6. Freedoms and Rights of Individuals

6.1 Right to Self-Determination (Art 1)

While noting Morocco’s initiative for engaging in negotiations on autonomy for Western Sahara and additional information provided by the State party, the Committee remained concerned that limited progress had been made on the issue of self-determination for the people of Western Sahara and about reports that Morocco was not consulting the people of Western Sahara on the issue of development of natural resources in the region. The Committee also noted with concern the presence of the “berm” or sand wall which limited the freedom of movement of people in Western Sahara by limiting the number of crossing points open to civilians. The presence of landmines and other explosive remnants of war along the berm also endangered the life and safety of communities in the vicinity. 688

The Committee recommended that the State party continue and increase its efforts undertaken within the framework of the negotiations on Western Sahara under the Secretary-General in order to ensure the right of self-determination for the people of Western Sahara and urged Morocco to enhance “meaningful consultations” with the people of Western Sahara to ensure their prior, free and informed consent for development projects and resource extraction in the region. Lastly, it recommended that the State Party take steps to ensure freedom of movement along both sides of the berm alongside continued demining operations and efforts to compensate victims. 689

6.2 Right to Privacy (Art 17)

The Committee noted that New Zealand, Namibia and Sweden undertook “extreme surveillance measures” with no clear mandate on “national security” and “private communications,” often with a non-transparent framework with wide access to and interception of communication. 690 Similarly, the Committee noted a lack of clarity regarding the reach of legal interception and lack of judicial independence in Namibia, Poland and Rwanda. The Committee then asked the States parties to ensure that interception was conducted only when justified by law, with necessary procedural and judicial safeguards and only to achieve specific and legitimate objectives. 691

The Committee also noted a lack of proper oversight mechanisms 692 to prevent abuse of surveillance powers in South Africa and Sweden and accordingly recommended that the States parties respectively ensure that an independent oversight body was set up that not only functions promptly and effectively but is also adequately funded and equipped. 693 Further, the Committee recommended that such mechanisms ought to be in conformity with the principles of legality, proportionality and necessity. 694

The Committee also noted with concern that in Poland, foreign nationals were targeted to collect metadata through indiscriminate surveillance without notification, a procedure for complaints or mechanisms for remedy. 695 The Committee recommended that Poland revise the existing legislation in line

The Committee remained concerned that limited progress had been made on the issue of self-determination for the people of Western Sahara.
The Committee saw the use of DNA testing, as part of a counter-terrorism processes by Kuwait as unnecessary and disproportionate restrictions on the right to privacy. The compulsory nature of the DNA test imposed a penalty of a one year imprisonment with fine if a person refused to provide samples. Further, there was an absence of independent control and judiciary measure. The lack of necessary safeguards to guarantee confidentiality and prevent arbitrary use of the DNA samples collected further concerned the Committee. Kuwait was asked to uphold the principles of legality, necessity and proportionality, right to privacy and its obligations under the Covenant, including Article 17 and in this light limit DNA collection to serious crimes and on the basis of judicial decisions. Further, the Committee recommended that Kuwait allow individuals access to courts to challenge the collection of DNA samples, erase the samples after a time period and establish an oversight mechanism to monitor the collection and use of DNA samples and prevent abuses.

6.3 Freedom of Religious Belief and Conscience (Art 18)

States have been seen to curtail religious beliefs through application of sanctions and restriction to people’s religious practices, in turn limiting them in their chosen practice of living. In Rwanda, the Committee observed that Jehovah’s Witnesses were denied their right to refuse to participate when singing the national anthem, attending religious ceremonies of another faith in schools and to take an oath holding the national flag. This was seen as a restriction of freedom of thought, conscience and religion and the Committee advised the State to maintain its obligation under Article 18 of the Covenant by guaranteeing the same and ensuring that any limitations are in compliance with Article 18(3).

Similarly, the Committee noted that in Morocco, provisions of the Criminal Code criminalized the practice of any other religion than the official religion. Further, the Committee was concerned that actions contrary to the Muslim religion were criminalized and new offenses were further added to the draft Criminal Code that intended to extend the limits imposed on freedom of religion and expression. The Committee called for an elimination of this discriminatory practice and recommended that Morocco revise the Criminal Code to bring it into compliance with Art 18 of the Covenant.

