

Mandates of the Special Rapporteur on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment; the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context; the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders; and the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights

REFERENCE:
AL THA 7/2019

19 August 2019

Excellency,

We have the honour to address you in our capacities as Special Rapporteur on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment; Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context; Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders; and Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 37/8, 34/9, 34/5 and 35/19.

In this connection, we would like to bring to the attention of your Excellency's Government information we have received concerning the conviction of 14 land rights defenders and the imprisonment of 13 of them in connection with their resistance to eviction from their homes and lands located in the Sai Thong National Park.

Ms. **Nittaya Muangklang** is a land rights defender, community leader and board member of Isaan Land Reform Network (ILRN), established in 2006 in the Sai Thong National Park area, Chaiyaphum Province to assist local villagers in the defense of their land rights. Ms. Nittaya Muangklang, along with 13 other land rights defenders from ILRN, Ms. **Seenuan Phasang**, Ms. **Pattama Komet**, Ms. **Sunee Nalin**, Ms. **Sakl Prakit**, Ms. **Narisara Muangklang**, Ms. **Thongpan Monggang**, Ms. **Suwalee Phongam**, Ms. **Suphaphorn Seesuk**, Mr. **Suwit Rattanachaisi**, Mr. **Samon Somchitr**, Mr. **Put Sukbongkot**, Mr. **Wanchai Arphonkaeo**, and Mr. **Sompitr Taennok**, has sought to resist the eviction of her community from their lands. ILRN forms part of the People's Movement for a Just Society (P-Move), a country-wide network of civil society organizations working to raise awareness on the rights related to land and the sustainable, community-led management of natural resources.

According to the information received:

The villagers have lived on and farmed the lands located in the Yae Sub-district, Nong Bua Rawe District of Chaiyaphum Province since the 1970s. In 1992, the Government designated the area a national reserved forest and national park. According to Forest Act B.E. 2484, the National Reserved Forests Act B.E. 2507, and the National Park Act B.E. 2504, those who encroach on, clear, and utilise land belonging to national reserved forests and national parks shall be punished

and evicted accordingly. The area covered by the Sai Thong National Park includes lands inhabited and farmed by eight communities and over 8,000 people.

In 2014, the Forestry Master Plan, known as the “Forest Reclamation Policy”, was adopted. The main aim of the policy was to address the problems of forest destruction and trespass on public lands, and to increase Thailand’s national forest area to cover 40% of the total area of the country. Within the discourse surrounding the adoption of the Master Plan, large-scale commercial exploitation of natural resources was identified as the driver of deforestation.

Since its adoption, the Forest Reclamation Policy has been supplemented by orders passed by the National Council for Peace and Order (NCPO). NCPO Order 64/2014 authorized certain state agencies to arrest those who encroach on, seize, possess, destroy, or act in any manner that may cause damage to the forest, specifically on protected land. The directive was aimed at stopping deforestation resulting from the exploitation of natural resources by commercial investors. NCPO Order 66/2014 identified large-scale investors and developers as the primary targets of these measures, and expressed the State’s commitment to protect the poor, landless and those who had settled in an area before it was declared as protected from any negative impacts of the implementation of NCPO Order 64/2014.

Despite these provisions, the implementation of the Forestry Master Plan has seen impoverished villagers who have lived on their lands for decades identified as “investors” or as funded by investors by the State, resulting in their loss of the protection granted to them by Order 66/2014. The State has reportedly evicted people as part of a strategy to combat illegal logging and forest encroachment. Further, as a result of the implementation of the Master Plan, the management and utilization of natural resources by communities inhabiting forests and protected areas has been restricted. Numerous cases linked to the enforcement of Order 64/2014 have been filed against local communities, many of them indigenous.

In 2015, in the context of the implementation of the Forestry Master Plan, residents of Sab Wai village were approached by officers from the Sai Thong National Park who told them that if they signed a certain document they would only be required to vacate a fraction of their land but could continue to utilize the rest of it. They were also told that the Master Plan and its associated NCPO orders were aimed at protecting forest-dependent communities. The Royal Forest Department officials and national park rangers repeatedly visited the houses of residents of Sab Wai village in order to force them to sign the documents or leave their homes and lands. During these visits, the villagers were reportedly threatened that they would be imprisoned along with their children. Some villagers signed the documents, while others refused to do so. The documents were later used as “evidence” of the villagers’ consent to vacate the entirety of their homes and lands.

In April 2016, eleven villagers were notified by the National Park Office that they had to remove all structures, including their homes, from their lands by the end of the month. Despite several subsequent meetings between the villagers and different government agencies, no agreement was reached and some of the villagers were formally accused of encroachment and trespassing. Those who had refused to sign the above-mentioned documents were reportedly threatened with prison and surveilled by the Sai Thong National Park officers.

Ms. Nittaya Muangklang

On 7 April 2016, the rangers of the Sai Thong National Park filed a case against Ms. Nittaya Muangklang (case no. 1739/2017) for trespassing on land belonging to the national park.

On 11 July 2016, the rangers filed a second case against her (case no. 1738/2017), in this instance for destroying the forest through farming activities.

On 20 July 2017, the public prosecutor submitted both cases against Ms. Muangklang to the Court of First Instance of Chaiyaphum Province.

On 8 August 2018, during a hearing at the Court of First Instance concerning cases 1738/2017 and 1739/2017, Ms. Muangklang was found guilty of encroaching on, utilising, and clearing land belonging to national reserved forest and national park area under Sections 54(1) and 72(1) of the Forest Act B.E. 2484, Sections 14 and 31(1) of the National Reserved Forests Act B.E. 2507, and Section 16(1), (2), (4), and (13), Section 24, and Section 27 of the National Park Act B.E. 2504. In case 1739/2017, the land rights defender was sentenced to 4 months in prison and a fine of THB 40,000 with an interest rate set at 7.5 percent per year as compensation for the damages caused to the forest. In case 1738/2017, she was sentenced to 8 months in prison and a fine of THB 150,000 with an interest rate set at 7.5 percent per year for destroying or seizing the forest for herself or others. She was also ordered to remove all structures causing damage to the national park area and vacate the land.

Ms. Muangklang denied all charges brought against her and was summoned for the appeal process before the Chaiyaphum Provincial Court.

On 15 May 2019, the Appeal Court Division 3 at the Chaiyaphum Provincial Court upheld the verdict of the Court of First Instance with regards to case 1739/2017. On 5 June 2019, the Appeal Court upheld the verdict of the Court of First Instance with regards to case 1738/2017, and concluded that Ms. Muangklang had not provided sufficient evidence that she had occupied the land before it was declared a national park.

