

# Russia: Changes in the Sphere of Media and Internet Regulation 2015-6

---

March 2016

# Acknowledgements

---

**This paper was commissioned and edited by ARTICLE 19. It was written by Russian legal experts Galina Arapova and Svetlana Kuzevanova.**

This work is provided under the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-ShareAlike 2.5 licence.

You are free to copy, distribute and display this work and to make derivative works, provided you:

- 1) give credit to ARTICLE 19 and the authors;
- 2) do not use this work for commercial purposes;
- 3) distribute any works derived from this publication under a licence identical to this one.

To access the full legal text of this licence, please visit: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-ncsa/2.5/legalcode>.

ARTICLE 19 would appreciate receiving a copy of any materials in which information from this report is used.

Original version produced February 2016. This updated version published March 2016.

# Contents

---

Acknowledgements .....	2
Introduction .....	4
<b>1. The ‘Right to be Forgotten’ .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. Toughening of penalties for ‘abuse of media freedom’.....</b>	<b>7</b>
a. Fines of millions of rubles for publication of extremist materials and other offences related to abuse of freedom of the media ....	7
b. Propaganda and/or display of Nazi symbols .....	8
c. Separatism .....	10
<b>3. Offending the feelings of believers .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4. Obligation of data operators to store personal data of Russian citizens     using database servers located in Russia .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>5. The latest novelty: a requirement for mass media outlets to notify     Roskomnadzor about foreign funding .....</b>	<b>13</b>
References .....	14

# Introduction

---

The Internet is an important tool to facilitate the free exchange of views and ideas. It can enable people to access and receive a vast amount of information, helping to realise the universal right to freedom of expression.

The issue of legislation regulating online content is a topic of great interest to both governments and Internet users. Under international law, online content may legitimately be subject to some narrow restrictions, for example, to prevent the dissemination of child pornography; however, any content regulation must not undermine freedom of expression, and must be necessary and proportionate to their aim.

Over the past five years, Russian legislation relating to the Internet has become extremely dynamic. Notable amendments in 2013-4, for example, have led to the extrajudicial blocking of websites, including independent media, and increased regulation of bloggers. Roskomnadzor – the body responsible for monitoring and controlling Russian media – both on and offline – has seen its powers increasingly extended.

Affecting Internet users more broadly, they also impact upon online media, journalists and bloggers more concretely. This focus on media, both on-and-offline, is further illustrated with the introduction at the start of 2016 of tighter controls regarding foreign funding for media outlets.

Non-compliance with any of these changes can result in severe sanctions, including heavy fines.

This legal analysis reviews some of the most recent changes that have taken place since the start of 2015, either through amendments to existing legislation or the introduction of new laws – such as the ‘right to be forgotten’.

# 1. The ‘Right to be Forgotten’

---

In 2016 a so-called “right to be forgotten” law came into force. During summer of 2015 the Law “On information, information technologies and information security” was amended (to include Article 10.3). These legislative amendments grants any citizen (including foreign citizens), who reside in Russia as of January 1, 2016, the right to demand that search engine companies stop listing links in search results if they contain specific information about such persons. In practice, as only links to websites are meant, and not the information itself, formal “deletion” does not take place.<sup>i</sup>

Requests to de-list links shown by search engines to information on websites, may be filed when the information is:

- Inaccurate;
- Distributed in violation of legislation; or
- Outdated, having lost its relevance due to subsequent events or actions.

Exceptions include: information about committed crimes for which conviction was not removed from official records, and information about events which contain elements of crimes, for which the period of limitations has not expired.<sup>ii</sup>

While the law contains some welcome safeguards for the protection of freedom of expression (such as the exclusion of information about criminal proceedings) the question of whether personal information is ‘relevant’ is an unduly broad measure by which to decide whether information should remain genuinely accessible. In particular, it assumes that personal information is only relevant in the eye of the person making the “right to be forgotten” application. However, information about a person may be both personal and public - it may be relevant to the person seeking the information, and may be relevant insofar as it concerns a matter of public interest. In other words, there is no such thing as an *objective* conception of relevance.