The Committee has held that the right to conscientious objection is inherent in the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. Further, the Committee held that this right entitles any individual to an exemption from compulsory military service if such service cannot be reconciled with that individual’s religion or beliefs; moreover, the right must not be impaired by coercion. A State may, if it wishes, compel the objector to undertake a civilian alternative to military service, outside the military sphere and not under military command. The alternative service must not be of a punitive nature. It must be a real service to the community and compatible with respect for human rights.
The Committee also noted that Kazakhstan did not legally recognize the right to conscientious objection to military service and reminded the State party of its failure to implement the Committee’s previous recommendations on the same issue. Accordingly, the Committee recommended that Kazakhstan implement the recommendations made by the Committee in this context.

6.4 Freedom of Expression (Art 19)

In its observations on the freedom of expression, the Committee covered issues arising in varied contexts. The Committee observed constraints placed on the media in the form of influence and failure to guarantee independence. Aside from the aforementioned, it noted measures in States Parties that curbed the freedom of journalists. Concerns were also raised that as a result of concentration in media ownership in States parties, the right to freedom of expression was infringed. The Committee noted with concern instances of limitations of social media access in several States.

Aside from issues pertaining to media and social media, the Committee faced instances of criminalization of speech in several States. Vague definitions of crimes and the prosecution of individuals for exercising their freedom of expression led to the Committee making several recommendations in this regard. In this context, the Committee also discussed intimidation, harassment and threats to individuals in the context of their exercise of their freedom of expression. The Committee also noted limits placed on access to information and constraints on academic research and their respective effects on the freedom of expression.

6.4.1 Media, social media, broadcast and journalism

The Committee noted with concern that past and proposed legislation in Poland did not offer enough guarantees to ensure the independence of the Polish public television and radio services. It was concerned about the continued concentration of media ownership in Moldova and Argentina. Additionally, the Committee was also concerned about the influence of political and private interests on the media in Moldova which did not reflect public interest. In Namibia, the Committee also observed with concern the trend of self-censorship in state-owned media.

The Committee recommended that Poland, Moldova and Argentina ensure that their media and broadcasting services operate independently. The Committee recommended that Moldova and Argentina observe the General Comment No. 34 to prevent a concentration of media ownership.

In its observations on Azerbaijan, the Committee noted reports of arbitrary interference with media freedom including the revocation of broadcast licenses on political grounds (Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, ANS television and radio outlets) and allegations of financial pressure on the independent newspaper “Azadiq.” The Committee noted with concern that Kuwait had adopted legislation which placed restrictions on internet based expressions, had terminated licenses of
those in the media who were critical of the government, curtailed access to the internet and revoked the licenses of internet service providers without due process. The Committee recommended that Azerbaijan and Kuwait take steps to end the aforementioned persecution or retaliation against the media and ensure that the media can operate free from the fear of government intervention.

Similarly, the Committee was concerned about interference with journalistic activity and the shutting of independent newspapers, magazines, television channels and news websites for minor irregularity or charges related to extremism in Kazakhstan. Additionally, the Committee also noted that Kazakhstan blocked social media blogs, news sites and other internet sources based on national security concerns in accordance with its domestic laws. The Committee also observed that the State did not comply with the principles of legal certainty, necessity and proportionality as required by the Covenant with reference to its laws and practices pertaining to freedom of expression. Accordingly, the Committee recommended that Kazakhstan should revise its laws that limit freedom of expression to bring them in conformity with the Covenant, while refraining from using criminal provisions and other regulations to stifle the expression of dissenting opinions beyond the limits placed by Article 19(3) of the Covenant.

The Committee also clarified that in determining whether or not a violation of Article 19 has taken place, any domestic legislation must be demonstrated by the State party to be necessary and proportional. Further, in accordance with its General Comment No. 34, it also held that the reasons for restrictions are limited to those under Article 19(3) of the Covenant.

6.4.2 Criminalization of speech
The Committee was concerned that Poland, Slovenia, Kazakhstan and Kuwait continued to criminalize defamation. The Committee urged the aforementioned States to decriminalize defamation in accordance with its General Comment No. 34.

