

(Translated from Arabic)

**Permanent Mission of Bahrain to the United Nations Office at Geneva/Vienna
Explanatory memorandum**

With regard to joint communication No. AL BHR 5/2018, dated 5 November 2018, sent by the Vice-Chair of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers, the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, and the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, concerning allegations of the arbitrary detention, enforced disappearance and torture of a number of persons, we wish to provide the following clarifications:

Summary of the facts

The leaders of a number of terrorist groups that conducted a series of terrorist operations in the Kingdom of Bahrain and a number of convicted persons belonging to those groups who fled from the country to Iran and Iraq held several meetings in Iran with the support, coordination and guidance of certain leaders of the Iranian regime and members of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards, with a view to combining their criminal activities in the Kingdom of Bahrain, joining together under one banner and establishing a joint terrorist organization called the Zulfiqar Brigades. It was also reported that the establishment of the joint organization was the result of the apprehension of a number of terrorists in Bahrain and the confiscation by police officers of seized items and explosives found in their possession, as well as the arrest of leaders and many trained members of terrorist organizations in Bahrain, and the discovery of their clandestine arsenals. The goal of the unification and integration of the leaders and their affiliates abroad and inside the country was to alleviate the shortage of qualified and trained military staff, and to build their capacity to procure and manufacture the explosive devices and weapons that they required to carry out their terrorist plans.

As a result, the accused were able to establish their terrorist organization, using qualified and trained staff with experience in the manufacture and detonation of explosives, the use of firearms, and the establishment of arsenals for explosives and weapons. In addition, they recruited and integrated new members, training them to perpetrate their criminal schemes. The organization's leaders managed to establish a military wing inside Bahrain. The investigations also revealed that, in response to orders from the organization's leaders, the members of the military wing managed to conduct several terrorist operations in Bahrain, having been trained abroad either in the camps of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards or in camps based in Iraq that are supervised by the Iranian Revolutionary Guards. The organization's members were trained to use various types of firearms and explosive materials, and to manufacture and use explosive devices. They also received training in guerrilla warfare, procedures for confronting security personnel, personal security, counter-surveillance, inspection of buildings to be targeted, and preparation of arsenals and clandestine bunkers. The defendants monitored a number of headquarters and related movements for the purpose of executing their terrorist plans. They set off a number of explosions and perpetrated related incidents involving the murder of police officers, property destruction and arson. A number of simulated explosive objects were also placed in different parts of the country.

Measures taken

The accused were all charged with membership of a terrorist group, and with charges ranging from the possession and acquisition of weapons, ammunition, explosives and Molotov cocktails, training in the use of weapons, the manufacture of explosives and the use of bombs, premeditated murder, destruction of public and private property, arson, communication with persons working on behalf of a foreign State, and the development of

simulated explosives for terrorist purposes in all cases and for the perpetration of terrorist acts.

Each of the accused was charged with the crimes that he had perpetrated or in which he had participated in connection with the activities of the terrorist organization.

The Public Prosecutor's Office instituted investigations, interrogating the arrested suspects and confronting them with the evidence in its possession. Each of them confessed to the charges, and the Public Prosecutor's Office ordered that they be placed in custody and that criminal proceedings be instituted against the fugitives.

Accordingly, the High Criminal Court considered the case in the presence of the accused who had been placed in custody. Their lawyers attended the proceedings and presented their arguments. The Court eventually convicted and sentenced the accused whose names are listed below:

1. Ali Ahmed Ali Abbas al-Halal: life imprisonment and revocation of citizenship;
2. Ahmed Isa Ahmed Yahya Ali: life imprisonment and revocation of citizenship;
3. Husain Abdulla Salman Khalaf: life imprisonment and revocation of citizenship;
4. Ahmed Abdul Hasan Habib Yusuf Husain: five years' imprisonment and revocation of citizenship;
5. ██████████: three years' imprisonment and revocation of citizenship;
6. Sayed Ahmed Ali Mohamed Ali Mohamed: life imprisonment and revocation of citizenship;
7. Taha Sayed Amin Jawad Shubar: life imprisonment and revocation of citizenship;
8. Ahmed Khalil Ebrahim Ali Ahmed: life imprisonment and revocation of citizenship;
9. Mahdi Ali Hasan Mahdi Khalaf: life imprisonment and revocation of citizenship;
10. Mohamed Jameel Abdulnabi Mansoor al-Toblani: life imprisonment and revocation of citizenship;
11. Ali Isa Ali al-Tajer: five years' imprisonment and revocation of citizenship;
12. Salman Ali Salman Mohamed Saleh: life imprisonment and revocation of citizenship;
13. Husain Mohsen Salman Maki Ali al-Moftah: life imprisonment and revocation of citizenship;
14. Husain Abdulla Juma Maki Mohamed: life imprisonment, a fine and revocation of citizenship;
15. Hasan Radhi Hasan Abdulla al-Baqali: seven years' imprisonment and revocation of citizenship;
16. Mohamed Abdulelah Abduljalil Ahmed: life imprisonment and revocation of citizenship;
17. Jasim Mohamed Abdulla Ebrahim: life imprisonment and revocation of citizenship;
18. The Court decided to acquit Hasan Mohamed Hasan Ahmed Qambar of the charges filed against him.

The Court's convictions of the sentenced defendants was based on oral and material evidence, including the testimony of witnesses, the results of the criminal laboratory and crime scene reports on the seized items and the sites of the crimes, the defendants' fingerprints and human cells found at the sites, the seized items and tools used to commit the crimes, and the confessions of some of the defendants.

The convicted accused filed an appeal against the judgments handed down against them. The case was heard before the High Court of Appeal and deferred until a hearing on 28 January 2019.

Response to the allegations contained in the communication

The Special Investigation Unit (tasked with investigating allegations of torture and cruel and degrading treatment) reported that it had received complaints from some of the accused in the case. The Unit therefore proceeded to undertake the following investigations:

1. Mohamed Jameel Abdalnabi al-Toblani

The Special Investigation Unit received a complaint from the above-mentioned person's lawyer on 15 February 2016, in which she alleged that her client had been tortured by the police. The Unit therefore proceeded to investigate the complaint and asked the complainant to provide details of his allegation. It then requested all medical reports concerning the complainant and reports on the police investigation into his claims. According to the report of the complainant's forensic physician, no evidence that he was suffering from any injuries had been found. Furthermore, the medical reports failed to mention that he was suffering from any injuries. The Unit concluded its investigations by asking the members of the Public Security Forces who had arrested and interrogated the complainant about the content of the records and they denied the allegations. It finally stored the documents on account of the lack of evidence, inasmuch as the statements were unsubstantiated and there was no evidence of any injuries.

2. Ali Isa Ali al-Tajer

The Special Investigation Unit received a complaint from the above-mentioned person's lawyer on 6 December 2015, in which he alleged that his client had been tortured by the police. The Unit therefore proceeded to investigate the complaint and asked the complainant to provide details of his allegation. He stated that he was arrested on 5 November 2015 and beaten by the police during his interrogation for the purpose of extracting a confession, adding that he had not sustained any injuries therefrom. The complainant was examined by the forensic physician, who found that he was not suffering from any injuries attributable to criminal violence. He was also examined by a psychiatrist, who did not find any psychological impact stemming from his allegations. The Unit concluded its investigations by questioning members of the Public Security Forces about their interaction with the complainant, and they denied his allegations. It also examined two videos of the arrest and questioning of the complainant, which failed to show that he had suffered any injuries or any abuse or ill-treatment. It finally stored the documents on account of the lack of evidence, inasmuch as the statements were unsubstantiated and were not backed up by any other evidence.

3. Taha Sayed Amin Jawad Mohamed

The Special Investigation Unit received a complaint from the above-mentioned person's lawyer on 14 January 2016, in which he alleged that his client had been beaten by the police. The Unit therefore proceeded to investigate the complaint and asked the complainant to provide details of his allegation. He was examined on two occasions by the forensic physician, and no injuries attributable to criminal violence were found. The Unit then asked a member of the Public Security Forces who had questioned the complainant about the content of the records and he denied the allegation. It finally stored the documents on account of the lack of evidence, inasmuch as the statements were unsubstantiated and there was no evidence of any injuries.