The requirements of the new law cover search engine companies. A search engine is understood to be a system, which enables search for information on Internet sites of third persons. Therefore Internet sites with internal search possibilities are not considered to be search engines.<sup>iii</sup> Exceptions include systems used for provision of state and municipal functions and services, as well as for other public authorizations determined by federal laws.

In requiring search engines to determine the ‘relevance’ of information, lawmakers and courts put private operators in the position of having to decide matters, involving a complex balance between the rights to privacy, data protection, and freedom of expression, which should be properly determined by the courts or at the very least by an independent adjudicatory body.

More generally, while the Bill broadly seeks to replicate the more limited right which was recognised by the European Court of Justice (CJEU) in the *Google Spain* case, it fails to provide the crucial safeguards for the protection of the right to freedom of expression that the CJEU had identified. In particular, the Russian law fails to include an explicit reference to the public interest, and the special interest for the public in receiving information when the data subject plays a role in public life.<sup>iv</sup>

The law sets out the following general procedure for citizens to exercise the ‘right to be forgotten’:

- A claimant has a right to apply with a request to the search engine operators in question, and demand that they de-list information about them, on grounds that he or she believes to be valid in line with the Russian law;
- The applicant’s claim must include specific information, which the search engines subsequently verify. In case the information is found to be incomplete, the search engine

operators *have the right* to ask the claimant to add particular missing pieces of information to the initial request.

It appears unclear, however, whether the operators are actually exonerated from the responsibility to undertake any actions in cases where the original claim is found incomplete.

Nevertheless, should the applicant receive a request to complement the initial claim, he or she is obliged within 10 working days to update it and send it back to the search operators, who must then, within the same time period, either accept the claim, or reject it and subsequently notify the applicant.

Such a refusal may be appealed in court if citizens consider the refusal to be unfounded, by filing a lawsuit about discontinuation of listing contested links. Legislators specifically provided the possibility of filing lawsuits about removal of information locally at the plaintiff residence; a foreign entity may be defendant in such cases. It is also permissible for a lawsuit against Google, registered in California to be considered by any Russian court.<sup>v</sup> It is worth noting, the law obliges the search engines not to disclose any information regarding the claim whatsoever.

The law does not include any provisions to ensure transparency and accountability regarding the handling of 'right to be forgotten' requests and does not specify what information on this should be made publicly available.

The law came into force very recently, and how it will be applied remains to be seen. However, so far it is unclear if citizens are entitled to demanding removal from search engines of links to accurate information only on the grounds of it being out-dated or having lost relevance for the citizen. Theoretically, based on the wording of the legal provision it is possible. However, removal of such accurate information may infringe upon the right of society to receive this information, regardless of it having lost its relevance for the citizen, it may have relevance and importance for society as a whole, and for some members of society, in particular.

For instance, important information in public interest (e.g. links to documents released by whistleblowers) could be delisted in response to a 'right to be forgotten' request if the names of military commanders are mentioned in those documents. Moreover, if the laws in question are unduly broad, there is a risk that access to vast swathes of legitimate information may be prevented.

## 2. Toughening of penalties for the ‘abuse of media freedom’

Extremism cases occupy a special place in the list of offences considered by the Russian authorities as ‘abuse of media freedom’, in particular incitement of national, religious enmity, offending feelings of believers and Nazi propaganda. In case journalists, bloggers and editorial boards of mass media outlets are found to be calling for extremist activity, aimed at inciting hatred or enmity, or abasement of the dignity of a person or a group of persons on the basis of gender, race, nationality, language, origin, attitude to religion and social background, they are usually accused of committing of so-called verbal extremism.

The most serious issue regards the assessment of whether materials disseminated by the media contain extremist attitudes; such assessment is performed by staff of regulatory bodies, without involvement of relevant experts or consideration of their competent opinion. It is, therefore, difficult to determine the justifiability or legitimacy of such an assessment. When materials are addressed to the general public, i.e. when media outlets are held responsible by regulatory bodies, the attitude of the general public to the information published by the media is not taken into consideration at all. Therefore, an arbitrary assessment may take place, determining that the materials are a public danger, with negative influence over the population.