The Committee also noted that in Ecuador, several crimes such as sabotage and terrorism were defined in vague terms. Similarly, in Rwanda, the crime of separatism and other crimes were defined in vague terms which made them susceptible to misuse. The Committee also noted with concern prosecutions against journalists, politicians and human rights defenders on the basis of such crimes in Ecuador and Rwanda respectively. In a similar context, the Committee observed that the Organic Act on Communication in Ecuador included ambiguous or disproportionate obligations such as the obligation to “cover and disseminate facts of public interest” or the ban on disseminating “information that is, directly or through third parties, issued by prior arrangement and repeatedly published in one or more medium of communication with a view to discrediting a natural or legal person or undermining his or her public credibility.” Failure to comply with these obligations gave rise to severe penalties.
Accordingly, the Committee recommended that Rwanda and Ecuador adopt the necessary legislative measures to bring in line with the Covenant its criminal law to the extent that such law infringed the freedom of expression in the State and urged Rwanda to refrain from prosecutions of journalists, politicians and human rights defenders.

The Committee noted that several States Parties criminalized insults, insults to state symbols, blasphemy, territorial integrity of a state, senior officials (including monarchs, Presidents and other officials) and religion and was also concerned about politically motivated criminal proceedings against independent media outlets in Azerbaijan such as “Meydan TV” and its journalists. In the case of Morocco, the Committee noted with concern the prosecution or threat thereof for criminal charges for insulting Islam, the monarchy or the state’s territorial integrity. Similarly, in Kuwait, there were prosecutions of activists, journalists, bloggers and other individuals for expressing critical views or insulting the “Emir,” defaming religion and threatening Kuwait’s national security or relations with other States. The Committee also noted with concern Kuwait’s recent amendment of domestic law according to which individuals who had been convicted of the aforementioned offences in Kuwait were prevented from standing for election. Accordingly, it recommended that Morocco and Kuwait bring its domestic legislation restricting the freedom of expression into compliance with Article 19(3) of the Covenant. The Committee also specifically recommended that Kuwait and Kazakhstan amend their criminal laws and make appropriate changes to its laws to bring them in conformity with the Covenant, clarify key terms and provisions that are vague and ambiguous and ensure that these are not used as tools to curtail the exercise of freedom of expression. It also recommended that Kuwait provide effective judicial redress and compensation to individuals imprisoned in contravention to Articles 9 and 19 of the Covenant.

The Committee observed that in Kuwait, Law No. 15 (article 13) was being increasingly used arbitrarily against government critics for politically motivated reasons to deprive them of citizenship for “undermining the social or economic system” or “threatening the higher interests of the State or its security.” Accordingly, the Committee recommended that appropriate amendments be made to the aforementioned law and the same never be used to deny citizenship and allow for the peaceful exercise of the freedom of expression.

The Committee was also concerned about a draft law in Poland that would impose up to three years of imprisonment on anyone who referred to Nazi camps operated in occupied Poland during the Second World War and accordingly recommended that Poland review the draft law in order to bring it into compliance with the Covenant.

Case review: Incitement to religious hatred – a corollary
In an individual communication against the Netherlands, the authors submitted a complaint alleging that a Dutch court’s acquittal of Mr. Geert Wilders, a Member of Parliament and the founder of the extreme right-wing political Party for

6. Freedoms and Rights of Individuals

The Committee noted that several States Parties criminalized insults, insults to state symbols, blasphemy, territorial integrity of a state, senior officials and religion.
Freedom, on charges of incitement of religious hatred was not in conformity with Article 20(2) of the Covenant. The authors alleged that the acquittal did not take into consideration the corpus of Mr. Wilders’ statements, accentuated the artificial distinction between criticism of Islam and humiliating Muslims, rejected the counts of incitement on grounds of race because “Moroccans and non-Western migrants” are not races and created a kind of general and absolute exception (“the public debate”) to the crime of incitement to discrimination or hatred. Further, the complaint alleged that the Dutch courts had granted too much leeway to freedom of expression over incitement of hatred and that the court failed to take into account the State party’s obligations under Article 20 of the Covenant.

The Committee concluded that Article 20(2) of the Covenant was justiciable rejecting the State party’s arguments in this regard stating that Article 20 was “designed to give specific recognition to the prohibition of discrimination set forth in article 26 of the Covenant, by identifying a limitation that States parties must impose on other enforceable Covenant rights, including the principle of freedom of expression under article 19.” Further, the Committee stated that Article 20 not only required States parties to adopt legislation prohibiting conduct but also imposed on them an obligation to provide for a complaints procedure and appropriate sanctions.

