INDEX

access to justice, 159–188. *See also* barriers to domestic justice
  children, 159, 173, 182–183, 185
  effectiveness
    accessibility, 164–165
    availability, 163–164
    definition, 162
    justiciability. *See* justiciability
    quality, 165–166
  legal aid. *See* legal aid
  marginalised groups, 161, 170, 182
  requiring a good evidentiary system, 24
  standing and representation, 230
accountability. *See* state accountability
actio popularis, 230
actori incumbit probatio
  meaning, 32
  of application to state party, 44
actori incumbit probatio (n), 307
Addis Ababa Guidelines, 8
admissibility. *See also* victim status
  colourable claim (IACHR), 77, 302
  concept, 70
  decisions at, 88
  examination of substantiation deferred to merits stage, 92–94, 118
  examined with merits, 12
  facts prematurely established at, 58, 65, 113
  grounds for rejection at
    claim manifestly ill-founded, 68, 73, 75, 82, 94–95
    claim manifestly unfounded, 68, 73–75, 95
    domestic remedies not exhausted. *See* exhaustion rule
    factual allegations not sufficiently substantiated, 75, 79–80. *See also* sufficiently substantiated claim
    legal claim not adequately supported, 80–82
    official documentation not provided by complainant, 83–84, 90–91
    personal disadvantage not demonstrated, 82–83
    right claimed not in clear existence, 84–86
    state-held evidence not produced by complainant, 94
  legal representation an advantage, 277, 313–314
  rate of rejection at, 69, 71
  recommendations from Symposium, 304
  requirements
    UNTB's Rules of Procedure, 12, 300, 303, 316–318, 324
      recommendations from Symposium, 314
  standard of proof at. *See* prima facie
  state submissions at, 87–88
    to be disregarded, 304
  substantiation requirement at, 68–96, 110–113, 307–310. *See also* sufficiently substantiated claim
  to be distinguished from merits stage, 24

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 05 Nov 2026 at 10:47:32, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009639231.018

admissibility (cont.)
unmeritorious claims, 111. *See also* arguable claim
victim status contested, 58, 269–285. *See also* victim status
adversarial legal systems, 37
adverse inferences, 26, 307
Afghanistan, 179
African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights
on prima facie standard, 77
on the exhaustion rule, 224
registration criteria unclear, 301
African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights
on *prima facie* standard, 78
African system of human rights protection, 4
structural orders, 234
Ahmadov, Farid (n), 81
Algeria, 142, 179, 208–209, 231
Altwicker, Tilmann, 193
amicus curiae. *See* third-party intervention
Amnesty International, 179, 206, 212, 220
antisemitism, 100
arbitrary detention
categories (WGAD), 130–131, 133
discriminatory, 133, 136–139
immigration-related, 133, 147
arguable claim as a standard of proof, 111, 118–122
close to prima facie standard, 110–111
asylum seekers
asylum refused, 183
Chechen, 61
Eritrean, 183
fearing deportation, 180–181
non-registered claim, 61–63
legal correspondence as evidence, 42
Sudanese, 183
Ugandan, 180
Australia, 147
authoritative sources
preference for, 257, 260, 264
unduly weighted, 261
Azerbaijan, 150

balance of probabilities, 226
appropriate standard at merits, 306
as standard for shifting burden of proof (context condition), 46
default standard in human rights adjudication, 48, 64, 144–145
meaning, 45, 111
proposed role in WGAD adjudication, 154
recommendations from Symposium, 306
risk of upward slippage, 65
synonyms, 45, 48, 306
barriers to accessing UNTB procedure, 315–316
recommendations from Symposium, 315–316
barriers to domestic justice. *See also* access to justice; exhaustion rule
complainant's legal proficiency lacking, 276, 291, 307
cost, 163–164, 177, 181–186
inconsistently recognised as a barrier, 169
legal fees, 183. *See* also Legal aid
cost of evidencing
forensic analysis, 41
court backlogs, 186
disability, 163, 307
evidentiary requirements, 69, 94, 96, 162, 251
fear of deportation, 180
futility of domestic remedies. *See* justiciability
gender stereotypes. *See* gender stereotypes
gendered economic inequalities, 165, 184
geographical remoteness, 160, 163, 176–177

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 05 Nov 2026 at 10:47:32, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009639231.018

illiteracy, 176
ineffective remedy, 187–188
judicial bias, 165–166, 175, 187, 221, 250, 255–256, 258. *See also* discrimination
judicial delay, 166, 168, 225
judicial error, risk of, 227
justice of poor quality, 186
legal aid rejected, 185
legal representation lacking. *See* Legal aid; Legal representation
linguistic challenges, 160, 164, 177–179
marginalised groups, 307
non-justiciability, 171–176
poverty, 182–184
remedies not known, 177–178
risk of backlash, 177, 179–181, 221
statute of limitations, 176, 179, 181, 187
systemic inequality, 160, 162, 170, 177, 188, 250–251
Bassim, Wafaa Ashraf Moharram (n), 185
BBC (British Broadcasting Corporation), 60
Belarus, 61–63
beyond reasonable doubt, 45–48, 61–65
fit for human rights adjudication?, 48, 144, 226
standard adopted by ECtHR, 48
bias
in investigations. *See* domestic investigation
in sources, 222
in stereotypes. *See* stereotypes
judicial. *See* Barriers to domestic justice
Border Violence Monitoring Network, 41
Bosnia and Herzegovina, 41
Buergenthal, Thomas, 75
burden of proof, 70. *See also* shifting the burden of proof
allocation in relation to presumptions, 263
allocation left implicit, 114
allocation problematic, 88
allocation where pattern/practice of violations, 226
impact of state non-participation, 200–201, 208
in WGAD adjudication
formalisation from 2011, 134–135
role in evidentiary sequence, 154
unclear in early practice, 132
link to the right to fair trial, 197
not to rest on complainant alone when state possesses evidence, 59, 90, 208, 308
production and persuasion (concepts), 192, 309
proving obstacles to avoid the exhaustion rule, 170, 174
re policy or practice of state violations, 225–228
recommendations from Symposium, 309–310
reduced for trauma victims, 91
reduced for unrepresented complainants, 89–90
shared. *See* Shared burden of proof
shared burden of production, 105
shifting. *See* Shifting the burden of proof
to be adjusted in detention cases, 59, 139, 308
within the individual communications procedure (HRC), 196–201, 308
Burden of proving (in practice), 253, 256, 258
a negative. *See* Negative proof
heightened standard
due to stereotypes, 256
no need to prove discriminatory intent, 109, 121–122