When Article 4 of the Mass Media Law’s ‘abuse of mass media’ provisions are violated by the editorial boards of mass media outlets, editors in chief and journalists, oversight and control functions rest with relevant executive agencies, primarily with Roskomnadzor, as well as with law enforcement bodies (i.e. police and public prosecution office). Furthermore, there is a large number of legal mechanisms, ranging from a warning to blocking measures, which permit these bodies to curb offences and held perpetrators responsible.

In recent years, legislative initiatives have increasingly enforced responsibility for public statements, publications or dissemination of extremist materials.

### **a. Fines of millions of rubles for publication of extremist materials, and other offences related to ‘abuse of media freedom’**

In the middle of 2015, provisions were introduced prohibiting the ‘production or dissemination of mass media products containing public calls to terrorism; materials which publicly justify terrorism and other materials; which call to extremist activities; or give reasons or justifications for engaging in such activities’.<sup>vi</sup> Provisions were also added regarding mass distribution of extremist materials, which are outlined in a federal list, as well as their production or storage for the purposes of mass distribution<sup>vii</sup>.

The amendments introduced tougher penalties in the form of administrative fines: the maximum amount of fine increased from 100,000 rubles to one million rubles, while the 100,000 rubles became the minimum fine. These fines are punitive, and appear excessive, with the potential to cause significant financial issues for smaller media houses.

Under Article 4 of the Mass Media Law, distribution of extremist materials is treated as ‘abuse of media freedom’. The long list of offences under Article 4 contains two categories regarding penalty: either a warning citing a violation of the law, or an administrative offences protocol with subsequent transfer to courts for the imposition of administrative penalty in the form of a fine, or both measures simultaneously.

Receiving a warning as a penalty is extremely undesirable for editorial boards of mass media outlets: if two warnings are issued to a mass media outlet within a year by Roskomnadzor, the regulator can

initiate termination of activities of that outlet. Administrative fines are significant as indicated in the next pages.

Article 13.15 of the Code of the Russian Federation on Administrative Offences lists the offences which amount to ‘abuse of media freedom’, and the corresponding administrative fines for the commission of such offences:

- i) Dissemination of information about any public association or another organization which been entered into the list of organisations (public and religious associations and other organisations) whose activities have been banned, or who have been liquidated according to a court decision according to provisions of the “Law on countering extremist activities”, if the media outlet has failed to indicate that the organisation or their activities are banned. This offence is punishable by a fine of four to five thousand roubles imposed on officials, forty to fifty thousand rubles imposed on legal entities.
- ii) Illegal dissemination of information about a minor who has been a victim of unlawful acts (failure to act) or violation of requirements<sup>viii</sup> for dissemination of such information. This is punishable by a fine of thirty thousand to fifty thousand rubles imposed on officials; and **four hundred thousand to one million rubles** imposed on legal entities.
- iii) Public dissemination of statements clearly demonstrating contempt to society about days of war glory or commemorative days of Russia related to defence of the Fatherland, or public desecration of symbols of military glory of Russia, including via mass media outlets and (or) information and telecommunication networks (including the Internet). This is punishable by a fine of **four hundred thousand to one million rubles**, imposed on legal entities.
- iv) Dissemination via mass media outlets, or on the Internet and telecommunication networks, of information, containing instructions for production of homemade explosive substances and explosive devices. This is punishable by a fine of **eight hundred thousand to one million rubles** imposed on legal entities.
- v) Production or distribution of mass media materials containing public calls to terrorist activities, materials publicly justifying terrorism and other materials that incite extremist activities, or explaining or justifying the need to engage in such activities. This is punishable by a fine of **one hundred thousand to one million rubles** imposed on legal entities.

## b. Propaganda and/or display of Nazi symbols

Federal Law of July 25 2002 “On countering extremist activities” defines propaganda **and** public display of Nazi symbols and attributes, or symbols and attributes confusingly similar to Nazi symbols and attributes as one of the types of extremist activities.

