

(Translated from Arabic)

Explanatory note concerning Mohamed Ramadan Issa Ali and Hussain Ali Moosa Hassan Mohamed

With reference to the joint urgent appeal (UA BHR 4/2020) from the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances, the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions and the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism concerning the case of Mohamed Ramadan and Hussain Moosa, and without prejudice to the previous responses provided by the Kingdom of Bahrain, we provide you with the following response:

1. Summary of the case of Mohamed Ramadan and Hussain Moussa and details of the trial and the procedures taken during the review

Mohamed Ramadan and Hussain Moosa planned to kill law enforcement officers. They prepared an explosive device for this purpose and on 14 February 2014, they and others attacked the public security forces with iron bars and Molotov cocktails. This was done with the aim of luring them to where they could detonate the device and kill them. The security forces took action to disperse the men. Meanwhile the men detonated the explosive device, causing the death of one law enforcement officer. The two men were arrested together with others who had participated in the crime. The Public Prosecution charged the 2 men and 10 others with: the premeditated murder of the deceased police officer and the attempted murder of a number of other police officers by detonating an explosive device; causing an explosion and acquisition and possession of an explosive device and Molotov cocktails and the materials used in their manufacture, all for terrorist purposes; and participation in an unlawful gathering in the framework of which they committed offences under the Criminal Code, the Act on protecting society from terrorist acts and the Weapons and Ammunition Act.

On 29 December 2014, the High Criminal Court unanimously decided to sentence the two individuals in question to death, to sentence another of the accused to life imprisonment, and the remaining nine accused persons with 6 years' imprisonment for some of the charges, acquitting them of others. The two men in question and eight others appealed the ruling. The Supreme Court of Appeal examined the case and ruled unanimously on 27 May 2015 to reject the appeal and uphold the judgment of the High Court. The Court of Cassation also upheld that ruling on 16 November 2015. All of the defendants were represented by a lawyer at all stages of the trial. They were all allowed to plead and present their defences orally and in writing, as required by law. The court responded to the applications of the defendants and their lawyers, allowed them to present their defence, and heard the witnesses they had called on their behalf.

The two persons sentenced to death had argued before the court that their confessions were invalid. The courts at both levels rejected that argument, as the conviction was based on the testimony of the victims and witnesses, as well as physical evidence and technical and forensic reports. The evidence included text messages on the defendants' phones in which they all agreed to participate in the crime and coordinated its commission. The head of the Public Prosecution's technical office stated that after the judgment became final, the Special Investigation Unit, in the course of its investigations into the complaints filed by the two men sentenced to death, identified medical reports concerning one of them. As the Unit established that the medical reports had not been seen by the court when it was ruling on the case, it referred the matter to the Public Prosecutor, who in turn referred it to the Minister of Justice to examine the possibility of submitting a request for a review of the final judgment handed down against the two men in order to fulfil the requirements of justice, bearing in mind the possibility that the reports could change the court's opinion about the invalidity of the men's confessions. This was in line with article 253 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which stipulates the requirement of the integrity of the oral evidence on which a judgment is based, in accordance with article 15 of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. Accordingly, as the law permits, the Minister of Justice submitted an application to the president of the Court of Cassation to



review the ruling handed down against the two convicted men in order to fulfil the requirements of justice, which call for all legal remedies to be exhausted to the maximum extent possible in order to establish the truth, and to evaluate the new documents found by the Special Investigation Unit that had not been seen by the court when considering the evidence in the case against the two men. The application was granted. The Court of Cassation overturned the death sentence imposed on the men and referred the case to the Supreme Court of Appeal.

The Supreme Court of Appeal considered the case again in public sessions before a different chamber. The defendants were represented, and the court heard the testimony of the doctors who had conducted medical examinations on the two men since their arrest and prosecution and defence witnesses called on behalf of the two men. The Court also heard the defence present its case and reached the unanimous decision on 8 January 2020 to uphold the death sentence. In its reasoned judgment, it stated that the injuries identified in the medical reports had not occurred at the same time as the procedures conducted by the police and Public Prosecution and had no impact on the confessions, which the men had made of their own free and conscious will, without any physical or moral coercion. The confessions were consistent with the truth and the facts of the case and with the testimony of the prosecution witnesses and other evidence. In accordance with the law, the verdict was presented to the Court of Cassation, which upheld it on 13 July 2020, after proving its integrity and its compliance with the law.