Cameroon, 149, 187, 206–207
Canada, 175, 180
case selection effected. *See* research strategies adopted
child cases
disputed status, 57

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 05 Nov 2026 at 10:47:32, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009639231.018

child cases (cont.)
domestic violence, 257
custody proceedings, 256, 259, 264, 266
education, 186
filicide, 256, 264
pushback, 56–61
sexual assault, 256
children
best interests, 265
circumstantial evidence, 225
class action, 230. *See actio popularis*. *See also* ECtHR pilot-judgment procedure
climate change cases, 159, 182, 187
Committee against Torture
addressing substantiation at admissibility stage, 73, 75, 84, 91
approach different from HRC, 190
assessment of state bias, 221
concluding observations
used as evidence by Committee, 55
used as evidence by complainant, 179
expertise of members, 9
number of cases, 4
on exhaustion of domestic remedies, 178, 180
cost, 182
destitution, 183
on fact-finding visits, 221
power to initiate inquiries, 218
reliance on own reporting, 60
Rules of Procedure, 55, 324
Rule 104 (n), 300
third-party interventions, 219
unclear evidentiary reasoning, 51–52, 55
Committee for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination
evidentiary trajectory over time, 20
Committee membership (UNTBs)
Addis Ababa Guidelines, 8
desirable diversity in (n), 9
diversity, desired in, 9
drawn from academia, 272
drawn from diplomatic service, 101
election process, 9–10
vote trading, 10
former members acting as counsel, 277, 291
independence, 8
legal training not required, 9
length of tenure, 9
linguistic skills limited, 275
number of members (across UNTBs), 3, 8
qualifications, 8
range and limits of expertise, 9–10, 101, 292
secondary to professional occupation, 10, 14
unremunerated, 10
Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
addressing substantiation at admissibility stage, 73, 75, 89
consideration of third-party documentation, 219
power to initiate inquiries, 218
Rules of Procedure, 219, 324
Committee on Enforced Disappearances
addressing substantiation at admissibility stage, 73
power to initiate inquiries, 218
Rules of Procedure, 324
Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, 84–85, 89, 91–92
anti-stereotyping analysis, 255, 259, 262, 267
General Recommendation 25 (n), 250
General Recommendation 28 (n), 250
General Recommendation 33, 163–166, 245, 251, 258–261
on legal aid, 164
General Recommendation 35 (n), 250, 252
number of cases, 4–5
on exhaustion of domestic remedies, 178

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 05 Nov 2026 at 10:47:32, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009639231.018

breakdown of the rule of law, 186
contextual approach, 175–176
financial barriers, 181–182
on gender stereotypes, 215–238
developing reasoning on evidential impact, 252
evolution of case law, 254–262
inconsistencies, 257
insufficient examination, 252, 257–260
proposed shift, 262, 267
reliance on complainants to define stereotypes, 261, 267
on legal aid funding model, 184
power to initiate inquiries, 218
role in addressing gender stereotypes, 17, 244
Rules of Procedure, 324
third-party interventions, 219
Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination
Ad Hoc Conciliation Commissions, 106
addressing substantiation at admissibility stage, 73, 94
adopting complainant narratives, 111
composition, 103
concluding observations, 283
expertise of members, 101
General Recommendation 30, 105
General Recommendation 31, 165
General Recommendation 31 (n), 163
General Recommendation 32, 104
monitoring mechanisms, 99, 103
number of cases, 4–5
on exhaustion of domestic remedies
financial barriers, 181
Rapporteur on Communications, 115
registration conflated with admissibility, 300
requests for information
failure to make use of, 114
Rules of Procedure, 105–107, 300, 324
Rule 95 (n), 300
Rules of Procedure (n), 103
third-party interventions, 219
Committee on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families
Rules of Procedure, 324
Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
addressing substantiation at admissibility stage, 73
on exhaustion of domestic remedies, 174, 184
on legal fees, 183
complainants criticised for not using legal aid, 184–185
contrast with other UNTBs, 185
power to initiate inquiries, 218
Rules of Procedure, 324
Committee on the Rights of the Child
addressing substantiation at admissibility stage, 73, 90, 92
citing HRC on the burden of proof in detention cases, 59
on education, 186
on exhaustion of domestic remedies, 159–160, 171, 173, 186–187
domestic alignment, 159
financial barriers, 181
exemption where unaffordable, 185
identity characteristics shaping exhaustion analysis, 186
on legal aid, 184
on the burden of proof, 300
power to initiate inquiries, 218
registration conflated with admissibility, 300
Rules of Procedure, 300, 324
unclear evidentiary reasoning, 60
Committees' mode of functioning
sessions, 277
frequency, 3
impact of resource constraints, 15
organisation, 10
time constraints, 15, 101, 149–150, 293

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 05 Nov 2026 at 10:47:32, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009639231.018

common law vs. civil law traditions, 45
concluding observations as evidence, 55, 175, 179, 283
conclusive evidence as a standard of proof, 81–82
consistent legal reasoning. *See* UNTB reasoning
convention against torture and other cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, 322
  Article 15, 133
  Article 16, 52–53
  Article 22, 319
  as distinct from ICCPR in torture cases, 195
Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, 73, 85, 323
  Article 1, 254
  Article 2, 251
    (e), 250
    (f), 244, 250
  Article 5, 254–255
    (a), 244, 250, 252
  Optional Protocol, 73, 244, 252, 320
  role in addressing gender stereotypes, 244, 262, 266
Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, 9, 323
  Optional Protocol, 320
Convention on the Rights of the Child, 4, 323
  Article 12, 159
  Article 37, 60
  domestic alignment, 159
  Optional Protocol, 320
convention relating to the status of refugees, 33
convincing evidence, 79, 84, 94, 226
Cook, Rebecca, 248
Coronavirus, 186
corporal punishment cases, 171
corroboration assumed in presumption, 263
corroborative evidence, 22, 135
  effected through digital analysis, 41
  need for, 193, 208, 212
  role of witness statements, 37
  state non-participation as, 209
Council of Europe
  Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, 281
  Committee of Ministers, 232
    on general measures, 234
  electronic evidence guidelines, 140
Court of Justice of the European Union
  case law cited in UNTB proceedings, 118
credibility
  affected by stereotypes, 251, 254, 258–259
  of aggressor, 260
  of complainant, 256, 264
  of witnesses, 249
credible and reliable information (WGAD), 129–130
credible evidence
  role in shifting the burden of proof. *See* Shifting the burden of proof
  unclear meaning, 208
critical legal theory, 246–248
Croatia, 41
Cusack, Simone, 248–249, 255