Ms. Muangklang's legal representatives subsequently submitted an appeal to the Supreme Court, concerning the judgment of the Appeal Court in the case

1739/2017. The petition challenges NCPO Order 66/2014, claiming that it does not meet the objective of protecting poor people, including Ms. Muangklang.

On 31 July 2019, Ms. Muangklang was released on bail from Chaiphaphum Provincial Prison.

The remaining land rights defenders

Between July and September 2018, the Court of First Instance of Chaiphaphum Province convicted the 13 other above-named land rights defenders on charges of utilizing, clearing and encroaching on land forming part of the national reserved forest and national park under The Forest Act B.E. 2484, Section 54(1), and Section 72(1); The National Reserved Forests Act B.E. 2507, Section 14 and Section 31(1); and The National Park Act B.E. 2504, Section 16(1), (2), (4), and (13), Section 24, and Section 27. The public prosecutor of Chaiphaphum Province appealed the judgments of the Court of First Instance in all cases, as the Court had reduced the amount to be paid in damages, provided by the public prosecutor. Appeal hearings were held between May and July 2019.

On 4 June 2019, the Appeal Court of Chaiphaphum Province upheld the decision of the Court of First Instance, sentencing Ms. Phasang, who is 60 years old, to 5 months and 10 days in prison and a fine of THB 150,000. Ms. Phasang started serving her prison sentence in Chaiphaphum Provincial Prison on the same day. Her lawyer has submitted a petition, along with a request for bail, before the Supreme Court within 30 days following the Appeal Court judgment. The petition questions the validity of Ms. Phasang's exclusion from protection under NCPO Order 66/2014.

On 12 June 2019, the Appeal Court of Chaiphaphum Province upheld the decision of the Court of First Instance, sentencing Ms. Komet to eight months in prison and payment of a fine reduced from THB 250,000 to THB 200,000 at 7.5 percent interest per year. She started serving her prison sentence in Chaiphaphum Provincial Prison on the same day.

On 12 June 2019, the Appeal Court of Chaiphaphum Province upheld the decision of the Court of First Instance, sentencing Ms. Nalin, who is 71 years old, to five months and 10 days in prison, and payment for damages increased from THB 150,000 to 439,027 THB at 7.5 percent interest per year. The Appeal Court rejected the request to allow for a bail application to be submitted directly before the Court, despite Ms. Nalin's advanced age.

On the same date, the Appeal Court of Chaiphaphum Province upheld the decision of the Court of First Instance, sentencing Ms. Seesuk to five months and 10 days in prison, and payment of a fine increased from THB 190,000 to THB 381,010 at 7.5 percent interest per year. The Appeal Court concluded in its judgment that Ms. Seesuk could not be granted protection under NCPO Order 66/2014 as there

was no evidence to prove that she had lived on her land before its designation as a national park.

On 18 June 2019, the Appeal Court of Chaiyaphum Province upheld the decision of the Court of First Instance, sentencing Ms. Prakit to four years in prison, and payment of a fine increased from THB 900,000 to THB 1,587,211 at 7.5 percent interest per year. The Appeal Court concluded that Ms. Prakit could not be considered poor due to her lifestyle and the fact that her family owned a house, a tractor, and a computer.

Ms. Monggang is Ms. Nittaya Mongklang's mother. She was sentenced by the Court of First Instance to nine months and 10 days in prison, payment for damages amounting to THB 70,000 at 7.5 percent interest per year for case 1740/2017, and an additional payment for damages in the combined second case 1741/2017 amounting to THB 30,000 at 7.5 percent interest per year. On 25 June 2019, the Appeal Court upheld the decision of the Court of First Instance, while reducing her prison sentence to 8 months. The Appeal Court concluded that Ms. Monggang could not be granted protection under NCPO Order 66/2557, as she reportedly had no evidence to prove that she had been forced to sign the agreement to vacate her land.

The Court of First Instance ruled that Mr. Somchitr would be monitored for one year, during which he will be required to present himself every three months at the provincial Department of Probation of the Ministry of Justice. The monitoring measure is aimed at preventing Mr. Somchitr from leaving the country. Further, he was ordered to complete 24 hours of voluntary social service activities related to forest conservation and protection of the environment. He was also issued a fine of THB 80,000 with 7.5 percent interest per year.

On 25 June 2019, the Appeal Court at the Chaiyaphum Provincial Court upheld the decision of the Court of First Instance against Mr. Somchitr and increased the amount to be paid in damages to THB 366,663. The Appeal Court concluded in its judgment that Mr. Somchitr was excluded from protection under NCPO Order 66/2557, as he had not provided evidence that he had lived in the national park area before its declaration as national park.

Mr. Arphonkao was sentenced by the Court of First Instance to six months and 20 days in prison, and payment of THB 300,000 in damages, at 7.5 percent interest per year. On 25 June 2019, the Appeal Court at the Chaiyaphum Provincial Court upheld the decision of the Court of First Instance and increased the amount to be paid in damages to THB 860,395. The Appeal Court concluded in its judgment that Mr. Arphonkao was excluded from protection under NCPO Order 66, as he had only proved that he was allowed to live in the national park area after committing the offence.

On 2 July 2019, the Appeal Court at the Chaiyaphum Provincial Court upheld the decision of the Court of First Instance, sentencing Mr. Sukbongkot to six months and 20 days in prison, and payment of THB 370,000 in damages at 7.5 percent interest per year. The Court justified the exclusion of Mr. Sukbongkot from protection under NCPO Order 66/2014 by concluding the he could not utilize the land given to him by his wife's father, as his wife's father had not been included on the list of persons with the right to utilize the land located in the national park.

Mr. Taennok was prosecuted in two cases (1746/2017 and 2452/2017). In case 1746/2017, he was sentenced to ten months in prison, and payment of a fine of THB 100,000 at 7.5 percent interest per year. On 2 July 2019, the Appeal Court at the Chaiyaphum Provincial Court upheld the decision of the Court of First Instance concerning this case. The Court ruled that Mr. Taennok was excluded from protection under NCPO Order 66/2014, as he had not been included on the list of people who had lived on the land before its designation as a protected area.

In case 2452/2017, Mr. Taennok was sentenced to a further ten months and 20 days in prison, and payment of THB 100,000 in damages at 7.5 percent interest per year. On 3 July 2019, the Appeal Court at the Chaiyaphum Provincial Court upheld the decision of the Court of First Instance.