All stages of the trial, as described above, met all the requirements of a fair trial. The two convicted persons and their lawyers were able to make whatever defence arguments and pleadings they wished. The judges listened to the testimony of all those connected with the case and the events surrounding it and to the defence witnesses called to testify. The case was heard during the various stages of the trial by 15 judges over a period of 6 years. They concluded that the evidence presented against the two convicted individuals was legitimate, and that it was proven that they were criminally responsible for the charges against them.

This ruling by the Court of Cassation is the penultimate stage in the death sentence. The sentence remains unenforceable until it is ratified by the King.

2. The particularities of dealing with crimes of torture and ill-treatment, and the role of the Special Investigation Unit in combating these crimes

The protection of fundamental human rights and freedoms is a principle that cannot be completely or partially suspended, violated or ignored, in accordance with the National Action Charter and the Constitution, and based on the belief that respect for human rights fosters the values of fairness and equality and preserves the rights and privileges of members of society. It is also the path to criminal justice and thus the rule of law, as they are closely interrelated and reinforce one another. National legislation emphasizes these concepts, pillars, and legal elements, in compliance with relevant international conventions and standards, including the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. National efforts to eliminate all forms of torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment are being intensified with the aim of instilling the values of integrity and equality and preserving the rights and privileges of community members by establishing independent monitoring and judicial mechanisms to protect and promote human rights in the criminal justice system. These mechanisms include the Special Investigation Unit, which plays a role in guaranteeing and protecting public rights and freedoms within the criminal justice system.

Since the Unit began performing its duties of investigating, documenting and uncovering the truth in connection with cases of torture and ill-treatment, it has endeavoured to strengthen cooperation with human rights and monitoring bodies throughout the country with a view to eliminating all forms of torture and other cruel treatment or punishment. It has succeeded in building cooperation and trust with the public as a result of the criminal judgments and disciplinary sanctions it has secured and the protection and follow-up measures it has taken in respect of victims. This action serves as a deterrent to anyone who is tempted to threaten the dignity and human rights of people in Bahrain. In accordance with its powers, established by law and in its rules of procedure, the Unit takes specific measures

to prevent possible reprisals by the perpetrators of acts of torture and ill-treatment that might make the victims reluctant to submit complaints. These measures for the protection of victims and their families include changing their place of residence, changing their identity, prohibiting the disclosure of information revealing their identity or whereabouts, and verifying the testimony without revealing its source. The Unit's powers extend to include the possibility of removing persons who may be involved in torture or ill-treatment from any position that gives them, directly or indirectly, any influence or power over the complainants or witnesses or their families. This is to ensure that these persons do not hinder the progress of the investigation as a result of their functional authority. Over the years, the Unit's work has resulted in a significant decrease in the rates of the crimes that come under its remit year after year, which is an indication that it is on the way to reaching its main objective, namely eliminating all forms of torture or ill-treatment.

3. Legal means to compensate victims of torture and ill-treatment

The perpetrators of all wrongful acts that cause harm to others are obligated to provide compensation for the damage caused.¹ If the act constitutes a crime punishable by law, this gives rise, in addition to the civil lawsuit for compensation, to a criminal lawsuit to punish the perpetrator with the prescribed penalty. Each of the two lawsuits is independent of the other. The civil case is filed by the injured party before the competent civil court, in accordance with the Code of Civil and Commercial Procedure. The criminal proceedings are undertaken by the Public Prosecution before the criminal courts, in accordance with the Code of Criminal Procedure.

When it comes to the crimes of torture and ill-treatment, there is a common basis for liability in both types of lawsuits. Under article 22 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, persons who have suffered a direct personal injury which has been shown to be the result of a crime are entitled to claim their civil rights against the accused during the course of the collection of evidence, the conduct of the investigation or before the court that hears the criminal case, at any time until the court issues its decision to close pleadings. If the civil plaintiff is accepted in the investigation, the referral of the criminal case to the court includes the civil case.