D'Ascoli, Silvia, 167
de Frouville, Olivier, 285–286
de Frouville, Olivier (n), 82
Dembour, Marie-Bénédicte, 33
Denmark, 108, 111–117
Der Spiegel, 41
detailed account as evidence, 135, 203, 208. *See also* Victim account
  as prelude to shifting burden of proof, 206
  expected from state, 136
  impact when absent, 204
detention. *See also* arbitrary detention
  as prelude to torture, 195
  cases. *See* detention cases
  in informal sites, 35, 191

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 05 Nov 2026 at 10:47:32, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009639231.018

incommunicado, 137, 308
secret, 33
state obligation to record, 195, 199
failure to record, 35, 54, 84, 191, 211
detention cases, 186, 191–192, 200, 211
death in custody, 199
incommunicado, 205–207
labour camp, 83
of child, 184
of migrant, 84, 172
child, 173
punishment of alleged criminals, 205–212
terrorism, 207–208
theft, 184
secret detention, 41
devil's proof. *See* diabolical proof
diabolical proof, 188, 191–192, 200
as unacceptable burden of proof (HRC), 200, 212
definition, 192
shifting the burden of proof, 192
digital evidence, 36, 38–41, 139–141, 154, 310–312
Council of Europe guidelines, 140
forensic analysis, 36, 65
inaccessible to most victims, 41
geolocation, 38–39, 41, 47, 305
mobile phones, 35, 38–40
no clear avenue for submission of (in UNTB procedure), 311
potentially left unexamined by UNTBs, 311
produced during protests, 141
recommendations from Symposium, 311
storage and privacy, 140, 154
direct evidence
replaced by presumption, 262
disappearance. *See* Enforced disappearance
discrimination
biases in domestic justice systems, 160, 162, 165, 175, 250. *See also* Barriers to domestic justice
CEDAW Committee's approach, 250
differential treatment, 103–104
difficulty proving, 102, 122
direct vs indirect, definition (n), 102
disability
as a barrier to justice, 163
gender-based
indigenous women, 175
stereotypes. *See* gender stereotypes
structural discrimination, 251
impeding access to justice, 251
intersectional, 139
LGBT inequality
as evidence of non-justiciability, 175
race. *See* race discrimination
religion, 100
discrimination cases
disability-related, 174, 184, 256
gender-related, 92, 181, 186, 191–192, 200, 211
indigenous people. *See* Indigenous people
nationality-related, 85, 93, 108, 111–117
religion-related, 180
disputed facts
applicable standards of proof, 61–65
in pushback cases, 49–63
left unaddressed (CERD), 114
possible judicial outcomes, 43, 48
documentation
concerning pattern/practice of violations, 236
digital evidence. *See* digital evidence
expected of complainant, 84, 86
expected of state, 136
exculpatory evidence to rebut torture claims, 210–213
external, 136. *See also* reports
identity documents, 92
medical. *See* medical evidence
not expected of complainant, 43, 144
submitted by third parties, 219
domestic investigation
absent, 43, 112–117, 133, 186, 191, 203–204
biased, 253, 256, 258
delayed, 253

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 05 Nov 2026 at 10:47:32, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009639231.018

domestic investigation (cont.)
failure to collect evidence, 253, 258–259
flawed, 50
domestic procedures followed (state alleges), 36, 54, 136
domestic proceedings. *See* no fourth instance principle; exhaustion rule
domestic remedies
barriers to justice. *See* barriers to domestic justice; exhaustion rule
effectiveness, 224. *See also* exhaustion rule
exhaustion rule. *See* exhaustion rule
subsidiary role of international justice, 21, 160
domestic violence cases, 253–260, 264
femicide, 254
filicide, 256, 264
impacted by stereotypes, 253, 256, 259
due process cases, 92
due weight
to be given to complainant's submissions, 24
in CAT case law, 55–56
in CRC case law, 59
in HRC case law, 203–208

early warning mechanisms (UNTBs), 8, 103
education cases, 108
Egypt, 209
electronic evidence. *See* digital evidence
enforced disappearance, 195–196, 198, 225–226, 308
enforced disappearance cases, 179, 225, 231
burden of proof, 225
English language
as UN working language, 13, 23, 275
documents in proceedings not translated into, 289
dominance in NGOs, 275
secondary sources in, favoured over original evidence, 275
equal access cases. *See* race discrimination cases
Equality of arms. *See also* power differentials
concept, 197
defeated by state conduct, 32–33, 59
defeated by state non-participation, 194
European Centre for Constitutional and Human Rights, 34, 36, 40, 56
European Commission of Human Rights
on the exhaustion rule, 223
European Convention on Human Rights, 34
European Court of Human Rights, 76, 232
case law cited in UNTB proceedings, 118
caseload crisis, 228, 231
citing UNTB jurisprudence, 150–151
model for effective supranational adjudication, 128
on prima facie standard, 77
on the exhaustion rule, 224
parties' submissions not seen by judges (n), 14
pilot-judgment procedure, 217, 228–229, 231–233
registration criteria, 302
Rules of Procedure (n), 302
Rule 61, 232
standard of proof (beyond reasonable doubt), 48, 65
state compliance rate, 128
weak on migrants' rights, 33–34
European system of human rights protection, 4
caseload crisis, 231
minority rights, limited protection, 278
repetitive cases, 232
structural orders, 234
European Union
Race Equality Directive (n), 102, 109