Ms. Narisara Muangklang was sentenced to nine months and 10 days in prison, and payment for damages amounting to a total of THB 130,000 at 7.5 percent interest per year. On 3 July 2019, the Appeal Court at the Chaiyaphum Provincial Court upheld the decision of the Court of First Instance and increased the amount to be paid for damages to a total of THB 607,171. The Court excluded Ms. Muangklang from protection under NCPO Order 66/2014, as she had not been included on the list of people who had lived on the land before its designation as a protected area.

On 3 July 2019, the Appeal Court at the Chaiyaphum Provincial Court upheld the decision of the Court of First Instance, sentencing Ms. Phongam to five months and 10 days in prison, and payment for damages amounting to THB 160,000 at 7.5 percent interest per year. The Court excluded Ms. Phongam from protection under NCPO Order 66/2014, as she had not been included on the list of people who had lived on the land before its designation as a protected area.

Mr. Rattanachaisi was sentenced to seventeen months in prison, and payment of THB 40,000 in damages at 7.5 percent interest per year. On 3 July 2019, the Appeal Court at the Chaiyaphum Provincial Court upheld the decision of the Court of First Instance and increased the amount to be paid for damages to THB 110,762. The Court excluded Mr. Rattanachaisi from protection under NCPO Order 66/2557, as he reportedly had not been able to prove that he had utilized the land before its declaration as a protected area.

All 14 land rights defenders were ordered to vacate their homes and lands and remove all structures that could cause damage to the protected area. They were not offered relocation or compensation.

All of the land rights defenders barring Mr. Somchitr, who is being “monitored”, have been imprisoned in Chaiyaphum Provincial Prison. Ms. Muangklang has reportedly been separated from the other imprisoned land rights defenders. The lawyer representing the 14 land rights defenders has submitted applications to the Supreme Court within 30 days following the Appeal Court judgements in all cases, along with an application for bail for the 13 land rights defenders who have been imprisoned. The orders to vacate the land will not be enforced until the Supreme Court provides its final verdict.

On 19 July 2019, Ms. Seesuk, Phasang, Prakrit and Komet were released on bail. On 25 July 2019, Mr. Sukbongkot and Ms. Nalin were released on bail. On 6 August 2019, Mr. Arphonkhaeo was released on bail. On 13 August 2019, Ms. Phongam, Narisara Muangklang and Monggang were released on bail as well. Messrs. Taennok and Rattanachaisi remain in prison, awaiting the review of their bail applications.

We express our serious concern at the prosecution and conviction of the 14 land rights defenders, and the imprisonment of 13 of them, which appear to be directly linked to their peaceful resistance to eviction from lands designated as part of the Sai Thong National Park. Ms. Nittaya Muangklang was the first land rights defender in the Sai Thong National Park area to be convicted and imprisoned, which appears to be a result of her work as a community leader and board member of the ILRN. Moreover, we express our concern at the unclear criteria and measures used to establish whether the land rights defenders qualified for protection under NCPO Order 66/2014.

Further concern is expressed regarding the reported misuse of the Forest Reclamation Policy and the supplemental NCPO orders, leading to the violations of the human rights of forest-dependent communities and land rights defenders, in particular through their pending eviction. If executed, their eviction from their homes and lands may violate multiple human rights, including their right to housing, food, water, health, work and security of the person. While we welcome the efforts of your Excellency’s Government to preserve the forest and its natural resources, we wish to recall that protecting the environment and protecting human rights are interdependent priorities as opposed to competing goals. While the environment must be protected to ensure the enjoyment of human rights, the environment itself depends on the exercise of human rights. It is thus crucial that conservation policies integrate these rights.

In connection with the above alleged facts and concerns, please refer to the **Annex on Reference to international human rights law** attached to this letter which cites international human rights instruments and standards relevant to these allegations.

As it is our responsibility, under the mandates provided to us by the Human Rights Council, to seek to clarify all cases brought to our attention, we would be grateful for your observations on the following matters:

1. Please provide any additional information and/or any comment(s) you may have on the above-mentioned allegations.
2. Please provide information on the legal and factual basis of the prosecution and conviction of the 14 land rights defenders, along with information on how these are compatible with international human rights law.
3. Kindly explain the legal procedure and criteria invoked for identifying individuals excluded from protection under NCPO Order 66/2557. Please provide information on the definition of the “poor” under the NCPO Order 66/2557 and on how it is employed in the process of granting protection from the impacts of the NCPO Order 64/2014.
4. Please provide information on how the evictions of forest-dependent communities from their lands, as being pursued under the Forest Reclamation Policy and the supplemental NCPO orders, as well as the lack of corresponding relocation or compensation measures, are compatible with Thailand’s obligations under international human rights law.
5. Please provide information as to what steps have been taken to ensure that human rights defenders, including land rights defenders, in Thailand are able to carry out their peaceful and legitimate work in a safe and enabling environment, free from any physical, judicial or other harassment.

We would appreciate receiving a response within 60 days. Passed this delay, this communication and any response received from your Excellency’s Government will be made public via the communications reporting website. They will also subsequently be made available in the usual report to be presented to the Human Rights Council.

While awaiting a reply, we urge that all necessary interim measures be taken to halt the alleged violations and prevent their re-occurrence and in the event that the investigations support or suggest the allegations to be correct, to ensure the accountability of any person(s) responsible for the alleged violations.

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

David R. Boyd

Special Rapporteur on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment

Leilani Farha
Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate
standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context

Michel Forst
Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders

Philip Alston
Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights

Annex

Reference to international human rights law

We wish to draw the attention of your Excellency's Government to its obligations under article 11.1 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), ratified by Thailand in 1999, which states that "[t]he States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living for himself and his family, including adequate food, clothing and housing, and to the continuous improvement of living conditions."