However, article 20.3 of the Code of the Russian Federation on Administrative Offences provides liability for offences, including propaganda **or** public display of Nazi symbols and attributes, or symbols and attributes confusingly similar to Nazi symbols and attributes, or symbols and attributes of extremist organizations, or other symbols and attributes propaganda or public display of which are prohibited by federal laws<sup>ix</sup>.

A seemingly minor contradiction of the conjunctions “and” and “or” in practice creates a serious law enforcement problem: because of the conjunction “or” in the wording of Article 20.3 of the Code of the Russian Federation on Administrative Offences, liabilities were created not only for propaganda and display of Nazi symbols, but also for simply displaying Nazi symbols, regardless of the purpose of doing so, whether that is scientific, artistic, educational etc. Consequently, there have been in a large number of court cases regarding situations, where there was no intent to propagandise Nazi symbols (for instance, a still from a film where the character gets a swastika tattoo, or dissemination of archive



photographs on social media, where a city is documented at the time of fascist occupation, with a flag with swastika in the background).

On 15 April 2015, Roskomnadzor posted clarifications on its website, which stated that the display of Nazi symbols without the purpose of propaganda will not be considered as an extremist manifestation and therefore such display is not subject to penalties. This public statement of the regulator's position was relevant and important for the mass media, but the issue with improper enforcement of the law was not fully resolved.

Clarifications given by Roskomnadzor are treated by law enforcement bodies as a non-binding recommendation: law enforcement bodies continue to have powers which permit them to initiate administrative cases under Article 20.3 of the Code of the Russian Federation on Administrative Offences, and they continue to do so. The number of cases initiated in connection with the display (without purposes of propaganda) of Nazi symbols by citizens is remarkably high, with many of these cases bearing little relation to the expressed intent of law itself.

The law establishes the following penalties for display and /or propaganda involving Nazi symbols in the form of administrative fines:

- for citizens: one to two thousand rubles, with confiscation of object of administrative offence, or administrative arrest for up to 15 days with confiscation of object of administrative offence;
- for officials: in the amount of one thousand to four thousand rubles with confiscation of object of administrative offence;
- for legal entities: ten thousand to fifty thousand rubles with confiscation of object of administrative offence.

Below the full clarification given by Roskomnadzor on April 15, 2015 is quoted for information:

*Before celebration of the 70 Years of Victory in the Great Patriotic War Roskomnadzor considers it necessary to state the legal opinion of the Agency regarding public display of Nazi symbols. Federal Law "On countering extremist activities" considers as extremist activities: propaganda **and** public display of Nazi symbols or attributes, or symbols and attributes confusingly similar to Nazi symbols and attributes, or public display of symbols and attributes of extremist organizations.*

***The quote from the law does not highlight the conjunction "and" by accident. One word may completely change legal meaning of the sentence.*** Roskomnadzor commissioned specialized legal linguistic expertise. Specialists of the Department of Forensic Inquiry of the O.E. Kutafin Moscow State Law University issued the following opinion. When drafting the federal law, legislators used for connecting concepts a coordinating conjunction "and". That is the concepts are not simply enumerated, they are grammatically linked. Their usage is such that "propaganda" has the strong, priority position in relation to the concept "public display".

***In linguistic terms it means, according to the experts, that in and of itself display of Nazi symbols and attributes without purposes of propaganda is not a manifestation of extremism.***

*According to the experts, using Nazi symbols and attributes, and symbols and attributes confusingly similar to Nazi symbols and attributes, for e.g. historic, scientific purposes is considered permissible. Nazi symbols may not be used with the purpose of insulting the Soviet people and memory of the victims of the Great Patriotic War, for popularization of Nazi ideas, theory of racial supremacy or for justifying war crimes of fascists.*