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 05 Nov 2026 at 10:47:32, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009639231.018

evidentiary reasoning
impacting legal findings, 24, 53, 60
recommendations from Symposium, 311–315
unclear in UNTB case law, 19, 24–25, 34, 53, 56, 60–63, 297, 306
evidentiary thresholds. *See* standard of proof
exhaustion rule, 21, 50, 159–188, 216, 223–225, 304. *See also* access to justice; barriers to justice; exhaustion rule's exemption factors
as itself a barrier to justice, 25
avoided by proving barriers to justice, 174
unclear evidentiary threshold, 170
contextual vs literal application, 175
contradictory jurisprudence, 169
inapplicable in pushback cases, 43
individual communications procedure, tensions, 168
legally complex (n), 276
purpose, 167–168, 171, 173, 185
rationale, 225
recommendations from Symposium, 304
respects domestic accountability, 168–169
scrutiny of state claims on accessibility of remedies, 178
subsidiarity, 168, 171
exhaustion rule's exemption factors, 21, 161, 168–169, 223–225
accessibility illusory, 180
cost of proceedings, 182–183, 185
destitution, 183
domestic legal reform ineffective, 172
fair trial violations, 178
ineffective relief, 161, 168, 176
judicial bias, 187
manifestly unfair domestic proceedings, 81
no prospect of success, 169, 172
patterns or practices of violations, 224, 304
risk of backlash, 179
social and economic repercussions, 181
when pursuing remedy would be a crime, 180
exhaustion rule's exemption factors refused
legal aid not sought, 185
expert opinion evidence, 312

fact-checking (by UNTBs), 141, 298
limitations of fact-finding mechanisms, 144
fact-finding visits, 221. *See also* inquiries
facts. *See also* disputed facts; summaries
'false facts', 148
'translated', 274
argument translated into 'objective fact', 287–291
distorted by stereotypes, 251–253, 264
distortion, subject of, 114, 290
legal facts, 290
obscured by monitoring processes, 290
prompt reporting mistaken for lying, 261
socially constructed, 245–246
unresolved at merits stage, 112–117, 124, 306
versus law, 245
fair trial
under ICCPR Article 14, 197
feminist legal theory, 246–248
financial constraints. *See also* barriers to domestic justice: cost
Finland, 23–26, 269–293
flexible evidentiary approach in human rights adjudication, 6, 19, 107, 142, 145, 298
follow-up procedure, 13, 22, 112–116, 233
forced confession, 202–205
analysed under ICCPR Articles 7, 9, and 14, 195
connected to detention, 195
forced disappearance. *See* enforced disappearance
forensic architecture (University of London), 40

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 05 Nov 2026 at 10:47:32, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009639231.018

forensic evidence
requirements, 39
use in cases, 258
fourth instance principle. *See* no fourth instance principle

Gaer, Felice, 52
Gbedemah, Hilary, 27
gender stereotypes
anti-stereotyping obligation, 248, 251, 254
CEDAW Committee's analysis. *See* Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women
proposed role for regional bodies and authorities, 267
as fabricated facts, 255, 257, 259, 264
depicting
amoral victim, 260
consenting woman, 255
father contact essential for child, 257, 265–266
ideal aggressor, 253, 255–260
ideal victim. *See* Victim status
sexual violence survivor, 170, 181
women as economically dependent, 184–185
women as primary caretakers, 264
women as untrustworthy, 257–258, 264, 266
handling by UNTBs
CEDAW Committee's approach, 84–86, 165
CEDAW's approach, 215–238
complainants responsible for identifying stereotypes, 261, 267
evolution of CEDAW Committee case law, 254–262
selective use of evidence, 254, 258–261
impacting
access to justice, 244, 249–262. *See also* CEDAW: General Recommendation 33
evidential reception of women's accounts, 245, 255, 258, 266
fairness of trial, 250–251
legal presumptions, 228–235
the shaping of legal definitions, 263
the standard of proof applied, 23
the understanding of women's experiences of violence, 255, 257, 265
gender-based violence, 252
evidence of violence neglected, 256, 259, 264–266
misinterpreted as civil dispute, 258
narrow legal definitions, 256
normalised through stereotypes, 255, 257
presumption in favour of father-child contact, 266
stereotypes in adjudication, 249, 255
violence as normal, 257–258
women's reactions as irrational, 259, 266
general comments, 8, 218, 316
Germany, 173
Giorgetti, Chiara, 152
Gómez Martínez, Carlos (n), 81
Greece, 40

Hakiki, Hanaa, 60
Halme-Tuomisaari, Miia, 272
Hansen, Alexandra, 193
hate speech
cases, 82, 108, 111–117
legal prohibition, 163
hearing. *See* oral hearing before UNTBs
heightened standard of review (WGAD), 138–139, 153
Helfer, Laurence, 128, 152
Helfer, Laurence (n), 81
Henkin, Louis, 154
Human Rights Committee
addressing information asymmetries, 192–193, 210, 308
addressing state non-participation, 200–201

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 05 Nov 2026 at 10:47:32, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009639231.018

addressing substantiation at admissibility stage, 72, 80–95
burden of proof in detention cases, 90, 139
case law cited in CERD proceedings, 118
cases procedure, 228
concluding observations
used by HRC as evidence of pattern/practice, 175
examination of individual torture claims, 151
three-stage evidentiary framework, 22, 211
expertise of members, 292
general comment 32, 197
guidelines on third-party submissions, 219
history of, 275
interim measures to enable asylum registration, 61–62
number of cases, 4
on exhaustion of domestic remedies, 172, 175, 177, 179–181, 187
cost, 182, 184
financial barriers, 181
judicial bias, 187
on legal fees, 185
on the burden of proof, 308
own view triggering violations, 26
repetitive cases procedure, 217, 231
Rules of Procedure, 10, 219, 324
Rule 90 (n), 302
Rule 92 (n), 300
Rule 96, 219
Rule 98 (n), 274, 277
summarised evidence in public decisions, 288
teleological treatment of evidence, 198–200
Human Rights Council, 142, 153
Code of Conduct for Special Procedures Mandate-holders, 142, 148
Manual of Operations of the Special Procedures of the HRC, 143
methods of work of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, 142
Resolution 51/8, 129
Terms of Reference for Country Visits, 142
Universal Periodic Review, 142, 236
human rights defenders' cases, 138
Human Rights Watch, 60, 220