We further recall the General Comments 4 and 7 of the Committee on Economic Social and Cultural Rights, which stress the need to provide adequate legal protection from forced eviction, due process, alternative accommodation, and access to an effective remedy of those that are affected by eviction orders. In its General Comment No. 7 on forced evictions, the Committee clarified that "appropriate procedural protection and due process are essential aspects of all human rights but are especially pertinent in relation to a matter such as forced evictions which directly invokes a large number of the rights recognized in both International Covenants on Human Rights. The Committee considers that the procedural protections which should be applied in relation to forced evictions include: (a) an opportunity for genuine consultation with those affected; (b) adequate and reasonable notice for all affected persons prior to the scheduled date of eviction; (c) information on the proposed evictions, and, where applicable, on the alternative purpose for which the land or housing is to be used, to be made available in reasonable time to all those affected; (d) especially where groups of people are involved, Government officials or their representatives to be present during an eviction; (e) all persons carrying out the eviction to be properly identified; (f) evictions should not take place in particularly bad weather or at night unless the affected persons consent otherwise; (g) provision of legal remedies; and (h) provision, where possible, of legal aid to persons who are in need of it to seek redress from the courts". The Committee has repeatedly expressed concern over forced evictions that have taken place without adequate compensation or alternative accommodations.

We also wish to draw your attention to the Basic Principles and Guidelines on Development-Based Evictions and Displacements, prepared by a former Special Rapporteur on adequate housing, which urges all States to ensure that relevant policies and programmes "are not formulated or implemented in a discriminatory manner, and do not further marginalize those living in poverty" and that "[a]ll persons, groups and communities have the right to resettlement, which includes the right to alternative land of better or equal quality and housing that must satisfy the following criteria for adequacy: accessibility, affordability, habitability, security of tenure, cultural adequacy, suitability of location, and access to essential services such as health and education".

We would also like to refer your Excellency's Government to the fundamental principles set forth in the Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, also known as the UN Declaration on Human Rights

Defenders. In particular, we would like to refer to articles 1 and 2 of the Declaration which state that everyone has the right to promote and to strive for the protection and realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms at the national and international levels and that each State has a prime responsibility and duty to protect, promote and implement all human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Furthermore, we would like to bring to the attention of your Excellency's Government the following provisions of the UN Declaration on Human Rights Defenders:

- article 9 paragraph 1, which establishes that in the exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the promotion and protection of human rights, everyone has the right, individually and in association with others, to benefit from an effective remedy and to be protected in the event of the violation of those rights.
- article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3, which provides that the State shall take all necessary measures to ensure the protection of everyone against any violence, threats, retaliation, de facto or de jure adverse discrimination, pressure or any other arbitrary action as a consequence of his or her legitimate exercise of the rights referred to in the Declaration.

Finally, we would like to refer to the Human Rights Council resolution 31/32 which in paragraph 2 calls upon all States to take all measures necessary to ensure the rights and safety of human rights defenders, including those working towards realization of economic, social and cultural rights and who, in so doing, exercise other human rights, such as the rights to freedom of opinion, expression, peaceful assembly and association, to participate in public affairs, and to seek an effective remedy. It further underlines in paragraph 10 the legitimate role of human rights defenders in mediation efforts, where relevant, and in supporting victims in accessing effective remedies for violations and abuses of their economic, cultural rights, including for members of impoverished communities, groups and communities vulnerable to discrimination, and those belonging to minorities and indigenous peoples.

(Translated from Russian)

Additional information and comments by the Republic of Uzbekistan on the communication from the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights, Karima Bennouna, and the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context, Leilani Farha

1. Comments on the assertions of the Special Rapporteurs

1. The human right to adequate housing is crucial to the enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights. The “Well-Maintained Village” and “Well-Maintained Mahalla” programmes (“*Obod kishlok*” and “*Obod mahalla*” programmes) are aimed at gradually improving the living conditions of the population and introducing positive changes to the way of life and standard of living, with a view to boosting the profile of villages and the local bodies known as mahallas and creating jobs. There are plans to build or improve 312,549 residential buildings with more than 1.6 million inhabitants within the framework of State programmes. Considerable work is being done to provide provincial and district centres with amenities and bring about urban renewal.

2. However, the complaints and communications received from residents indicate that there are problems with creating and improving the housing and living conditions of the population. For example, owing to the irresponsibility of local chief administrators (*hokim*), housing stock has not been repaired for years, which has led to the deterioration of the roofing of houses and facades that no longer meet established requirements. Furthermore, there are frequent power grid and transformer accidents and shortages of liquified petroleum gas in communities. Another pressing problem is the poor quality of road repair and maintenance work at the local level, water supply facilities and networks in a state of disrepair and sewage systems that do not meet sanitation requirements.

3. During large-scale construction and reconstruction work on the housing stock, owners of houses, apartments and other real estate rightly complain about local authorities and developers who act in violation of the law when demolishing housing without notice or public discussion.

4. The Tashkent chief administration and investors carried out demolitions of individual low-rise residential and office buildings in different parts of the city in connection with the reconstruction, further urban development and improvements to road and transport infrastructure in Tashkent in the period 2016–2019.

5. The number of dwelling houses that have been affected in the areas where demolitions occurred under decisions of the Government of Uzbekistan and decisions of the chief administrator of Tashkent was approximately 2,000, in which more than 4,700 families were living (without taking into account those formally registered but not living at the address in the residence permit, who sometimes make up as much as 40 to 50 per cent of the total number of permanent residents).

6. With respect to projects for the demolition of the House of the Train Driver cultural heritage site, located at 45 Amir Temur Street in the Mirabad district, by decision of the Tashkent chief administrator (No. 103 of 19 January 2018), the private enterprise Memor Mexanizatsiya Qurilish was given a permit to carry out demolition work on residential and non-residential buildings and make land improvements in Mirabad district from Said Baraka Street to Moshtabib Street and along Avenue Amir Temur. The Ministry of Culture of Uzbekistan has recognized the house at 45 Amir Temur Street as a cultural heritage site and demolition work on the house has now stopped.

7. By order of the Ministry on 28 June 2019, the Department of Cultural Heritage has been entrusted with the task of involving scholars, experts and qualified specialists in the



collection of information on the building and its historical and cultural value and in research and other necessary activities.

8. According to the chief administration of Samarkand province, there have never been any plans to demolish any dwellings on Khodja Akhrar Street. The descriptions provided in the joint communication of the Special Rapporteurs suggest that they are in fact referring to Namozgoh Street. However, to date, not a single house has been demolished, nor are there any plans to do so in the near future.

9. A review of the problems with the demolition of dwellings and resettlement of citizens has shown that it is not permanent residents but rather permanently registered citizens also wishing to receive housing in compensation for demolitions who are the main source of discontent and complaints.

10. Given the dwelling unit density of 3–3.5 families per residential building, the amount of compensation provided in the form of apartments or plots of land was often higher than the market value of the demolished dwelling.

11. In this regard, the provision of housing to registered citizens, as opposed to residents, is examined by commissions of the offices of the regional chief administrators, taking into account the place of actual residence, ownership of a second home, average household income, etc.