This does not affect the independence of the criminal and civil lawsuits and does not preclude the injured party from filing the case before the originally competent civil court if he or she so wishes. Rather, the injured party has the right to abandon the case he or she filed before the criminal court and revert to filing it before the civil court, as stipulated in article 38 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.²

4. The results of investigations conducted in accordance with relevant international standards

Further to the details of the investigation procedures undertaken by the Special Investigation Unit since the complaint of the two individuals was brought to its attention, as described above, and the independence and integrity of the investigations it has conducted, as well as the independence and professionalism of the forensic doctor and the doctors who examined the two individuals and documented their injuries, we confirm that the Unit has spared no effort in recent years to establish the truth in connection with the allegations of torture and ill-treatment presented by the two individuals in question. The Unit does so in accordance with the relevant international conventions, standards and protocols, including, most importantly, the Manual on the Effective Investigation and Documentation of Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (Istanbul Protocol). The Unit has taken all the necessary measures to investigate the validity of these allegations. It has gathered oral, physical and technical evidence in accordance with the principles of effective investigation and documentation of torture stipulated in the Istanbul Protocol. It also provided the two individuals with all the procedural safeguards established for the

¹ Article 158 of the Civil Code states that every wrongful act that causes injury to another imposes an obligation on the perpetrator to provide compensation.

² If a civil plaintiff relinquishes his or her case before the criminal courts, he or she may file it with the civil courts, unless he or she has authorized the relinquishment of the right for which the legal action is brought.

benefit of detainees and prisoners during questioning. It used its specialized staff to investigate the allegations, and the two men's injuries were examined and documented in accordance with the purposes of investigation, examination and documentation stipulated in the Protocol. All the necessary X-rays and medical examinations were conducted in order to document the injuries and indicate whether they were consistent with the men's allegations. The investigations into the individuals' complaint have concluded the following:

Mohamed Ramadan Issa

His allegations that he was subjected to physical and moral torture to induce him to confess are untrue, and the statements he made at the hearing for the collection of evidence and the interrogation by the Public Prosecution were not the result of any material or moral coercion. There is no evidence in the case file to support his claim. His statements contradicted each other as well as the technical evidence and the facts established in the case documents. These contradictions are difficult to reconcile. The investigations and medical examinations conducted revealed that he had not suffered any injuries between his arrest and the conclusion of the Public Prosecution's interrogation. He underwent a medical examination on 21 February 2014 at 3.01 p.m. He was admitted to the detention centre on the same date at 3.45 p.m. The injury that the forensic doctor uncovered at the top of his right leg occurred during the period between his placement and the examination by the forensic doctor on 2 March 2014. Accordingly, this injury is not connected with the interrogation conducted by the Public Prosecution during its investigations, and has no bearing on the statements he made. The Unit reached that conclusion based on the following factors:

1. The individual in question did not make any allegations of torture or ill-treatment during the Public Prosecution's questioning, despite the fact that the Public Prosecution guaranteed his legal right, while he was being interrogated, to deny the accusations against him, namely premeditated murder and detonating the bomb that resulted in the death and injury of the victims.

2. The prosecutor established during the questioning that the individual in question was not suffering from any injuries and the individual acknowledged to the investigator that he did not have any injuries.

3. The doctors who conducted the medical examinations on the individual gave testimony to the effect that he was not suffering from any injuries at the time of his medical examinations on the date of his arrest or after the conclusion of the Public Prosecution's questioning, when he was placed in the detention centre on 21 February 2014. The individual told them that he did not have any illness, pain or injuries.

4. It is established in the record of proceedings issued by the detention centre in respect of the complainant's admission that he was placed in the centre on 21 February 2014 at 3.45 p.m. It is noted on the admission form that he did not have any visible injuries and that he said that he was in good health.

5. The member of the Public Security Forces in charge of receiving the individual when he was placed in the centre testified that he was in a normal condition and did not have any injuries.

6. The forensic report and the forensic doctor's testimony confirmed that the injuries to the upper right leg occurred following the interrogation by the Public Prosecution, during the period following his placement in the detention centre and at most a week before he was presented to the forensic expert.

7. The complainant claimed to the forensic doctor that he did not know the cause of the leg injury, which is consistent with what he said during the Unit's investigations to the effect that the forensic doctor's opinion regarding the timing of the injury was likely true because he himself did not remember the exact date of the injury.

8. The proper procedures were followed for the arrest of the individual at Bahrain International Airport, pursuant to a legal arrest warrant, and the interrogation, which was carried out at the premises of the Criminal Investigation Department during the legally prescribed period. All of the relevant legal and health measures were taken.

9. The persons who arrested and questioned the complainant during the hearings for the collection of evidence denied the allegations.