*A series of resolutions of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation, connected to the enforcement of anti-extremist legislation, endorses this position. In this series, the Constitutional Court consistently determines, that “an obligatory characteristic of the indicated type of extremism is the evident or covert contradiction of the relevant actions (documents) to the constitutional prohibition on incitement of enmity and propaganda of social, racial, national, religious or language supremacy”.*

*Presence of this characteristic “must be determined with consideration of all relevant circumstances of each specific case: form and content of activities or information, their addressees and goal, social and political context, presence of a real threat, caused by calls to unlawful encroachments on values protected by the Constitution, or justification of such actions etc.”*

*Roskomnadzor is determined to use this interpretation in its law enforcement practice regarding the relevant provisions of the Law “on countering extremist activities”.<sup>x</sup>*

### **c. Separatism<sup>xi</sup>**

On 9 May 2014 the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation was amended to include a new Article 280.1, which established liability for public calls to action aimed at violating the territorial integrity of the Russian Federation.

Calls disseminated in mass media outlets or on the Internet are penalized through compulsory community service of up to 480 hours or deprivation of freedom for up to 5 years. Journalists or editors are held liable in a private capacity, as individual persons.

Publications containing appeals to any group of citizens in any form (spoken, written, pictorial, illustrative (posters, photographs, caption), with use of technical equipment), which express a commitment to unify citizens with the purpose of influencing their consciousness, will and behaviour and to impel them to carry out action in some form (not necessarily violent) that are aimed at violating the territorial integrity of the country are understood to be calls to separatism.

Only calls regarding the partition of Russia incur liability, but not those relating to other countries and territories. It is irrelevant if any actions were committed as a result of such calls: liability is incurred merely by the act of publishing a text (a video) containing such a call. The calls in themselves may have no addressees and be absurd in nature, but what is material is that the goal of such calls is the partition of Russia into various parts or through the transfer of some of its territory to another state.

It appears that any publication criticizing or questioning the rationale of maintaining Russia’s current borders, support of opinions regarding the separation of the Caucasus region, or even expressing doubts concerning annexation of Crimea by Russia, may incur criminal liability.

Unfortunately, the article of the Criminal Code regarding separatism is formulated in broad terms, leaving room for abuse in its enforcement by law enforcement bodies and officials.

### 3. Offending feelings of believers

---

Prior to 2013, Article 148 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation imposed liability for actions hindering the activities of religious organizations or the administration of religious rites by believers. In that year however, the content of the Article was radically changed and a new version was brought into force. The amendments now impose criminal liability for actions taken publicly aimed at offending feelings of believers and expressing open disrespect to members of society.<sup>xii</sup>

At the time when the new version of Article 148 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation was enacted, administrative liability for offending the religious feelings of citizens already existed. Nevertheless, in 2013 the penalty was toughened, changing from administrative to criminal liability.

Recently, offences in the sphere of inciting religious enmity and offending feelings of believers are becoming increasingly “popular.” Roskomnadzor, in cases where it identifies that a mass media publication could be held liable for offending religious feelings, it considers them more often as ‘abuse of media freedom’ under Article 4 of the Mass Media Law. This is because such publications, according to the regulator's opinion, can incite religious enmity and offend specific religious groups.

Issues also arise due to the vague wording of the legal provision stipulating liability for offending feelings of believers. It is difficult to determine what ‘religious feelings’ are. The term “offending” is also ambiguous, even linguistic experts do not agree about what constitutes an offence.<sup>xiii</sup>

After the terrorist attack on the headquarters of French magazine Charlie Hebdo, there were high numbers of Internet media publishers held liable for inciting religious enmity and offending feelings of Russian Orthodox and Muslim believers. Roskomnadzor even published clarifications, which dealt with possible future publication by the Russian media of caricatures from the well-known magazine. On January 16, 2015 the clarification was posted on the regulator's website and stated the following:

*“Due to multiple publications in the media and discussion of acceptability of publishing in the Russian Federation of caricatures depicting sacred sites and objects of various religions, affecting feelings of believers Roskomnadzor in the framework of its prevention activities issues additional clarification.”*