12. In addition, previously, a large share of the complaints were from people whose homes were located in areas that had been allocated to business entities for construction provided the costs of the demolition work and resettlement were borne by the investor.

13. There has been virtually no monitoring of the demolition work, provision of compensation or holding of dialogues between the population and the regional chief administrators in such areas. All negotiations with the public, provision of housing and other activities are carried out by business entities on their own, with practically no monitoring on the part of the authorities.

14. However, pursuant to Presidential Decree No. UP-5511 of 15 August 2018, on measures to carry out the pilot project to improve the investment climate in Tashkent, a new procedure for granting land to business entities and authorizing the demolition of residential buildings has been introduced that envisages tentatively setting aside plots of land for business entities for a certain period, during which the enterprises take steps to compensate and resettle citizens; only after this is done may the land, free of buildings, be provided to the business for urban planning activities.

2. Measures and action taken by the authorities to avoid resettlement and the demolition of houses

15. Pursuant to Presidential Decree No. UP-5490 of 27 July 2018, on measures to further improve the system of protection of the rights and legitimate interests of business entities, a central fund has been established under the Cabinet of Ministers to compensate citizens and business entities for the seizure of their land for State and social needs and the agreement of the fund is now required for the seizure of land for State and social needs.

16. Presidential Order No. R-5491 of 3 August 2019, on additional measures to fully guarantee the property rights of citizens and business entities, established a procedure for the seizure of land and the demolition of real estate of citizens and business entities to be carried out in three stages.

17. In the first stage, a set of documents on the area in which the demolitions are planned is submitted by the regional chief administrator to the Cabinet of Ministers. The Government then comes up with findings in accordance with urban planning requirements and financial estimates. The findings are then submitted to the Prime Minister for consideration and action.

18. The documents are approved by the members of the national coordination working group and regional working groups set up to take stock of the extent of the loss incurred by citizens and business entities in the event of seizure of land.

19. The national working group has been assigned the following tasks:

- Taking stock of the loss incurred by local citizens and business entities and determining its actual extent on the basis of fair market value
- Offering remedies and, if the harm caused is the result of an unlawful decision by an official, recovering the losses from these officials by seeking legal recourse
- Coming up with specific proposals for improving legislation and holding officials to account for wrongdoing

20. The Chairs of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Qoraqalpog'iston and provincial, district and city chief administrators are personally responsible for full compliance with the law as regards the seizure of land, including:

- Informing owners in due course according to the established procedure about decisions taken to seize land and demolish residential and non-residential buildings or other constructions, structures or plantings located on the plots of land
- Preventing the demolition of houses and other buildings and structures on seized land before preliminary and full compensation is provided for the loss at market value
- Making available temporary housing, according to the established procedure during the development of the land, provided as compensation to resettled citizens for up to two years

21. In addition, the Cabinet of Ministers has been requested to take a decision that covers:

- Implementing government programmes and major investment and other projects with due account taken of the view of the majority of the region's population
- Selecting the plots of land to be seized, primarily those with dilapidated or condemned buildings, including unused buildings, involving public discussions with the owners of real estate located on them
- Obtaining the consent of owners of residential and non-residential properties located in a given area and entering into written agreements on compensation for losses so that chief administrators may make decisions on the seizure of land

22. Pursuant to the above-mentioned presidential order, the Ministry of Justice has prepared a bill to amend certain pieces of legislation; the Government has also drafted a decision on further measures to guarantee the property rights of persons and entities and to improve the procedure for the seizure of land plots and the provision of compensation in connection with such seizures and a decision on measures to ensure greater availability of land for business and urban planning activities.

23. The experience of Belarus, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation and others was drawn on in the drafting of the relevant laws and regulations.

24. The bills have been posted on the common interactive public services portal of Uzbekistan for public discussion. They have then been further developed based on the comments and proposals put forward, and submitted to the Cabinet of Ministers.

3. **Please inform us about any efforts carried out by the authorities to ensure that the planned urban regeneration projects in Samarkand and Tashkent are in compliance with the rights of the affected residents to be consulted and to participate in decision-making. Please also explain the extent to which the rights of the affected residents to housing and to participate in cultural life have been considered.**
4. **Please indicate if any resettlement programmes have been considered or implemented in consultation with those affected, how many people will benefit from these resettlement programmes in Samarkand, Tashkent and other cities, and whether all affected residents and tenants can return to their respective neighbourhoods after implementation of the regeneration programmes.**

5. **Please indicate if any adequate compensation for the loss of home and property has been put in place for affected homeowners and tenants living in the urban regeneration areas and their adequacy in comparison to the value of the homes and land. Please provide more information on short and long-term accommodation that has or will be provided for the affected residents of Tashkent and other cities, including their adequacy, affordability and location.**
6. **Please provide information concerning measures taken to ensure that none of the residents, tenants or inhabitants of the affected urban regeneration areas will become homeless as a consequence of the planned demolition of houses.**

25. The organization of demolition work and the resettlement of citizens in Tashkent and compensation for losses in connection with the seizure of land for State and social needs is carried out according to Cabinet of Ministers decision No. 97 of 29 May 2006 and has been entrusted to the Commission of the District Administrations of Tashkent headed by the regional chief administrators or their deputies.

26. The resettlement of families or individual citizens from the demolition zones is carried out in accordance with the regulations approved by the above-mentioned decision of the Cabinet of Ministers, i.e. by:

- Providing citizens with title to equivalent well-appointed housing with a floor space not less than the standard floor space per inhabitant and covering the cost of plantings
- Giving payments to citizens for the market value of the demolished dwelling houses and other buildings, structures and plantings and compensation for the losses incurred by the owners in connection with the seizure of land
- Allotting plots of land to citizens for private housing construction within the established standards and providing them with temporary rented accommodation while the land is being developed, for up to two years, along with compensation in full for the market value of the demolished houses or apartments, buildings, structures and plantings and for the losses incurred by owners in connection with the seizure of land
- Paying full compensation for the losses incurred by the seizure of land, for State and social needs
- Relocating and rebuilding dwelling houses, buildings and structures belonging to citizens and entities and also compensating for the losses incurred by owners in connection with the seizure of land
- Constructing dwelling houses and buildings and transferring ownership to citizens and entities and compensating owners for losses incurred in connection with the seizure of land

27. The demolition of homes and resettlement of citizens from the demolition zone are carried out only with the consent of the citizens to resettlement or by allocating to them if they so desire plots of land for private housing construction.