In deciding on the merits, the Committee considered the tension in the application of Articles 19 and 20 of the Covenant as they applied to this case. Relying on its General Comment No. 34, the Committee held that the freedom of expression included expression that may be regarded as deeply offensive and the free communication of information and ideas about public and political issues between citizens, candidates and elected representatives which is essential. Additionally, the Committee considered that any prohibitions under Article 20 must be compatible with Article 19(3) of the Covenant.

Further, the Committee held that the obligation under Article 20(2) did not require States to secure convictions but only to ensure that individuals are prosecuted before an impartial court of law. The Committee noted that the State party had fulfilled its obligations under Article 20 of the Covenant by pursuing a prosecution and it was satisfied with the detailed judgment of the court.

6.4.3 Intimidation, harassment and threats to individuals
The Committee noted several instances of threats, intimidation and attacks against individuals in different capacities with a view to curbing their freedom of expression. For instance, the Committee was concerned that journalists and human rights defenders in Morocco were subject to threats and prosecutions and accordingly recommended that Morocco ensure that restrictions placed on journalists and human rights defenders do not exceed the limits set by Article 19(3) of the Covenant. Similarly, in Namibia, it was concerned about the harassment of journalists by members of the South West Africa People’s Organization and the restrictions on political activities.
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The Committee was also concerned at the lack of legislation guaranteeing the right to information in Namibia.

6.4.4 Access to information and independence of research

The Committee noted that the Research, Science and Technology Act (Act No. 23 of 2004) in Namibia governing research projects defined them very broadly and subjected them to a cumbersome and costly prior authorization procedure. Accordingly, it recommended that Namibia amend its impugned legislation to respect, protect and promote academic freedoms including removing the need for prior authorization from the State.

The Committee was also concerned at the lack of legislation guaranteeing the right to information in Namibia and accordingly recommended that it develop and adopt legislation guaranteeing the right to information. Similarly, it was concerned about reports suggesting that the Access to Information Act (2004) in Jamaica suffered from obstacles in its implementation such as the low level of knowledge of information officers and an inaccessible complaint procedure. It asked Jamaica to ensure effective implementation of the aforementioned legislation including providing training to officers, conducting public information campaigns and establishing an accessible complaint mechanism. Lastly, in Ghana it noted delayed adoption of its Right to Information Bill and accordingly, recommended an expedited adoption of the bill.

6.5 Right to Peaceful Assembly (Art 21)

6.5.1 Prior authorization for assembly

The Committee noted that some States parties placed a requirement of prior authorization for peaceful gatherings either in domestic legislation or as a matter of practice. There were instances where such authorizations were denied outside the scope of the Covenant.

The Committee noted that laws in Rwanda, Morocco, Azerbaijan (in practice) and Kuwait subjected assemblies and demonstrations in public places to prior authorization. The Committee also noted that Rwanda had refused authorization in several instances based on justifications outside Article 21 of the Covenant and Kuwait barred non-citizens from participating in public gatherings. Accordingly, the Committee recommended that the States parties ensure that any restrictions on the right to peaceful assembly are
In deciding the limits of permissible restrictions to Article 21, the Committee concluded that the same must be sourced within the second sentence of Article 21 and the burden to justify the same remains on the State party.\textsuperscript{789}

### 6.5.2 Excessive regulation and the chilling effect thereof

Excessive regulation, intimidation tactics and use of excessive force at peaceful assemblies led in some States parties to a chilling effect on such gatherings as noted by the Committee.

The Committee observed that assemblies in Moldova were excessively regulated, the number of prosecutions produced a chilling effect and law enforcement officials warned individuals against participating in political assemblies.\textsuperscript{790} Accordingly, the Committee recommended that the States parties review their legislations to bring them in compliance with Article 22 of the Covenant.\textsuperscript{791}

On a similar note, authorities in Azerbaijan used a variety of tactics including preventive detention and “prophylactic conversations on police premises aimed at intimidating activists and discouraging them from participating in assemblies”\textsuperscript{792} and were asked to end the aforementioned practices that are inconsistent with Articles 19 and 21 of the Covenant.\textsuperscript{793}

### 6.5.3 Excessive use of force

The Committee noted that security forces in Kuwait\textsuperscript{794} had used force excessively and disproportionately to disperse peaceful demonstrations and it recommended that Kuwait train all security forces on using force taking “due account of the Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials.”\textsuperscript{795}