10. The results of the Unit's investigations are consistent with the facts presented in the final criminal judgement, after the review, that the complainant's injury was sustained after his interrogation by the Public Prosecution and had no bearing on his confession. The confession was not tainted, and he was not coerced into making it.

Hussain Ali Moosa

His allegations that he was subjected to physical and moral torture to induce him to confess are untrue, and the statements he made at the hearings for the collection of evidence and the interrogation by the Public Prosecution were not the result of any material or moral coercion. There is no evidence in the case file to support his claim. His statements contradicted each other as well as the technical evidence and the facts established in the documents. These contradictions are difficult to reconcile. The investigations, medical examinations and X-rays that were conducted showed that he did not have any injuries consistent with his claim. The friction injury around his wrists was the result of his being handcuffed after he was legally arrested pursuant to the arrest warrant issued against him because he tried to run from law enforcement officers upon his arrest. The back pain he was allegedly experiencing as a result of physical torture was actually caused by a congenital defect in the fifth lumbar vertebra and the first sacral vertebra. The Unit reached that conclusion based on the following elements:

1. The individual in question did not claim that he had been subjected to torture or ill-treatment during the questioning by the Public Prosecution that took place on the day of his arrest.

2. The prosecutor established during the questioning that the individual was not suffering from any injuries other than his injury to the hands. The individual admitted that that injury was the result of being handcuffed. He also stated that he was suffering from back pain because he had fallen on the ground while trying to escape from the law enforcement officers.

3. The doctor who conducted the medical examination the day after his arrest and after the conclusion of the Public Prosecution's questioning testified that the individual was suffering only from a minor injury, namely swollen hands, which could have a number of causes, including a fall or handcuffs.

4. The forensic report and the forensic doctor's testimony confirmed that the injury around the wrists was caused by friction from the handcuffs, and that he did not have any other injuries consistent with his claim.

5. The X-rays performed on the complainant's hands, left thigh and lumbar and sacral vertebrae confirmed that he did not have any recent injuries consistent with his claim and revealed a congenital defect in the fifth lumbar vertebra and the first sacral vertebra.

6. The proper procedures were followed for the arrest of the individual, pursuant to a legal arrest warrant, while he was at home hiding from law enforcement, and the interrogation, which was carried out at the premises of the Criminal Investigation Department during the legally prescribed period. All of the relevant legal and health measures were taken.

7. The persons who arrested the complainant and questioned him at the hearings for the collection of the evidence denied the allegations. The officer who arrested him said that the individual in question and others tried to flee when the arrest warrant was being executed.

8. The results of the Unit's investigations are consistent with the facts presented in the final criminal judgement, after the review, that the complainant's hand injuries were the result of the handcuffs. The X-rays performed on him revealed that he had a congenital defect in the lumbar and sacral vertebrae, which is an old injury and has no bearing on his statements. His confession was not tainted, and he was not coerced to make it.

9. The use of restraints during the individual's arrest was lawful in accordance with article 15 of the Criminal Code³ and articles 12 and 13 of the Public Security Forces Act (No. 3) of 1982.⁴ There was no intentional or unintentional error of any kind in the manner or duration of the use of handcuffs. The use of restraints was within the legal limits stipulated by the Minister of the Interior in resolution No. 24 of 2014 on the basic principles for the use of force and firearms, in accordance with article 3 of the Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials, which was adopted and published in accordance with the United Nations General Assembly resolution of 17 December 1979 and the Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials.

5. The legal obligation of the Special Investigation Unit to bring those responsible for enforced disappearances, torture and ill-treatment to justice

Since its establishment, the Unit has taken all the measures required by each investigation, in cooperation with all relevant authorities throughout the country, with the aim of establishing the criminal liability of government officials who have violated the law or committed acts of torture or ill-treatment, bringing criminal and administrative prosecutions and taking all legal and disciplinary measures against them, in accordance with the law and national and international codes of conduct and professionalism. When an investigation shows that there is evidence against a suspect, he or she is referred to trial, regardless of his or her position or rank.