4. Hasan Radhi Hasan al-Baqali

The family of the above-mentioned person filed a complaint with the Special Investigation Unit on 17 November 2016, in which they stated that they had visited him in the Reform and Rehabilitation Department on 15 November 2016 and that he had informed them that he had been beaten by the police. Accordingly, the Unit proceeded forthwith – on the very day that it received the complaint – to ask the complainant to provide details of the complaint. He informed a member of the Unit who went to the prison that he had been arrested and detained because a number of judgments had been handed down against him. He had not had any problems with the police and they had treated him quite normally until 14 November 2016, when they had beaten him to obtain information. The forensic physician who examined him concluded that he was not suffering from any injuries consistent with his assertion and allegation. The Unit concluded its investigations by

questioning members of the Public Security Forces about their interaction with the complainant, and they denied his allegations. It finally stored the documents on account of the lack of evidence, inasmuch as the statements were unsubstantiated and were not backed up by any other evidence.

5. Jasim Mohamed Abdulla Ebrahim

The Investigation Unit received documents from the General Secretariat for Grievances concerning the above-mentioned person's complaint on 23 March 2016. The Unit therefore proceeded to investigate the facts, asking the complainant to provide details of his complaint and questioning his sister, who had submitted the complaint to the General Secretariat for Grievances. He was examined by the forensic physician, who found no injuries attributable to criminal violence. The Unit then asked a member of the Public Security Forces who had interrogated the complainant about the content of the records and he denied the allegation. It finally stored the documents on account of the lack of evidence, inasmuch as the statements were unsubstantiated and there was no evidence of any injuries.

6. Sayed Ahmed Ali Mohamed Ali

The Special Investigation Unit received a complaint concerning the above-mentioned person from the General Secretariat for Grievances on 14 February 2016. The Unit initiated its investigations by asking the complainant to provide details of his complaint. He was examined on two occasions by the forensic physician, who did not detect any injuries and recommended that he be examined by a urologist. The consultant found that he was suffering from symptoms of an illness and not from the effects of an injury. The Unit concluded its investigations by questioning members of the Public Security Forces about their interaction with the complainant, and they denied his allegations. It finally stored the documents on account of the lack of evidence, inasmuch as the statements were unsubstantiated and were not backed up by any other evidence.

7. Mahmood Saeed Ahmed Isa

The Special Investigation Unit received a complaint concerning the above-mentioned person from the General Secretariat for Grievances on 14 February 2016. The Unit initiated its investigations by asking the complainant to provide details of his complaint. He was examined by the forensic physician, who did not detect any injuries. The Unit then questioned members of the Public Security Forces about their interaction with the complainant, and they denied his allegations. It finally stored the documents on account of the lack of evidence, inasmuch as the statements were unsubstantiated and were not backed up by any other evidence.

8. Husain Abdulla Salman Khalaf

The Special Investigation Unit did not receive any complaint concerning the subjection of the above-mentioned person to torture.

A complaint had, however, been filed, according to which he had been beaten by a police officer while in the Pretrial Detention Centre. According to a notification to the Unit, dated 14 August 2016, from the administration of the Pretrial Detention Centre, the complainant was beaten by a police officer. The Unit therefore immediately launched investigations of the facts. A member of the Unit who visited the Pretrial Detention Centre questioned the complainant and witnesses and interrogated the accused police officer. The complainant was then referred to the forensic physician. The Unit concluded from the circumstances of the incident and its lack of gravity that disciplinary action should be taken against the accused, and such action was effectively taken.

9. Ali Ahmed Ali al-Halal

The Special Investigation Unit received a complaint from the lawyer of the above-mentioned person on 23 March 2016 claiming that his client had been subjected to torture by the police. When the complainant was asked to provide details of the incident, he refused to comment on the grounds that he was not seeking anything. On the contrary, he wished to have the investigation halted and the case closed. The Unit nevertheless completed its investigation into the complaint. It examined the report of the complainant's forensic physician, which stated that there was no evidence of any injuries. It also asked a

member of the Public Security Forces who had interrogated the complainant about the content of the records and he denied the allegation. The Unit finally stored the documents on account of the lack of evidence of the allegation.

10. Ahmed Isa Ahmed Yahya

The Special Investigation Unit received a complaint from the lawyer of the above-mentioned person on 28 January 2016 claiming that his client had been subjected to torture by the police. The Unit therefore initiated investigations into the complaint by asking the complainant to provide details of the incident. It examined the report of his forensic physician, who had not found any injuries consistent with the allegation. The Unit completed its investigation by asking a member of the Public Security Forces who had interrogated the complainant about the content of the records and he denied the allegation. It finally stored the documents on account of the lack of evidence, inasmuch as the statements were unsubstantiated and were not backed up by any other evidence.