identity disputed (pushback cases), 38, 57–60
identity documents as evidence, 37–38, 58
impartiality
lacking. *See* bias
Indigenous people
Canada, 175
Finland. *See* Sámi
narrative of internal unity and harmony, 271, 289
Nepal, 176, 211
indirect evidence, 225, 247
individual communications procedure, 194
advertises itself as accessible, 25
anonymous communications prohibited, 300, 303, 319–324
burden of proof in, 196–201
exhaustion rule, tensions with, 168
final views limited to 10,700 words, 15, 315
four stages, 11
ignores actors beyond state and complainant, 293
legal representation of complainant (not) needed, 25, 313–314
OHCHR guidance difficult to navigate, 313
Optional Protocol (ICCPR)'s role, 276
purpose, 166–171
quasi-judicial character, 4
resource constraints, 15, 317
role of the Petitions Section, 11
subject to state consent, 3–4, 25, 276, 302

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 05 Nov 2026 at 10:47:32, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009639231.018

individual communications procedure (cont.)
method of consent, 3
submission portal
digital limitations, 140
no clear avenue for submission of digital evidence, 311
online submission, 11
submission rounds (number), 13
submissions accessible in full to parties, 14
three decision points, 299
inference
(not) drawn by domestic courts, 120
in de facto presumptions, 262
logical, 225
not drawn, 267
not drawn by adjudicator (CERD), 118
inferences. *See also* presumptions
information requests. *See* requests for information
inner conviction of the judge, 45
inquiries
UNTB power of initiation, 216–218
inquiry procedure (UNTBs), 8, 311
Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, 77
on the burden of proof, 225
registration criteria unclear, 301
Rules of Procedure (n), 302
serious violations prioritised, 237
Inter-American Court of Human Rights
on the burden of proof in pattern/practice cases, 227
on the exhaustion rule, 224
state compliance rate, 146
Inter-American system of human rights protection, 4
logical inference where pattern/practice of violations, 227
remedial jurisprudence, 231
reversing the burden of proof, 225
special approach to pattern/practice of violations, 226
structural orders, 234
interim measures, 230
as evidence, 42
countering state denial, 62
International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes, 78
International Committee of the Red Cross, 207, 210, 212
International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, 9, 323
Article 31, 321
International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 99, 322
antisemitism, impact on drafting, 100
Article 1, 103–104
Article 11 (n), 106
Article 14, 103–105, 319
Article 2, 113, 118
Article 3, 113
Article 4, 108, 113–114
Article 5, 111, 118–120
Article 6, 110–113, 118–124
Article 7, 118–120
history of, 99–101
International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, 322
Article 77, 320
International Court of Justice
consensual jurisdiction, contrast to WGAD, 152
position on evidentiary burdens, 134
provisional measures orders, 146
state compliance rate, 146
UNSC veto power, 153
International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 2, 72, 83, 322
Article 1, 283
Article 10, 207
Article 14, 197
Article 2, 283
Article 25, 283–285

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 05 Nov 2026 at 10:47:32, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009639231.018

Article 27, 278, 283–285
Article 7, 194–213
Optional Protocol, 4, 72, 194, 269, 276, 288, 319
individual communications procedure. *See* Individual Communications Procedure
International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 323
International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, 76
interstate communications, 106
intime conviction du juge, 45
investigations. *See* inquiries. *See* domestic investigation
Iran, 142
Israel, 100
Istanbul Protocol (n), 37
Italy, 84

joinder of cases, 230–231
journalism cases, 187, 206
journalistic evidence, 41, 60, 136, 141
JURIS database, 16, 195, 317–318
recommendations from Symposium, 318
justiciability
cases evidencing non-justiciability, 174–176
definition, 163
forced pursuit of futile remedies, 172–173
lack of, barrier to justice, 171–176

Kazakhstan, 209
Keane, David, 99
Koji, Teraya (n), 81
Kpatcha, Kobauyah Tchamdja (n), 81
Kran, Marcia, 81

late evidentiary questions, 114–115
legal aid, 164, 181–186
biases within, 164, 184–185
CEDAW Recommendation 33, 164
eligibility
international standard lacking, 164
inadequately funded, 184
legal correspondence as evidence, 42
legal presumption
absolute (definition), 263
functions, 263
interaction with stereotypes, 245
rebuttable (definition), 263
legal representation
(not) needed in UNTB proceedings, 25, 277, 313–314
cost of, a barrier to domestic justice. *See* Legal aid
counsel's inside knowledge an advantage, 277, 292
impact on evidentiary standard, 89–90
in border incidents, 41
unrepresented complainants, 41, 177–178, 180
Lentz, Christopher, 201
LGBT cases, 175, 178
Libya, 186, 209
Lighthouse Reports, 41
litigants in person. *See* unrepresented complainants
logical inference, 225, 227
logistical constraints
to UNTB-initiated inquiries, 219

Malaysia, 141
Mauritania, 53–55
Médecins Sans Frontières, 60
medical evidence, 36
difficult to obtain (in pushback), 39
disregarded, 258
use in cases, 198–199, 205, 207, 209, 211, 258, 261
merits stage, 69, 77, 81, 87–88, 92, 198, 252, 306–307
appropriate standard of proof at, 306
CERD's limited evidentiary engagement, 108, 113–114
requiring factual and evidentiary examination, 13
migrants. *See* people on the move
missing evidence
due to state erasure, 35, 38

