the truth and they try to provide cover up. Please Russian delegation, do not be afraid to cooperate. Thank you.

Mark Pritchard

Thank you Zhanna, and as the Special Rapporteur said we did in fact invite the Russian delegation here today. There may be somebody in the room who’s going to report back, we’ll wait and see. But they are welcome to attend any of these sessions, any time, and we do encourage them to do so. Can I now invite Vadim Prokhorov...

Vadim Prokhorov

Good afternoon. First of all, I would like to introduce myself as a lawyer who represented Mr. Boris Nemtsov for 10 years in his lifetime, and following his assassination I have represented his daughter, Mrs. Zhanna Nemtsova, for over 4 years.

By now, to give a bit my [1:06:52] so it’s necessary to clear that there are very few legal tools to push the authorities of Russia towards further steps aimed to detect the assassination of Mr. Boris Nemtsov. But however, such tools are available. For example, first of all, there are a few possibilities available within the framework of the OSCE PA, of PACE and so on. It’s very important to use these tools for us, as for the lawyers of Mrs. Zhanna Nemtsova. So, I am so thankful to Honorable Rapporteur of the Parliamentary Assembly of Council of Europe, Mr. Emanuelis Zingeris and his staff, Mr. Günter Schirmer, for his work, and all the procedures of report in the framework of the Parliament Assembly of Council of Europe. And in my opinion, I think that one of the reasons that the result of his procedure is quite successful, that we worked in the full cooperation with our party. We have kept an access for you, for all of the materials, all those evidences from the criminal case, more than 90 [01:08:24] of the criminal case, all of our motions, applications and requests.

And I also ... I already heard that our cooperation with Honorable Rapporteur Mrs. Cederfelt could be even more successful because we are ready to keep full access to all of the materials while all of them are banned, these accesses, by the Russian authority.

And first of all, I would like to pay attention to those evidences which I think to be very important but unfortunately which are fully ignored by our authorities. Just for example, there is a very important evidence, voluntary interrogatory record when I interviewed Mr. Akhmed Zakayev, who has been 1st Prime Minister of Chechnya a half of year ago. Just two quotes.

I quote Mr. Zakayev responds to my question: “It was in early February 2012, that I learned about reprisals being prepared against the leaders of the Russian opposition. The source of that information was the inner circle of Mr. Ramzan Kadyrov and Mr. Adam Delimkhanov. We remember that in the end of 2011 for a mass protest manifestation in Moscow Mr. Putin then Head of the Russian government and their Head of his Security Service General Viktor Zolotov both flew to Chechnya. They spent there 3 days.”

The second quote: “Some 2 or 3 weeks after Mr. Putin and General Zolotov left Chechnya, I got reports directly from Chechnya that the Senior officials of Russia had worked out a plan to
remove the leaders of the Russian opposition, in particular, they were planning to kill Mr. Boris
Nemtsov. I treated various reports in the most serious way as the source was highly reliable
and trustworthy while the information of earlier provider was confirmed on multiple
occasions.”

It’s a very important evidence which was fully ignored by our Russian authorities. And I hope
that the Rapporteur in the framework of the OSCE, Mrs. Cederfelt, will pay attention to such
kind of evidences and I hope this report would be also successful and it’s necessary to work
hard in this way. Thank you.

Mark Pritchard

Thank you very much indeed Vadim. This concludes the formal part of this session. I’d like to
thank all of the panelists for joining us here today and for their contributions, for participants
from the floor, to thank you. In particular, I’d like to put on record my thanks to the Swedish
delegation, and Fredrik and his excellent team for having organized today, thank you Sir. Plus
on more thanks to the other staff behind the scenes, and thank all of you for coming today.
And I hope the Parliamentarians from different Parliaments will go back to their own capitals
and perhaps think a little bit more of what we can all do individually and collectively across
Europe and across the world to make sure this case stays at the top of people’s minds. Again,
finally I’d like to pay a tribute to Zhanna and for your contribution and we look forward to
continue to work with you. Thank you, take care. God bless and have a safe journey home
tomorrow. Thank you.