11. Husain Mohsen Salman al-Moftah

The Special Investigation Unit received a complaint on 24 December 2015 from the sister of the above-mentioned person, in which she stated that her brother had informed her during her visit that he had been beaten in order to coerce him into confessing to the charges that had been filed against him in a criminal case. The Unit questioned the complainant about the details of his complaint and his response replicated the content of his sister's complaint. The complainant added that he had not been exposed to any visible injuries but that he had suffered from pain in his right ear and neck due to the beating he underwent during his arrest. The Unit's forensic physician was mandated to sign the medical examination of the person concerned, according to which no injuries pertaining to the alleged incident were found. He was then referred to an ear, nose and throat consultant, who examined his right ear in order to determine whether there was any injury. According to the consultant physician's report, he claimed during the examination that he suffered from reduced hearing capacity in his right ear due to the injury. His ear was cleared of wax and the subsequent tests showed that his hearing capacity was normal. He was also referred to the Unit's psychiatrist, whose examination concluded that he does not suffer from any mental illness. The Unit concluded its investigation by questioning the police officers who had arrested and interrogated the complainant and they denied his allegations. In light of the foregoing, the Unit stored the documents on account of the lack of evidence, inasmuch as the statements were unsubstantiated and were not backed up by any other evidence, and no injuries had been found.

12. Mahdi Ali Hasan Mahdi

The Special Investigation Unit received documents concerning the above-mentioned person's complaint from the General Secretariat for Grievances. It repeatedly summoned the complainant to appear before it (about 30 times) and provide a detailed account of the alleged incident, but he refused to appear. A member of the Unit's Judicial Police Division was sent to visit him in prison on two occasions in order to enquire about his failure to appear. He stated on each occasion that he was willing to appear, but subsequently refused to do so. The Unit nevertheless continued to conduct investigations and the complaint is still being investigated.

13. Ahmed Abdul Hasan Habib Yusuf

The Special Investigation Unit received documents concerning the above-mentioned person's complaint from the General Secretariat for Grievances. It commenced its investigations by questioning the complainant, who claimed to have been beaten and threatened by the police for the purpose of extracting a confession. He reported that his right hand had been injured by a fall from the first floor of his home during the inspection of construction work in 2011 and that he was suffering from pain in that hand and in his male organ due to the beating. His examination by the forensic physician failed to show any injuries apart from manifestations of the former injury which could not be definitively attributed to another subsequent injury. It was recommended that he should be referred to a urologist. The urological reports indicated that there were no genital injuries but that ultrasound imaging had led to a diagnosis of inflammation of the testicles. The Unit

It should be noted that Bahrain has ratified the following nine conventions and two protocols (out of 13 international counter-terrorism instruments):

- The Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft (Tokyo, 1963); ratified by Legislative Decree No. 4 of 1983;
- The Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft (The Hague, 1970); ratified by Legislative Decree No. 4 of 1983;
- The Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation (Montreal, 1971); ratified by Legislative Decree No. 4 of 1983;
- Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation (1988), supplementing the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation; ratified by Legislative Decree No. 15 of 1995;
- Convention on the Marking of Plastic Explosives for the Purpose of Detection (Rome, 1991); ratified by Legislative Decree No. 35 of 1991;
- International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings (1997); ratified by Legislative Decree No. 9 of 2004;
- International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism; signed by the Kingdom on 14 November 2001 at United Nations Headquarters in New York and ratified by Legislative Decree No. 8 of 2004;
- Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation (1988); ratified by Legislative Decree No. 15 of 2005;
- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents (1973); ratified by Legislative Decree No. 14 of 2005;
- Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf (1988); ratified by Legislative Decree No. 15 of 2005;
- International Convention against the Taking of Hostages (1979); ratified by Legislative Decree No. 16 of 2005;
- The Kingdom of Bahrain has also ratified the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, the Organization of the Islamic Conference Convention on Combating International Terrorism, the Arab Convention for the Suppression of Terrorism and the Gulf Cooperation Council Counter-Terrorism Agreement.