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 05 Nov 2026 at 10:47:32, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009639231.018

missing evidence (cont.)
due to stereotypes, 253. *See also* Stereotypes
lost in digital transmission, 38
mobile phones as creators of evidence. *See also* victim-generated evidence
destroyed by states (pushbacks), 38
during protests, 141
Moldova, 85, 117–124
monitoring. *See* state monitoring
Morocco, 50, 53–56, 60

nationality cases. *See* discrimination cases
negative proof, 80
Nepal, 160, 179, 181, 190–192, 210–212
Niezen, Ronald, 15
no fourth instance principle, 51–52, 113, 141
No Name Kitchen, 41
non-governmental organisations
dominance of English, 275
resource constraints, 275
non-governmental organisations' reports
evidencing violations, 41, 220–222
probative value not fully recognised, 222
non-refoulement cases, 60, 178
Norway, 173, 278

objective evidence, 6
objective facts
as constructed, 245, 287–291
objectivity
threatened by political considerations, 101, 270
Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, 11, 73, 95
2013 report on judicial stereotyping (Cusack), 249
Annual Report 2021 (n), 70, 299, 301, 318
dissemination of findings, 22, 236, 277
proposed role, 217, 229, 235, 237
fact sheets, 131, 137, 276, 314
JURIS. *See* JURIS database
Petitions Section, 11, 14, 300–301
recommendations from Symposium, 314–318
submission form (Special Procedures), 140
Official notice, (not) taking, 84, 312
open-source evidence, 41, 204, 311
oral hearing before UNTBs
possible but exceptional, 14, 105, 310–311
recommendations from Symposium, 310, 312

pattern/practice of violations, 22, 215–238
case processing, 228–235
traditional individual model, 230–231
decisions on, become evidence, 56, 217, 236
desirable information system on, 238
effect on UNTB caseload, 228
leading to shift in burden of proof, 46, 65, 225–228, 310
liberal approach to receipt of evidence, 223
pushback, 41–42, 56, 61. *See* Pushback
quasi-judicial role of UNTBs, 217–223
standard of proof to be applied, 226, 307
Pauwelyn, Joost, 192
people on the move, 32
periodic reports
cited by UNTBs, 55
in individual communications, 283
Peru, 207–208
Petitions Section, 11, 14, 300–301
Philippines, 85
photographic evidence, 36, 38–41, 46
limitations, 39
use in cases, 40–41, 58
pilot-judgment procedure. *See* European Court of Human Rights
plausible evidence as standard of proof, 77–78, 81

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 05 Nov 2026 at 10:47:32, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009639231.018

equivalent to prima facie threshold, 304
in discrimination cases, 81, 310
Poland, 61–63
police evidence, 80, 258
Politi, Mauro (n), 82
power differentials
between state and complainant, 152
in evidence law, 247
unequal access to evidence, 35, 43, 59, 90, 135, 144, 191–193, 198, 206, 308–309
prejudices. *See* bias
preponderance of evidence. *See* balance of probabilities
presumptions
de facto. *See also* inference
definition, 262
factual versus legal, 262
functions in human rights adjudication, 144–145, 193
complainant's allegations considered true, 193, 211
triggering shift in burden of proof, 192. *See also* shifting the burden of proof
used in establishing balance of probabilities, 144
legal presumptions. *See* Legal presumption
rebuttable presumption in torture cases (HRC), 193, 205, 212–213
truth-substituting function, 262
prima facie
appropriate standard at admissibility, 17, 299, 304
appropriate standard for linkage condition when burden is shifted, 304
appropriate standard to prove individual claim's link to pattern/practice of violations, 226
colourable claim (IACHR), 77, 302
differing conceptions, 19, 45, 75–77, 301
distortions, 17, 19, 68–96, 303–304
improperly applied, 19, 61–65, 258
lower at registration than at admissibility, 75, 301
origins, 74–79
prevailing definition, 19, 77–79
state submissions to be disregarded, 304
threshold in WGAD adjudication, 134, 136, 139
triggering state obligation to respond, 139
unclear meaning, 24, 75–76, 95
prior factual findings as evidence, 136. *See also* pattern/practice of violations
probable evidence. *See* balance of probabilities
probatio diabolica. *See* diabolical proof
procedural violation
due to domestic failure to shift burden of proof (racial discrimination), 120–122
not followed by substantive violation, 111, 114, 118–120, 124
procedural vs substantive establishment of the facts, 19, 47–48
protest cases, 80, 137
psychiatric evidence in domestic proceedings, 260–261, 264
pushback, 18–19, 31–66, 308
definition, 32–33
categories, 36
entails human rights violations, 33
key types of evidence, 36
not subject to domestic investigation, 43
pushback cases, 40–41, 49–63
identity disputed, 38, 57–60

race discrimination
definition, 103
difficult to prove, 102
discriminatory intent need not be proven, 109, 121–122
procedural vs substantive violation, 111
shifting the burden of proof, 105

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 05 Nov 2026 at 10:47:32, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009639231.018

race discrimination cases, 109–117
  access to services, 111
  employment, 109, 117–124
  Roma, 110–111, 117–124
racist violence cases, 111–117
rape cases. *See* sexual assault cases
rationalist conception of evidence, 246
rebuttal by state. *See* shifting the burden of proof:operation
registration stage, 299–303
  not mentioned as such in treaty texts, 299–302, 319
  rejection of complaints at, 12, 71, 299, 302, 313
    rate, 71, 299
  requirements, 300–303, 319–324
    conflated with admissibility requirements, 300
  should be simple verification, 11
  standard of proof at, 299
remedies. *See also* domestic remedies
  consistency in response to pattern/practice of violations, 229
  general measures, 217, 229, 234–235
  in European Court of Human Rights' pilot procedure, 232
  structural remedies, 166, 217, 229–235
    clarity, need for, 234
rendition cases, 209
reports
  as evidence, 42, 55, 60, 141, 179, 217, 283
  consideration by CESCR, 219
  corroboration in torture complaints (CAT), 179
  corroboration in torture complaints (HRC), 213
  country visit, 143, 147
  Inter-American Commission Annual Reports, 237
  on general conditions, 83
    detention facility, 209
  on lack of state judicial independence, 187
requests for information, 105–106, 124, 202, 302
  failure to make use of, 114
  recommendations from Symposium, 305, 310
research strategies adopted, 70, 195
  case selection effected, 16, 49, 107, 196, 220, 252, 273
  difficulties encountered, 16, 69, 197
  ethnographic observation, 272, 292
  symposium and edited volume, 16
resource constraints affecting UNTBs, 101, 219, 275, 292, 317
respondent state's position and conduct
  claims complaint is inadmissible, 12
  denies the facts (pushback cases), 19, 26, 35–36
    of asylum non-registration, 62
  disput factual findings, 57–60
  disputes factual findings, 113, 115–117, 148
  fails to engage satisfactorily in proceedings, 132
    late response, 149–150
    no engagement, 136
    silence, 133
  fails to participate in proceedings, 21, 25
    impact on burden of proof, 200–201
    indicators of non-engagement, 196
    shifting the burden of proof, 151
  fails to provide information on domestic legal processes, 178, 307
  leaves erroneous facts undisputed, 27
  not credible, 52
  seeks to evade accountability, 18
  withholds evidence, 101, 114
reversing the burden of proof. *See* Shifting the burden of proof
Roberts, Christopher, 45–46
Rodríguez-Rescia, Víctor Manuel (n), 71, 82–83
Russia, 80, 175, 179, 278
Rwanda, 149