*<...>*

*“Dissemination in the media or caricatures with religious subject-matter may be considered by Roskomnadzor as offensive or humiliating dignity of representatives of religious confessions and associations and may be qualified as inciting national and religious enmity, which is in direct violation of the Law “On Mass Media” and the Law “On countering extremist activities.”*

*<...>*

*“Roskomnadzor, expressing unconditional solidarity with those opposing any extremist and terrorist acts, request the media of the Russian Federation to abstain from publication of caricatures, which may be considered to be in violation of provisions of the Russian legislation.”*

Before the caricatures were published in the Russian Federation, a ban to publish them was introduced by the regulator. Clarifications provided by Roskomnadzor were not simply recommendations regarding its position on the issue. Rather they were an active warning to anyone who published the caricatures from Charlie Hebdo, that they would be held liable for abusing the freedom of the media.

This warning was rigorously followed up on by Roskomnadzor. All Internet media outlets that used the magazine's cover to illustrate their coverage of the first issue of Charlie Hebdo after the terrorist attack received a written warning from Roskomnadzor: in total, ten Russian Internet publications were held liable.

## 4. Obligation of data operators to store personal data of Russian citizens using database servers located in Russia

---

On September 1, 2015 a law entered into force, which requires the personal data of Russian citizens to be stored using database servers located within the territory of the Russian Federation. An explanatory note for the law states that such legal developments will contribute to “a more prompt and effective protection of Russian citizens' right for personal data security and confidentiality of correspondence in information and telecommunication networks.”

It was planned initially for the law to enter into force on 1 September 2016. However, the State Duma of the Russian Federation decided to expedite its entry into effect, insisting that it was necessary to protect the security of Russian citizens as soon as possible, and, therefore, to shift the date to January 2015. Business sector representatives referred to the fact that infrastructure is absolutely unprepared for such legal developments and time was needed to align it with the requirements of the law. Eventually the effective date was set for September 1, 2015.

According to the amendments entered into the Federal Law #152-FZ of July 27, 2006 “On Personal Data,” while collecting personal data, including data collected on the Internet, “the data operator is under obligation to ensure that recording, systemisation, accumulation, storage, rectification (updating, modification), retrieval of Russian citizens' personal data is conducted using databases located in the territory of the Russian Federation”.

Data that must be stored securely by data operators includes any information directly or indirectly pertaining to an identified or identifiable individual, which is essentially the legislative definition of personal data.

The amendments drew criticism and caused concern that popular foreign online resources including social networks, online stores and Internet booking engines would not be able to work in Russia.

The Ministry of Telecom and Mass Communications issued a clarification, in which it stated that the rule applies to any Internet data operators with the exception of foreign online airline reservation systems. This exception means that such entities may store personal data of Russian citizens abroad. In its clarification the Ministry specified that the “law on locating database servers in Russia” does not apply to online airline reservation systems, due to the fact that the processing of airline passengers' personal data is regulated by legislation pertaining to transportation security as well as various international treaties.

A procedure is stipulated for ensuring liability for failure to comply with personal data storage legislation. Whenever such violation is found anyone can file a complaint with the oversight agency, Roskomnadzor, which has the right to require Internet resource owners to delete personal data stored in violation of the law.

Roskomnadzor is also responsible for administering the list of data operators, violating the rights of personal data owners. As soon as owners of Internet resources are entered into the list, access to these resources is limited inside the territory of the Russian Federation, that is, the websites are blocked. It is possible to unblock them by remedying violations of the law.

## 5. The latest novelty: requirement for mass media outlets to notify Roskomnadzor about foreign funding

---

On January 1, 2016 another law came into force, which strengthens state control over activities of the media.

The Law “On mass media” was amended to include Article 19.2, which requires editorial boards of mass media outlets, as well as broadcasters or publishers, to report to Roskomnadzor if they are receiving of monetary funds from foreign states, international organisations, foreign organisations; NGOs, which, according to the legislation of the Russian Federation, act as foreign agents; foreign citizens, stateless persons, as well as from Russian organizations, members and or founders of which include such persons.