3. The role of the Public Prosecution Service in the investigation and handling of terrorist crimes

The Public Prosecution Office for Terrorist Crimes was established pursuant to Legislative Decree No. 68 of 2014, which amended certain provisions of Act No. 58 of 2006 on the Protection of Society from Terrorist Acts. The Act entrusted the Public Prosecution Service with special powers in the case of terrorist crimes, in addition to those previously specified in the law and beyond those normally exercised in legal proceedings, so that it can be informed immediately and forthwith of all evidence relating to the crime.

These important powers may be summarized as follows:

1. The legislature authorized the Public Prosecution Service, in addition to its pretrial detention authority under the Code of Criminal Procedure, to maintain the accused in custody pending the investigations for a period or periods totalling six months (article 26).
2. The Service was authorized to monitor and record conversations and events in public and private places, and to seize parcels, cables and letters. It had previously been required by the Code of Criminal Procedure to seek permission from the judge before taking any such measures (art. 29).

3. The Act also permitted the Service to issue an order to inspect or obtain any data or information pertaining to accounts, deposits, safes and related transactions, provided that such action may reveal the facts relating to terrorist crimes (art. 30).

4. The Act permitted the Public Prosecutor, where there was evidence of a serious charge relating to any of the terrorist offences defined in the Act, to order that a travel ban be imposed on the accused, or that he, his wife and his minor children be prohibited, if necessary, from disposing of or managing their assets, or to order any other precautionary measures that were deemed to be required by the investigation (art. 31)

The Public Prosecution Service also continues, in its investigation of terrorist offences, to follow regular procedures prescribed by the Code of Criminal Procedure, including respect for the legal guarantees of the accused, such as informing them of the charges and evidence against them, enabling their lawyer to attend the investigation and to submit their requests and defence, allowing them to make statements in full freedom, and ensuring that no adverse inference is drawn from their silence. In the event of a decision regarding pretrial detention, they must be held in a lawful place of detention, and their family and lawyer must be permitted to visit them.

In addition, the legislature authorized law enforcement officers, if there is sufficient evidence that a person may be charged with a terrorist offence, to arrest him for a maximum period of 48 days in order to listen to his statements and arguments and discuss the evidence against him (art. 27). They are also authorized to take decisions, in the area of jurisdiction of the crime, aimed at arresting perpetrators and preventing its occurrence (art. 27 bis).

4. Safeguards for accused persons and suspects

The competent authorities in the Kingdom of Bahrain comply with the procedures prescribed by law, and respect the legal guarantees of suspects and accused persons as set out below:

- Article 61 of the Code of Criminal Procedure stipulates that no one may be arrested or detained other than by order of the legally competent authorities. He must furthermore be treated in a manner that preserves his human dignity and may not be subjected to physical or mental harm. He must be informed of the reasons for his arrest and is entitled to communicate with his family members to inform them of what has happened and ask for the services of a lawyer.
- Article 134 of the Code of Criminal Procedure stipulates that a public prosecutor may not interrogate the accused or confront him with other accused persons or witnesses until he has requested his lawyer to attend. The accused must disclose the name of his lawyer. However, this is not required in a case of flagrante delicto or an emergency for fear that evidence may be lost.
- The detainee must be informed of the reasons for his arrest, and is entitled to the services of a lawyer as soon as such action is taken against him, regardless of whether the measures were taken by law enforcement officers or the Public Prosecution Service.
- Article 57 of the Code of Criminal Procedure stipulates that the law enforcement officer may detain an arrested person for up to 48 hours unless his innocence is established. He must present him to the Public Prosecution Service for interrogation within a maximum period of 24 hours. (An exception exists in the case of terrorist offences. Article 27 of Act No. 58 of 2006 on the Protection of Society from Terrorist Acts authorizes a law enforcement officer to detain a person for a maximum of 28 days if there is sufficient evidence that he has committed an offence defined in that Act. He must listen to his statements during that period and present him to the Public Prosecution Office for Terrorist Crimes within three days.)
- Article 84 of the Code of Criminal Procedure stipulates that litigants are always entitled to have legal counsel present during the investigations. If the investigation is conducted as a matter of necessity in the absence of a litigant, the party concerned is entitled to examine the documents produced for the procedures conducted or filmed in his absence, in accordance with article 87 of the Code.