### 6.5.4 Right to demonstrate – presumption of innocence

The domestic legislation in Burkina Faso punished acts of vandalism committed during public demonstrations in a manner which allows for any member of a group to be held criminally responsible regardless of whether the alleged perpetrator has been identified or not.\textsuperscript{796} Accordingly, the Committee recommended that Burkina Faso respect the presumption of innocence under Article 14 of the Covenant and Article 21 of the Covenant by appropriately amending national legislation.\textsuperscript{797}

### 6.6 Freedom of Association (Art 22)

In its observations on the freedom of association, the Committee mainly raised concerns at the onerous procedures for registration present in several States parties and noted this not only in the context of individual legislations but also the implementation of said laws in different States. The Committee also noted several instances where the rules related to funding of NGOs or other associations were used to influence them unduly. The Committee also observed that several States parties criminalized conduct that should otherwise be legitimate.
6.6.1 Registration and functioning of NGOs/other organizations and associations
The Committee noted that several States placed impediments on the registration and operation of NGOs, political parties and other associations or organizations. For instance, 
Kazakhstan imposed undue restrictions via regulations governing registration of political parties and on their exercise of the freedom of assembly and political participation.798 Similarly, the domestic legislations in Rwanda799, Azerbaijan800 and Moldova801 placed onerous obligations for the registration of NGOs and other organizations. Accordingly, the Committee recommended that the States Parties clarify the rules governing registration of NGOs and other organizations.802

The Committee also noted that civil society organizations in 
Kazakhstan were apprehensive that the establishment of a “central operator” and other provisions regulating allocation of funds to public associations may be used to exert control over them and limit their ability to receive funds from abroad.803 Accordingly, the Committee recommended that the State ensure that legislations governing allocation of funds to NGOs do not serve as means of undue control and interference.804 The Committee also noted that in Rwanda, NGOs had to provide evidence of funding for the entire duration of their intended period of operation which led NGOs in Rwanda to only apply for short term registrations.805 The Committee was also concerned at the invasive role played by the Rwanda Governance Board in determining the leadership of NGOs806 and recommended that Rwanda refrain from interfering with the internal functioning of NGOs.807

Similarly, the rules for suspension or dissolution of political parties were considered too broad (and therefore prone to misuse) in the case of Kazakhstan808 and Ecuador809. In both instances, the Committee recommended that the States Parties clarify the grounds for suspension or dissolution of political parties.810

Further, in Kazakhstan811, the Committee noted that the legal framework regulating strikes and mandatory affiliation of trade unions could adversely affect their freedom of association and accordingly recommended that Kazakhstan bring its domestic legislations regulating strikes and the freedom of association of trade unions in line with Articles 19, 22 and 25 of the Covenant.812

6.6.2 Criminalization of legitimate activities
The Committee noted that in Kazakhstan, associations could be held criminally responsible for undertaking legitimate activities including under the offense of incitement to “social, national, clan, class or religious discord.”813 Accordingly, the Committee recommended that Kazakhstan refrain from criminalizing public associations for legitimate activities. The Committee also recommended that criminal provisions should not be defined too broadly and must comply with the principle of legal certainty.814

Similarly, human rights defenders in Morocco were subjected to disproportionate and unjustified restrictions and had their freedom of movement limited particularly in Western
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The Committee noted that States parties have placed limits public participation by using restrictive criminal law provisions. For instance, the Committee noted that Azerbaijan applied severe restrictions during presidential election campaigns, such as only 22 days of campaigning, limited opportunities for assemblies, intimidation, conviction and detention of opposition candidates and violations of the registration process. Accordingly, the Committee, recommended that Azerbaijan enact transparent electoral regulation and encourage practices that allow pluralistic political debate and refrain from the use of the criminal law system to exclude opposition candidates.

Another example of the same can be seen in Burkina Faso where the State’s Electoral Code exempted certain citizens from participating in election or acceding to elected office on the renders ineligible, anyone who “supported an unconstitutional change in violation of the principle of the democratic rotation of power”. The Committee was concerned about the ill-defined exclusion of a several candidates on the basis of their political beliefs and deemed it to be a violation of Article 25 of the Covenant. The Committee recommended that Burkina Faso guarantee to its citizens the right to vote and run for elections without distinction. The Committee referred to its General Comment No. 25 (1996) and the ruling by the Community Court of Justice of the Economic Community of West African States.