28. The following work has been done by way of compensation for the resettlement of citizens.

A total of 1,426 families living in Ukchi and Olmazar mahallas in the Shaykhontohur district of Tashkent were evicted from the construction area of Tashkent City international business centre and allocated apartments, as follows:

- 1,070 families were resettled in 21 multistorey apartment buildings in the Yashnobod district
- 110 families in 3 new multistorey apartment buildings on Churkursai Street in Olmazar district
- 31 families in a new multistorey apartment building on Kamarniso Olmazar Street
- 21 families in a new multistorey apartment building in the Samarkand Darboza mahalla in the Shaykhontohur district

- 159 families were provided with apartments from the secondary housing market
 - 35 families were allocated plots of land to build private houses
29. Citizens were resettled only after the residential buildings had been up and running and the apartments in them were provided to the resettled citizens only with their agreement.
30. Furthermore, the development of extensive multistorey buildings and the resettlement of citizens were undertaken in accordance with their wishes to live together with their neighbours away from the demolition zones.
31. During the construction period, citizens were provided with cash for rent at their request in various districts of Tashkent amounting to the equivalent of US\$ 175 to US\$ 200 per month.
32. Compensation is primarily provided to permanently resident families, and the provision of compensation to registered families who are not residents is awarded to them at the discretion of the commission attached to the office of the district chief administrator.
33. With a view to helping citizens living in the Ukchi and Olmazar mahallas of Shaikhontohur district feel at ease, the Council of People's Deputies (*Kengush*) of Tashkent has taken the decision to change the name of the Marifat mahalla, where 21 apartments were built, to Ukchi and Olmazar.
34. Free plots of land in Tashkent and the suburbs in Tashkent province for the construction of private dwelling houses were exchanged for apartments from the secondary housing market by offering persons who so desired land in exchange of their apartments, which were transferred to the regional chief administration and then distributed among the residents based on their choice.
35. In accordance with paragraph 14 of the above-mentioned regulations compensation is provided to permanently resident citizens and members of their families.
36. The procedure for granting plots of land to business entities and demolition of housing was also changed, with plots of land being tentatively set aside for business entities for a certain period, during which the entity takes steps involving compensation and the resettlement of citizens; only after this is done may the land, free of buildings, be provided to the business for urban planning activities.
37. In accordance with Presidential Decree No. UP-5490 of 27 July 2018, on measures to further improve the system of protection of the rights and legitimate interests of business entities, decisions to seize plots of land for State and social needs may be taken only after a public discussion with the parties whose land is subject to seizure is held and a cost-benefit analysis carried out. Residential and commercial buildings and other buildings and structures belonging to citizens and business entities may be demolished in the event of seizure of land only after full compensation for the market value of the real estate and losses incurred by the owners in connection with such seizures is paid.

7. Please indicate what procedures you have in place to ensure adequate notice is provided prior to any forced eviction and the availability of legal aid to assist residents should they wish to challenge the decisions.

38. Under Presidential Order No. R-5491 of 3 August 2019 on additional measures to fully guarantee the property rights of citizens and business entities, the Chairs of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Qoraqalpog'iston and provincial, district and city chief administrators are personally responsible for full compliance with the law in the event of seizure of land, in particular informing owners in due course according to the established procedure about decisions taken to seize land and demolish residential and business buildings or other constructions, structures or plantings located on plots of land.
39. The Cabinet of Ministers is currently preparing a decision that provides for:
- Implementation of government programmes and major investment and other projects with due account taken of the view of the majority of the region's population

- Selection of plots of land to be seized, primarily those with dilapidated or condemned buildings, including unused buildings, involving public discussions with the owners of real estate located on them
- Obtaining the consent of owners of residential and non-residential properties located in a given area and entering into written agreements on compensation for losses so that chief administrators may make decisions on the seizure of land

8. Please indicate what administrative or judicial mechanisms are in place, both at national and municipal levels, to ensure access to remedies and accountability of various actors so that individuals and groups can claim their right to adequate housing and to participate in cultural life. Please provide us as well with information about the number of judicial and non-judicial complaints made by affected residents and their respective outcomes.

9. Please explain the reasons for the destruction of areas of historical and cultural significance in Samarkand, and their compatibility with the human rights standards mentioned above.

40. The country has established a system of legal protection of rights, which brings together the work of economic, administrative and civil courts that handle disputes at the regional level to ensure access to remedies and accountability on the part of the various actors so that individual persons and groups may assert their right to adequate housing.

41. The service attached to the Office of the President responsible for defending the rights of citizens and monitoring and coordinating the processing of communications has conducted an analysis of the complaints about the demolition of dwelling houses in Uzbekistan and seizures for State and social needs along with complaints received through the online and public help desks attached to the Office, including communications from Tashkent, Samarkand and Yangiyul. As a result of the analysis, measures are being taken to resolve the systemic problems found and hold officials accountable.

42. In particular, since 1 November 2018, the online and public help desks attached to the Office of the President have received 236 complaints from Tashkent residents, 26 from Samarkand and 16 from Yangiyul.

43. In order to protect the rights of homeowners, the Ministry of Justice has taken action on the applications from them on violations of their homeownership rights; in that connection, it has examined the issue of receiving compensation under the established procedures for the seizure of land for State and social needs.

44. According to the Ministry, the highest number of such applications came from Tashkent, Tashkent province and Namangan province and the lowest from Navoiy province.

45. The Ministry has drawn up a cadastral certificate of plots of land seized for State and social needs for 2018 and the first half of 2019 and also of properties that have been demolished.

46. It was found that, in 846 such cases, the owners had not been notified about the imminent demolition under the established procedure; in 1,388, there had been a violation of the time frame for notification; and most of the property had been demolished without a prior assessment of its market value. The greatest number of such cases were in Tashkent and Buxoro province and the smallest in Samarkand province.

47. The amount of compensation paid out during the demolition process was more than 600 billion sum. Furthermore, a monitoring exercise found arrears of more than 300 billion sum in payments in compensation for demolished residential and non-residential buildings in the city of Tashkent and Tashkent, Farg'ona, Qashadaryo and Namangan provinces.

48. In exchange for the plots of land seized for State and social needs, 359.2 ha of land have been allocated to the owners of the demolished property.

49. As part of the actions taken, 874 cases of violations of the law were found. The justice authorities made 236 submissions requesting the payment of monetary compensation to

natural persons and legal entities amounting to more than 6.5 billion sum, issued 100 warnings and brought 360 statements of claim totalling 30.3 billion sum before the courts.