- When persons have been arrested and informed of the charges against them, they are allowed to make a telephone call within hours of their arrest in order to inform their legal representative or embassy of their whereabouts. They can also contact family members and lawyers in order to inform them of their whereabouts. They are then placed in the designated location. The detainee's lawyer is permitted to attend the interrogation session at the Public Prosecutor's Office. Article 61 (2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure promulgated by Act No. 15 of 1976 stipulates that: "All arrested persons shall be informed of the reasons for their arrest and shall be entitled to communicate with family members of their choosing in order to inform them of what has occurred and to request the services of a lawyer." Furthermore, article 48 of the Reform and Rehabilitation Institutions Act promulgated by Act No. 18 of 2014 stipulates that: "The lawyer who represents a prisoner or a detainee on remand in a civil or criminal case may have contact with the person concerned, in accordance with the procedures and regulations laid down in the Implementing Regulations of the Act." Article 31 of the Implementing Regulations of the Reform and Rehabilitation Institutions Act promulgated by Act No. 18 of 2014 stipulates that: "The administration of the centre shall permit the lawyer of the prisoner or detainee on remand whom he represents in any litigation to which he is a party to meet with him in connection with the litigation. He may also be accompanied by an interpreter. The meeting shall be held within sight of but shall not be audible to the administration of the centre. The director of the institution or his deputy shall determine the dates and duration of such meetings." In addition, a foreign prisoner or detainee on remand may contact his country's embassy by telephone, in writing or through a meeting, in accordance with the applicable regulations.

5. Legislative safeguards for inmates in reform and rehabilitation institutions

The Bahraini legal system provides important safeguards and fundamental rights for inmates and convicted persons in reform institutions, and for inmates and detainees on remand in reform and rehabilitation centres. They are clearly specified in Legislative Decree No. 8 of 1989 promulgating the Court of Cassation Act, Legislative Decree No. 46 of 2002 promulgating the Code of Criminal Procedure, Act No. 18 of 2014 promulgating the Reform and Rehabilitation Institution Act, and Decree No. 131 of 2015 concerning the implementing regulations governing the latter Act. The rights are as follows:

- (a) The right to humane treatment;
- (b) The right to receive all necessary medical services and care free of charge from a competent physician;
- (c) The right to family visits;
- (d) The right to adequate nutrition;
- (e) The right to practise religious rites and rituals;
- (f) The right to communicate with the outside world and to receive visits from and exchange correspondence with relatives, in accordance with the applicable regulations;
- (g) The right to communicate with a diplomatic or consular official representing the country of which he is a national;
- (h) The right to communicate and to meet with the lawyer representing him in the case in which he is a party, and the right to attend such meetings with an interpreter; the meeting shall be held within sight of guards but shall not be audible to them;
- (i) The right to examine the regulations governing the treatment of inmates and the applicable disciplinary rules;
- (j) The right to examine the judgment or ruling handed down against him by the competent authorities;
- (k) The right to exercise on a daily basis;
- (l) The right to be informed about defence, appeals and cassation proceedings relating to the judgments handed down against him within the legally prescribed time period;

- (m) The right to submit complaints and grievances to the relevant authorities and to file such complaints and grievances using the complaint boxes installed for the purpose;
- (n) The right to privacy with his lawful spouse.

6. Health care in reform and rehabilitation institutions

The Ministry of the Interior, represented by the General Directorate for Reform and Rehabilitation, seeks to guarantee, in coordination with the Directorate of Health and Social Affairs, a healthy and appropriate environment for all inmates in the reform and rehabilitation centres. The provision of medical care begins as soon as the inmate is admitted to the facility, where he undergoes a medical examination by a competent physician in order to ascertain his state of health and diagnose any diseases from which he may be suffering. The treating physician informs the inmate of the results of the medical examination and prescribes appropriate treatment. Every facility has a clinic that operates round the clock to provide medical services for all inmates, and those whose state of health requires further treatment or follow-up are transferred to government hospitals in order to ensure that they receive the best health care in accordance with the provisions of the Reform and Rehabilitation Institution Act No. 18 of 2014 promulgating the Reform and Rehabilitation Institution Act, and Decree No. 131 of 2015 concerning the implementing regulations governing the Reform and Rehabilitation Institution Act.

The Kingdom of Bahrain has also provided for the establishment of independent bodies to investigate allegations of arbitrary arrest and detention and to take legal action to ensure the protection of human rights and freedoms.