Other UN Treaty Bodies

Regarding political participation, the CRC noted in the United Kingdom’s Concluding Observations that children demand increasingly for a right to vote from the age of 16 years. The voting age was lowered in Scotland. The Committee encouraged States parties to consult with children on this issue and if implemented, this should be supported by human rights education.
The Committee also mentioned political participation of children several times in the General Comment on the Rights of Adolescents. Adolescents engage in many activities and use social networks. They hold potential in terms of political engagement and monitoring accountability of States. The Committee emphasized the importance of participation through which they can advocate for their rights: adolescents need to be supported in forming organizations. If voting age is lowered, States need to make sure that adolescents understand their role as active citizens.

The Committee also stressed the importance of political participation with regard to the freedom of association: association with peers is a major part of one’s development. Adolescent’s organizations, clubs and associations should be legally recognized. Additionally, the right to information plays a great role, especially in the digital environment since adolescents often communicate through social media and find their information on the Internet. They should be trained on this as part of the basic education curriculum to ensure that this is accessible to everyone without discrimination.

Poverty during adolescence can lead to social and political exclusion, another reason why education plays a key role in ensuring the enjoyment of the rights of adolescents. Investments should be made in strategies to promote positive gender relations to overcome barriers for political participation of girls.
Poland, ¶¶ 37-38


Ibid, ¶ 3.3

Ibid, ¶ 9.7; Also see the Committee’s general comment No. 34 (2011) on the freedoms of opinion and expression, ¶¶ 51-52.


Ibid

Ibid

Ibid

Ibid, ¶ 10.7

Morocco, ¶ 43

Morocco, ¶ 44

Namibia, ¶ 39

Namibia, ¶ 38

Rwanda, ¶ 39

Rwanda, ¶ 40

Ecuador, ¶ 28

Ecuador, ¶ 29

Namibia, ¶ 41

Namibia, ¶ 42

Namibia, ¶ 39

Namibia, ¶ 40

Jamaica, ¶ 47

Jamaica, ¶ 48

Ghana, ¶ 39

Ghana, ¶ 40

Rwanda, ¶ 41

Morocco, ¶ 45

Azerbaijan, ¶ 38

Kuwait, ¶ 42

Rwanda, ¶ 41

Kuwait, ¶ 42

Kuwait, ¶ 43; Rwanda, ¶ 42; Azerbaijan, ¶ 39; Morocco, ¶ 46


Moldova, ¶ 33

Moldova, ¶ 34

Azerbaijan, ¶ 38

Azerbaijan, ¶ 38

Kuwait, ¶ 42

Kuwait, ¶ 43

Burkina Faso, ¶ 37

Burkina Faso, ¶ 38

Kazakhstan, ¶ 53

Rwanda, ¶ 41

Azerbaijan, ¶ 40

Azerbaijan, ¶ 42; Azerbaijan, ¶ 40; Moldova, ¶ 38

Kazakhstan, ¶ 53

Kazakhstan, ¶ 54

Rwanda, ¶ 41

Rwanda, ¶ 41

Rwanda, ¶ 42

Kazakhstan, ¶ 53

Ecuador, ¶ 27

Kazakhstan, ¶ 54; Ecuador, ¶ 28

Kazakhstan, ¶ 53

Kazakhstan, ¶ 54

Kazakhstan, ¶ 53

Kazakhstan, ¶ 54

Morocco, ¶ 41

Morocco, ¶ 42

Azerbaijan, ¶ 40

Azerbaijan, ¶ 40

Azerbaijan, ¶ 41

Azerbaijan, ¶ 40

Azerbaijan, ¶ 18

Azerbaijan, ¶ 41

Azerbaijan, ¶ 42-43

Electoral Code of Burkina Faso, Article 135 – “supported an unconstitutional change in violation of the principle of the democratic rotation of power.”

Burkina Faso, ¶¶ 39-40
824 CRC, UK, ¶32-33.
825 CRC, GC Adolescence, ¶2.
827 Ibid, ¶44.
828 Ibid, ¶45.
829 Ibid, ¶47.
830 Ibid, ¶66.
831 Ibid, ¶69.