In the cases of the two individuals in question, the Unit has undertaken all ordinary and extraordinary legal procedures in view of the severity of the sentence handed down and the allegations of torture and ill-treatment brought to its attention in the third trimester of 2016 after receiving the complaints submitted by the individuals' representative to the Ombudsman's Office, after the judgment issued against them became final when the Court of Cassation upheld the death sentence on 16 November 2015. As the Unit's investigations revealed that the two individuals had injuries that had not been considered by the various courts when adjudicating the case, the Unit – in view of its role to protect human rights in the criminal justice system – decided to apply for a review of the judgement, which was based on ignorance of the facts, in order to have the men retried in the light of the new evidence, enabling them to present their legal and substantive arguments and ensuring their access to justice. This was done because of the importance attached to legal certainty in judicial rulings. It is in the interests of justice and society to ensure that nothing undermines the public confidence that has been built in these rulings since they have become irreversible, and that they not be tainted in any way as to diminish their legal validity.

However, the fact that the request for a review resulted in the two individuals being retried does not mean that the investigations at the time concluded that the officers who arrested and questioned the two individuals were involved in acts of torture or ill-treatment against them during or after the arrest or the questioning. Otherwise, the Unit's request for a review would have been accompanied by a request for the men's confessions to be thrown out and for their statements not to be relied upon as they were made under torture, in accordance with article 253 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.⁵ The Unit ordered that criminal proceedings be initiated against those responsible for the crimes, in compliance with national and international legal obligations on the prevention of torture.

³ Article 15 of the Criminal Code states that an act is not an offence if carried out in the fulfilment of a duty imposed by law.

⁴ Article 12 of the Public Security Forces Act gives members of the public security forces, when carrying out their duties and whenever necessary, the right to use force to the extent necessary to carry out those duties. Article 13 (1) (2) of the Act allows members of the Public Security Forces to use force and firearms in certain cases, including during the arrest of any suspect in respect of whom an arrest warrant has been issued if he or she resists or tries to flee.

⁵ Article 253 of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides that the judge is to deliver a judgment in the case according to his or her own conviction, with complete freedom. However, the judgment is not to be based on any evidence that has not been brought before him or her at the hearing. Every statement that has been proven to have been given by an accused or a witness under coercion or a threat thereof must be ignored and not relied upon.

The Unit considered that it would be a denial of justice to ignore the two men's injuries, even though the investigations had concluded that Hussain Moosa's injury was the result of the handcuffs, and the X-rays performed on his back showed that he had a congenital defect in the fifth lumbar vertebra and the first sacral vertebra, and that Mohamed Ramadan had not suffered any injuries from the date of his arrest until the end of the Public Prosecution's investigation and his placement in the detention centre on 21 February 2014.

In this regard, the Unit is fully committed to national legislation and international conventions relevant to its work, in particular Act No. 4 of 1998 on accession to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The Unit conducts a prompt and impartial investigation whenever there are reasonable grounds to believe that an act of torture has been committed, with the aim of identifying those responsible and bringing criminal proceedings against them. Therefore, the claim that articles 2, 7, 12, 15 and 16 of the Convention against Torture have been violated, on the grounds that the Unit's investigations confirmed that the two men were subjected to torture in order to force them to confess, that no legal measures were taken to hold those responsible accountable, and that the judgment convicting the two men relied on their coerced confessions, is untrue.

Finally, it should be noted that, after almost eight years in operation, the Unit has taken all the necessary legal measures in response to the complaints submitted or referred to it, resulting in the referral of 167 officers and members of the Public Security Forces for criminal or military trials.

6. The Unit's response to the allegations of torture and ill-treatment of the two individuals in their place of confinement

The Unit has not received any complaints that the two persons in question have been subjected to psychological torture while in prison. Neither of them made any such allegations during questioning. In this regard, the Unit indicates that, in accordance with the role entrusted to it to respond to and monitor these allegations, it has opened an investigation and will take all necessary legal measures to establish the truth.

7. Judicial proceedings after the request for a judicial review was accepted, and the response of the court to all defence applications

It should be noted that, in view of the gravity of the death penalty prescribed for some crimes, the law requires that, if the crime for which the accused is being tried carries that penalty, the court must complete the investigation and hear the prosecution witnesses, and then hear the defence witnesses, in accordance with article 221 (1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.⁶ If the court fails to do so, whether the accused confessed before the court to the charges or not, even if he should have confessed, its judgment will be based on invalid procedures, as article 301 of the Code of Criminal Procedure⁷ requires the court to hear the witnesses who should have been heard or to designate one of its members for this purpose and to correct any other deficiencies in the investigation procedures.