Responsibility to provide the information listed above, does not extend to the editorial boards of mass media outlets, broadcasters or publishers in the following circumstances, if the funds are:

1. from a founder of the relevant mass media outlet;
2. from an advertiser;
3. for the distribution of the relevant mass media outlet;
4. for an amount below fifteen thousand rubles, received by editorial board of mass media outlet, broadcaster or publisher non-recurrently.

Legislators also introduced liability for failure to report such information, and failure to report it in a timely manner. Officials will have to pay an administrative fine of thirty to fifty thousand rubles; legal entities – one to two times the value of the monetary funds (which editorial board failed to inform about) received by editorial board of mass media outlet. In cases of repeated failure to report such information, the fines are increased manifold.

## References

---

- i A. Tolkachev and K. Yegelev, “Pravo na zabvenie v Runete. Analiz I posledstvia” (Right to be forgotten in Ru-Net. Analysis and Consequences), date, <http://www.atplaw.ru/useful/articles/pravo-na-zabvenie-v-runete-analiz-i-posledstviya.html>
- ii Ibid.
- iii Ibid.
- iv ARTICLE 19, The “Right to be Forgotten” Bill, Aug 2015, p.2, available at: <https://www.article19.org/data/files/medialibrary/38099/Full-Analysis---Russia---RTBF-Final-EHH.pdf>
- v See *Note i*
- vi Code of the Russian Federation on Administrative Offences of December 30, 2001 #195-FZ (as amended on December 30 with amendments introduced on February 17, 2016) with amendments enacted on January 15, 2016) Part 6, Article 13.15.
- vii Federal Law in Russia “On combating extremist activities”, dated 25.07.2002 N 114-ФЗ (amended on 23.11.2015), available at: [http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons\\_doc\\_LAW\\_37867/#dst100158](http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_37867/#dst100158)
- viii Federal Law in Russia “On mass media”, dated 27.12.1991 N 2124-1 (amended 05.04.2016), article 4, available at: [http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons\\_doc\\_LAW\\_1511/285787630b41d4963964c4c89fada1196a65cf3e/#dst211](http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_1511/285787630b41d4963964c4c89fada1196a65cf3e/#dst211)
- ix Federal Law in Russia ““On immortalizing of Victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War 1941 – 1945”, dated 19.05.1995 N 80-ФЗ (amended 04.11.2014), available at: [http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons\\_doc\\_LAW\\_6643/#dst3](http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_6643/#dst3)
- x “Demonstraciya nacistskoj simboliki bez celej propagandy ne dolzhna traktovatsya kak narushenie zakona o protivodejstvii ekstremizmu” (The demonstration of Nazi symbols without propaganda purposes should not be interpreted as a violation of the law on countering extremism), Roskomnadzor, 15 April 2015, available at: <http://rkn.gov.ru/news/rsoc/news31736.htm>
- xi Mass Media Defence Centre, “Otvetstvennosty za prizvyvy k separatizmu” (Liability for calls to separatism), available at: [http://www.mmdc.ru/consulting/common/otvetstvennost\\_za\\_prizvyvy\\_k\\_separatizmu/](http://www.mmdc.ru/consulting/common/otvetstvennost_za_prizvyvy_k_separatizmu/)
- xii “Chto po zakony yavlyaetsa oskorbleniem chuvstv veruyuschikh?” (What does the Law Consider to Amount to Offending Feelings of Believers?) [http://sovetnik.consultant.ru/pravila\\_povedeniya/chto\\_po\\_zakonu\\_yavlyaetsya\\_oskorbleniem\\_chuvstv\\_veruyuwih/](http://sovetnik.consultant.ru/pravila_povedeniya/chto_po_zakonu_yavlyaetsya_oskorbleniem_chuvstv_veruyuwih/)
- xiii Krysin L.P. “Slovo v sovremennyx tekstax i slovaryax. Ocherki o russkoj leksike i leksikografii” (Words in modern texts and dictionaries. Essays on Russian vocabulary and lexicography), p.218.