50. A list of tangible heritage sites was approved in accordance with the order of the Ministry of Culture of 28 June 2019.

51. Among the residential buildings on this list were the dwelling houses of residents who had applied to the Ministry of Culture to have their homes included in the national cadastre of cultural heritage sites.

52. Five dwelling houses in Tashkent were duly included in the national register in the light of the definition of historical and cultural heritage.

53. The procuratorial authorities regularly checks to ensure that the rights of natural persons and legal entities are observed during demolitions. When evidence of violations comes to light, appropriate measures are taken with respect to the offender in accordance with the law.

Tashkent

54. As for Tashkent, in particular the article published on the news website Gazeta.uz entitled "House No. 78 is still being demolished even though people are living in it", which reported that the three-storey 18-unit apartment building on 78 Ankhov Buyi Street in the Shaikhontokhursk district was demolished on the basis of a decision of the chief administrator of Tashkent, No. 1204 of 8 September 2017, in connection with the construction of the Navrus amusement park on 17 ha of land.

55. According to the report of the meeting of the Cabinet of Ministers at its special session, No. 5 of 23 October 2018, it was planned that the tenants of this building would be resettled before 20 November 2018 and the building would be completely demolished by 10 December 2018.

56. However, during an inspection it was established that the demolition work was being carried out without providing E. Nishanbaev (apt. 2), K. Kholmatova (apt. 4) and L. Shkodskikh (apt. 7) any other equivalent living quarters to move into from the demolished house.

57. In this connection, on 25 February 2019, the office of the procurator of Tashkent brought disciplinary charges against O. Musaev, the head of the department of the Centre for the Management of Municipal Assets of Tashkent responsible for resettling the residents of this house. Mr. Musaev was reprimanded by order of the Director General of the Centre on 28 February 2019.

Samarkand province

58. The procuratorial authorities carried out an on-site visit and spoke with the residents of this province during its review of the issues referred to in the communication of the Special Rapporteur.

59. It was established that there was no decision on the part of the chief administrator of Samarkand for the demolition of 500 houses in the district (mahalla) of Khodja Akhrar, nor was any such decision issued. Therefore, 600 inhabitants living in this district could not have been left out on the street and there was no deadline for the eviction of citizens from their homes set by the official authorities.

60. Decision No. 2093-k of the chief administrator of Samarkand of 1 November 2018 provides for the reconstruction of roads and the surrounding area in order to improve the city's appearance and to follow current trends for streets such as Giyosiddin Zhamshid, Ibn Sino, Butansoroi, Amir Temur, Khusain Baikaro, Ulug Tursunov, B. Mashrab, Mukumy and, in the Khodja Akhrar Vali mahalla, such streets as Mukumy, Orif Gulkhany, Samaria, N. Devonbegi, Khondamir, Khodja Akhrar Vali and Namozgokh.

Tashkent province

61. The procuratorial authorities have also reviewed the allegations put forward in the joint communication of the Special Rapporteurs concerning the violation of the rights of the inhabitants of the demolished residential buildings in the town of Yangiyul.

62. With a view to improving the town of Yangiyul in connection with the above-mentioned commissions, on 26 June 2019, the regional chief administrator took the decision to authorize planning for the construction of five-storey dwelling houses, Nos. 712 and 713, following the demolition of 1961 two-storey residential buildings, Nos. 103 and 105.

63. It has been established that buildings Nos. 103 and 105 are completely demolished and construction work is being done on the site by OOO Kishlok Kurilish Invest, a limited liability company. The residents of the above-mentioned residential buildings entered into agreements for compensation for the loss incurred under regulations approved by Cabinet of Ministers in its Decision No. 97 of 29 May 2006.

64. In addition, by decision of the town's chief administration, there were plans to construct five-storey residential buildings to replace buildings Nos. 113, 115, 117, 119, 123, 127, 129, 131, 133, 135, 137 and 139. The demolition of buildings Nos. 113, 115, 117, 119, 123, 127, 129, 131, 133, 135, 137 and 139 was since suspended and then cancelled by decision of the Yangiyul chief administrator on 2 August 2019.

65. Prior to the adoption of Presidential Order No. F-5491 of 3 August 2019 on additional measures for unconditional guarantees of citizens' and business entities' property rights, the necessary steps were taken in the province to compensate citizens and business entities for losses incurred as a result of the seizure of land for State and social needs: 10,594 citizens were given compensation amounting to 114 trillion sum and 953 legal entities 21.6 trillion sum.

66. Despite the measures taken to prevent negative consequences from occurring during the implementation of the above-mentioned actions, there were still cases in which property was unlawfully demolished.

67. In order to implement the decision of the chief administrator of Qashadaryo province, No. K-942/09 of 12 September 2018, on measures for the construction, repair and improvement of the village of Eski Yakkabog in Yakkabog district, a road map was developed to address the problems that arose and to further improve the region.

68. It should be noted that, on 20 July 2019, the deputy chief administrator of Yakkabog district, Mansur Tuimaev, conducted a communication campaign among owners of shops located along Okhnybabaev Street on the demolition of buildings along the street that projected beyond the building line. In the course of the demolition work on the shop belonging to [REDACTED], an employee of the limited liability company [REDACTED] who introduced himself at the time of the incident as the head of the company, [REDACTED], put up resistance, doused Mr. Tuimaev with petrol, who had taken the seat of the excavator driver, [REDACTED], and set the deputy chief administrator on fire. On 20 July, the Qashadaryo province procurator's office brought a criminal case against [REDACTED] for offences covered under articles 25 (1) and 97 of the Criminal Code. In the course of the investigation, [REDACTED] acts were reclassified as offences under articles 25 and 98 of the Code, and the deputy chief administrator, Mr. Tuimaev was accused of committing offences under articles 192-1 (3) (a) and 206 (2) (a). In addition, during the investigation, citizens and business owners were given compensation for losses amounting to 692.7 million sum.

69. Plans have now been made at three citizens meetings of mahallas held in Eski Yakkabog – Eski Yakkabog, Mustakillik and Ibn Sino – to carry out repairs and home improvements of 1,801 dwelling houses; work has begun on 1,510 of them and facade works on 1,250 have been completed. There are also plans for a major overhaul of a 2.5 km section of the 30 m wide Yakkabog-Chirakchi-Shurbazar Road (4R84). In this connection, 34 residential and 71 non-residential buildings were demolished along the section of the road under repair.