Salvioli, Fabian Omar (n), 71, 83
Sámi, 23–26, 269–293

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 05 Nov 2026 at 10:47:32, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009639231.018

history, 278
internal divisions, 272, 279
membership criteria, disputed, 271, 279–280
narrative of internal unity, 271, 289
utilised by complainants, 277, 281
Sámi Parliament in Finland, 279, 287–288
electoral roll, 271
disputes, 280
number of applicants, 287–288
subjects of oppression, 271
Santos Pais, Jose Manuel (n), 173, 185
Sapignoli, Maria, 15
Scheinin, Martin (n), 271
Scherr, Kathrin Maria, 167
Schulz, Patricia, 85
secondary rules, 127, 193, 201
self-identification
proof (not) needed, 121
sexual assault cases, 251, 253, 255, 261
child victim, 256
Shany, Yuval (n), 71, 83, 93
shared burden of proof, 44, 59, 130, 263
shifting the burden of proof, 88–94
in response to
country conditions, 91–92
death/injury in custody, 51
enforced disappearance allegations, 225
ineffective domestic protection (racial discrimination), 122
pattern/practice of violations, 225–228, 310
proof being diabolical, 192
racial discrimination claims (CERD), 105, 109, 118–124
state in possession of evidence, 90–91
operation
context and linkage conditions, 44–47, 49, 304, 307, 310
credible evidence initiates the shift, 90, 208–211
evidentiary framework in three stages (HRC, torture claims), 211
initial burden on complainant, 151, 202
due weight. *See also* due weight
substantiation, 203, 207–208
in Race Equality (EU) Directive, 109
Inter-American Court's approach to be followed, 227
mechanism unclear, 24, 32, 44
must be effected in the absence of state rebuttal, 22, 47
risks of incorrect application, 64–66
shift explicitly requested by the complainant, 118
shift masking substantive establishment of the facts, 59
rationale, 32, 198–199
Shulz, Patricia (n), 182
Slaughter, Anne-Marie, 128, 152
Slovakia, 123
Slovenia, 41
social media posts as evidence, 38–39, 47, 140
socioeconomic rights, 163
Spain, 50–53, 56–61
special rapporteurs, 60, 142, 222, 231, 236
Split requests, 12
Sri Lanka, 178, 203
standard of proof. *See also* arguable claim; balance of probabilities; beyond reasonable doubt; conclusive evidence; convincing evidence; plausible evidence; prima facie; Sufficiently substantiated claim
clearly apparent violation as, 79
comparative thresholds, 226
concept and categories, 45
differs at admissibility and merits, 58, 69, 93, 95, 299, 305–306
difference not respected, 81

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 05 Nov 2026 at 10:47:32, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009639231.018

standard of proof (cont.)
heightened due to gendered bias, 244
left unspecified by UNTBs, 299, 306
lowered for complainant in detention, 90
raised for represented complainants, 90
risk of being inadvertently raised, 19, 53, 64, 303–307
when proof is diabolical. *See* diabolical proof
State. See *headings below*, *See also* Power differentials
State accountability, 225. *See also* Respondent state's position and conduct; Equality of arms
affected by exhaustion rule, 178
core aim of human rights adjudication, 1, 21
domestic, 169, 171
impunity (pushbacks), 43
in tension with sovereignty, 160, 167
not to be defeated by exhaustion rule, 178–179
pressure for compliance
recognition of pattern/practice of violations, 229
remedial orders, 235
presumed responsible for death/injury in custody, 51, 56
urged by public findings of violations, 235–237
State compliance with UNTB decisions, 145–147, 151
declining trend away from, 154
encouraged by state consent to procedure, 152
example of non-compliance, 115–117
State interests
protected by exhaustion rule, 168
State monitoring, 7
country reviews, 236
country visits (WGAD). *See* Working Group on Arbitrary Detention
follow-up investigations, 235
special rapporteurs. *See* special rapporteurs
state party review, 218
Universal Periodic Review. *See* Universal Periodic Review
State obligations
to cooperate with UNTB communications procedures, 308
to investigate allegations, 46, 51, 203–204, 208, 308. *See also* Domestic investigation
to maintain detention records, 46, 195, 199
State suppression of evidence, 32, 35, 38, 65
evidence gathering, 35
failure to investigate. *See* Domestic investigation
State-created/held evidence, 35, 42, 90–91, 94, 114, 191, 193, 259
attesting to gender-based violence, 92, 191
detention records, 46, 195, 199
not translated into English, 289
probative value of, 221
public declarations, 61
stereotypes. *See also* gender stereotypes
as bias, 254–255, 257
definition, 22, 243, 248
absence of, 252
effect, including on evidence, 249, 256
factual construction, 217–223, 253
functioning as legal presumptions, 263
in de facto presumptions, 262
in legal presumptions, 228–235
instead of evidence, 255
perceptions of victim and aggressor. *See* victim status; Gender stereotypes
regarding victim and aggressor, 249
stereotypes as barriers to fact-finding, 243, 262, 266
Stirner, Torsten, 95

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 05 Nov 2026 at 10:47:32, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009639231.018

Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, 8
subsidiarity. *See* domestic remedies; exhaustion rule
Sufficiently substantiated claim, 19, 68–96, 300. *See also* prima facie
  CERD, 110–113
  harmonisation across UNTBs, 71
  inconsistent terminology, 110
  origins of notion, 71–74
  recommendations from Symposium, 304–306
  rejection categories, 79
  unclear meaning, 110, 207, 313
summaries created/provided in proceedings, 14
  impact on final views, 23, 286
    original material removed from deliberations, 274
  not translated into all official UN languages, 317
  of evidence in final views, 107, 193, 277
  provided by complainant, 289
  provided by secretariat, 289
Sweden, 278
Switzerland, 183, 221
systemic violations. *See* pattern/practice of violations

Tajikistan, 204
terrorism-related cases, 207–208
the Philippines, 250
third-party intervention, 14, 119, 219, 312
  recommendations from Symposium, 316
Tigroudja, Hélène, 83, 85
Tigroudja, Hélène (n), 185
time constraints. *See* Committees' mode of functioning
Timmer, Alexandra, 255
Toivanen, Reeta, 272, 281
torture
  connected to other civil and political rights violations, 195
  evidentiary burden
    HRC formula, 198–200
  prohibited in customary international law, 194
  prohibited under ICCPR Article 7, 194–213
torture cases, 178–179, 186–187, 191–192, 199–200, 211
  connected to detention, 195
  connected to forced confession, 202–205
  of child, 184
  torture used as punishment of alleged criminals, 205–212
    connected to alleged terrorism, 207–208
translation. *See also* English language
  (not) in the six UN official languages, 16, 289, 317
  bureaucratic discourse, 277
  from language to language, 23, 39, 275
  from life events into legal arguments, 23, 276, 291
  into UN discourse, 274
  of complainants' submissions (not) required, 316
trauma
  impact on evidence, 37, 40, 91, 305
truth
  distortion of facts, 251–253, 264. *See also* Facts
  impeded by presumptions, 262
  impeded by stereotypes, 262, 267
  linear conception, 247
  meaning, 246–248
  versus falsity, 266
Turkmenistan, 83, 199

Udombana, Nsongurua, 185
Ullman, Andreas, 146
UN Office on Drugs and Crime, 165
UN Special Rapporteur on the right to food, 165

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 05 Nov 2026 at 10:47:32, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009639231.018

UN treaty bodies
as producers of evidence, 217, 236
undisputed allegations
to be considered established, 48, 55, 259, 306
unequal access to evidence. *See* Power differentials
United Kingdom, 184
United Nations Commission on Human Rights, 11, 129
United Nations General Assembly, 99–101, 115, 153
Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (n), 138
United Nations Secretary-General, 300, 324
United Nations Secretary-General (n), 317
United Nations Security Council
veto power (enforcement of ICJ judgments), 153
United Nations Sub-commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, 100–101
United States of America, 148–149
Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 7
international standards for WGAD core task, 129
Universal Human Rights Index (OHCHR), 237
Universal Periodic Review, 142, 236
Unrepresented complainants, 89, 177
UNTB Database, 236
UNTB efficiency, efforts towards
addressing admissibility and merits together, 12
caseload, 72
discussion time, 15
word limit on documents, 15, 315
UNTB reasoning. *See also* evidentiary reasoning, *See also* UNTB reasoning
impact of quality, 151–153
limited, 70–71
need for consistency, 147, 151–153, 312
need for transparency, 299, 312, 314–315
UNTB Rules of Procedure, 10, 13, 300, 303, 324
do not specify the applicable standards of proof, 299
recommendations from Symposium, 314, 316–318
UNTB views
cited by regional human rights courts, 150
committees compared, 4
not legally binding, xvi, 4, 276, 291
not translated into all official UN languages, 16, 317
UNTBs
credibility with states, 128
preferred forum over ECtHR, 34
Uprimny, Rodrigo (n), 313
urgent actions (UNTBs), 8, 103
Uruguay, 198, 205
User Support Section (OHCHR), creation recommended, 316
Uzbekistan, 80, 203–204

Vardzelashvili, Konstantine, 93
victim
support recommended from Symposium, 316
trauma. *See* Trauma
victim account as evidence. *See also* detailed account
(in)consistent accounts, 135
challenges in taking statement, 37, 39
overlooked, 255, 257, 259, 261, 264
requiring translation, 39
retraumatising risk, 36
victim blaming, 260, 266
provocation, 260, 264

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 05 Nov 2026 at 10:47:32, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009639231.018

victim generated evidence, 39. *See also* detailed account as evidence
  prompt reporting mistaken for lying, 261
  requiring expert analysis, 39
  resource limitations, 46. *See also* power differentials
  safekeeping, 38–39
victim status
  clear disadvantage, 71
  clear disadvantage (n), 323
  contested in pushback cases, 58
  despite no personal involvement in domestic proceedings (HRC), 269–285
  direct victim, 83
  formal equality a disadvantage, 265
  ideal (stereotyped) victim, 251, 253, 255–256
  individual harm, 82
  victim of policy or practice, 226
video evidence, 311
video footage as evidence, 35, 38–41, 115–116, 140
  state-owned cameras, 35
von Staden, Andreas, 146
voting rights cases
  children, 173
  indigenous people, 283–285

Waughray, Annapurna, 99
weighting of evidence. *See also* Due weight
  affected by stereotypes, 264–265
  favouring authorities, 267
witness statements, 121, 253, 259
  challenges in taking statement, 37, 39–40
  corroborative role, 37
  probative value, 40
  used in cases, 115–116, 191, 211
witnesses, 143
  credibility, 40, 143, 249
  support recommended from Symposium, 316
women. *See* gender stereotypes
word limit on UNTB documents, 15, 315
Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, 126
  adjudicatory and information gathering functions, 148
  aligned with HRC on the burden of proof, 139
  Annual Report 2011, 133, 151
  Annual Report 2017, 138
  Annual Report 2022, 145
  Annual Report 2023, 145
  core task, 129
  country visits, 141–144, 147–148, 150, 154
  database, 134
  Fact Sheet No. 26, 131, 137
  history, 11, 127–131
  model questionnaire, 140, 154
  procedure, 11
  state prior consent not needed, 11, 129, 152
Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances, 210
  digital evidence, 140
World Trade Organization, 76
Written character of proceedings (UNTBs), 13, 311

Yigezu, Imeru Tamrat (n), 173
Young, Kirsten, 76

Zwart, Tom, 75

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 05 Nov 2026 at 10:47:32, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009639231.018

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 05 Nov 2026 at 10:47:32, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009639231.018