70. In accordance with the requirements of the regulations approved by Decision No. 97 of 26 May 2006 of the Cabinet of Ministers in connection with the seizure of land plots for State and social needs, 0.04 ha of land each were allocated for private housing construction.

71. Furthermore, owners of partially demolished homes were provided with compensation amounting to 692.8 million sum and new walls and facades were put up to replace the demolished walls of 20 houses at the expense of construction companies.

72. It is worth noting that, to date, 98 per cent of the planned construction work on 2.5 km of pavement has been completed, 98 lamp posts have been installed and the section of Yakkabog-Chirakchi-Shurbazar Road has been repaved and landscaped.

73. In view of the above, every necessary measure is being taken by the local authorities and other competent bodies to prevent the unlawful destruction of historical monuments and the demolition of private homes and to provide timely and adequate compensation and temporary accommodation or land plots for the construction of new buildings.

74. According to the statistical report of the Supreme Court of Uzbekistan, for the first nine months of 2019, the civil courts handled 260 claims for compensation for the cost of dwelling houses and other buildings totalling 29,872,978,926 sum in connection with the seizure of plots of land for State and social needs and 72 cases involving the demolition of dwelling houses and other buildings in connection with the seizure of plots of land, on which they were located, for State and social needs (see annex 1).

75. Of the total number of cases involving claims for compensation considered by the courts, 179 resulted in judgments being issued, with 165 claims being met, totalling 22,964,551,948 sum; 14 such cases were dismissed; proceedings were dropped in 5 civil cases; and 76 cases were not considered.

76. Of the 72 cases involving claims over demolitions examined in the first nine months in 2019, 48 resulted in judgments being issued, with the claims being settled in 40 cases and dismissed in 8 cases and proceedings dropped in 7; 17 cases were not considered (see annex 2).

10. Please provide information about the existing plans for the preservation of UNESCO World Heritage sites, that constitute the common heritage of all humankind, and that would be affected by the demolition.

77. As part of the implementation of the recommendations put forward at the forty-third session of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee on the property, Samarkand – Crossroad of Cultures, the President of Uzbekistan took the decision to impose a moratorium on all kinds of construction work in the historic area and buffer zone of Samarkand until the potential effect of such work is fully assessed and appropriate measures are taken to protect the outstanding world heritage site. The Government is working with experts from the International Council on Monuments and Sites to develop a management plan for the historic area of Samarkand.

78. According to the report of the Cabinet of Ministers, No. 01-05/1-856 of 11 September 2018, on the implementation of measures to accelerate the development of tourism in Samarkand, any construction in the historic area is prohibited.

11. We urge that all necessary interim measures be taken to halt the alleged violations and prevent their reoccurrence and, in the event that the investigations support or suggest the allegations to be correct, to ensure the accountability of any person responsible for the alleged violations.

79. Pursuant to Presidential Decree No. UP-5577 of 14 November 2018 on additional measures to improve State regulation in the area of construction, the Ministry of Construction has drafted a new version of the Town Planning Code of Uzbekistan, which provides for specific procedures for organizing public debates (including the objectives, time frames, stages, forms, recording and publication of the outcomes of the debates) and detailed regulation of public assessments conducted by the local authorities with the participation of citizens in addressing issues arising from the use of plots of land that affects their interests. The draft code is currently undergoing a domestic interdepartmental approval procedure.

80. Furthermore, a master plan for the city of Tashkent is currently being developed and a new master plan for the city of Samarkand is at the finalization and approval stage.

Annex 1

Statistics on cases heard involving claims for compensation of the cost of dwelling houses and other buildings in connection with the seizure of plots of land for State and social needs for the first nine months of 2019

No.	Province	<i>Total no. of cases heard</i>			<i>Including</i>				
		<i>No. of cases</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Judgments issued</i>	<i>Including</i>		<i>Dismissed</i>	<i>Case proceedings discontinued</i>	<i>Cases not considered</i>
					<i>No.</i>	<i>Amount</i>			
1.	Republic of Qoraqalpog'iston	3	218 201 083	3	3	215 201 083	-	-	-
2.	Andijon province	19	5 637 895 682	15	15	5 203 670 561	-	-	2
3.	Buxoro province	2	128 791 143.0	2	2	128 791 143	-	-	-
4.	Jizzax province	1	156 620 000	1	1	156 620 000	-	-	-
5.	Qashqadaryo province	13	697 976 244	11	11	577 763 194	-	-	2
6.	Navoiy province	10	1 030 727 135	10	10	1 013 650 212	-	-	-
7.	Namangan province	11	950 760 225	6	6	695 123 255	-	-	5
8.	Samarkand province	6	1 270 159 578	6	6	1 270 159 578	-	-	-
9.	Surxondaryo province	21	786 307 731	20	19	708 736 787	1	-	1
10.	Sirdaryo province	20	1 923 939 260	14	14	1 182 380 109	-	-	6
11.	Farg'ona province	15	1 182 969 549	14	13	1 163 998 651	1	-	1
12.	Xorazm province	9	1 388 481 250	2	2	110 439 000	-	-	7
13.	Tashkent province	75	8 826 458 149	59	54	7 105 824 949	5	-	16
14.	Tashkent	55	5 673 691 897	16	9	3 432 193 426	7	3	36
Total		260	29 872 978 926	179	165	22 964 551 948	14	5	76

Annex 2

Statistics on cases heard involving the demolition of dwelling houses and other buildings in connection with the seizure of plots of land, on which they were located, for State and social needs for the first nine months of 2019

Province		Total No. of cases heard	Including				Cases not considered
			Judgments issued	Including		Case proceedings discontinued	
				Settled	Dismissed		
1.	Republic of Qoraqalpog'iston	4	4	3	1	-	-
2.	Andijon province	6	4	4	-	-	2
3.	Buxoro province	-	-	-	-	-	-
4.	Jizzax province	10	8	6	2	-	2
5.	Qashqadaryo province	4	2	2	-	-	2
6.	Navoiy province	-	-	-	-	-	-
7.	Namangan province	15	5	3	2	2	8
8.	Samarkand province	4	4	4	-	-	-
9.	Surxondaryo province	6	6	5	1	-	-
10.	Sirdaryo province	5	2	2	-	-	3
11.	Farg'ona province	7	7	6	1	-	-
12.	Xorazm province	-	-	-	-	-	-
13.	Tashkent province	3	3	3	-	-	-
14.	Tashkent	8	3	2	1	5	-
Total		72	48	40	8	7	17