We reiterate that all the procedures set forth in the Code of Criminal Procedure were observed during the two men's trials. In each case, the accused and his lawyer were allowed to present his defence and make submissions. The court responded to all of the defence applications. The court heard the testimony of all those connected with the case, the two accused, and the defence witnesses called by them. The court also allowed Mohamed Ramadan to defend himself and to present a statement of defence.

⁶ Article 301 (1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides that the Appeal Court hears the witnesses who should have been heard before the court of first instance and may therefore designate one of its members for this purpose. It must also correct any other deficiency in the investigation procedures.

⁷ Article 221 (1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides that, after the testimony of the prosecution witnesses is heard, the defence witnesses are heard and cross-examined first by the accused, then the officer in charge of civil rights, the public prosecutor, the victim and the civil plaintiff.

8. Additional evidence on which the courts relied to uphold the conviction and the imposition of the death penalty

It should be noted that it has been established that the men's confessions matched the truth, were consistent with the facts of the case and the statements of other prosecution and defence witnesses mentioned in the ruling, and that the men had made the confessions intentionally of their own free will, without any physical or moral coercion, misrepresentation, fraud, threat or promise on the part of law enforcement or the Public Prosecution. The conviction was based on the statements of prosecution witnesses from the Public Security Forces and the confessions of other defendants made at the hearings for the collection of evidence and the investigations of the Public Prosecution, the report of the crime scene division, the criminal investigation laboratory report, the forensic report on the autopsy of the victim, the medical reports of the victims, the photographs and photographic examination of the reconstitution of the crime, and the text messages found on the telephones of some of the accused establishing an agreement to go out on the road to carry out attacks and vandalism and to monitor the movements of the security forces, and newspaper reports that some of the accused already had convictions in terrorist cases.

9. Actions taken by the Court of Cassation to uphold the death sentence

With regard to the case of the two men in question, the Court of Cassation has taken all the legal measures established in the applicable national laws, which are consistent with the country's international obligations and the human rights principles adopted by the United Nations. The Court heard the statements of the representatives of the two appellants and reviewed all of the formal and substantive elements on which the appealed ruling relied. It responded to all of the allegations made by the two men in respect of the appealed ruling and concluded that it stated the facts of the case, including all the legal elements of the crimes for which they were convicted. The ruling also stated that it was proven that the men had committed the crimes based on plausible evidence likely to lead to the conclusion reached in the judgment. There were no significant errors in the court's doctrine, as is established from the papers. The judgment recalled the intent to kill, the premeditated nature of the crime, the description of the victim and the material used in the attack. The convicted men's defence was addressed and rejected using acceptable logic. The judgment did not contain any violations of the law or incorrect application of the law that would alter the penalty that was imposed.

One of the allegations raised by the two men to which the Court responded was that the judgment relied on confessions, despite the fact that they were untrue and invalid, as they were extracted under physical and moral coercion and the men wished to retract them. The Court had confidence in the validity of their confessions and those of the other defendants made during questioning by the Public Prosecution and at the hearings for the collection of evidence, both those incriminating themselves and the other defendants, and in their integrity and conformity with the truth and facts of the case and that they were not coerced, as explained above. The Court was also satisfied that the conviction responded to the evidence put forward by the defence that the confession was invalid with ample evidence refuting the existence of any link between the injuries identified in the medical and forensic reports and the confessions made, because the injuries were either old or were incurred after the confession was made. Based on the foregoing and other legal and substantive reasons set forth in the judgment, the Court of Cassation upheld the ruling after it had established its integrity and compliance with the law.

10. State of health and health care received

Mohamed Ramadan

His health is stable, and his vital signs are normal, as is his cardiovascular system. His abdomen is soft, and the nervous system and motor system are healthy. He has not suffered any injuries or fractures of the leg. He does not have diabetes, high blood pressure or asthma. He is not undergoing psychiatric treatment and does not suffer from any addiction.

However, he had a toothache and was referred to the dentist, who prescribed the necessary treatment.

He underwent [REDACTED] surgery at Bahrain Specialist Hospital.

Hussain Moosa

His health is stable, and his vital signs are normal, as is his cardiovascular system. His abdomen is soft, and the nervous system and motor system are normal.

He has sickle cell anaemia but does not have any other diseases.

11. Family visits and telephone calls

All convicted and pretrial prisoners are granted their full rights to family visits and calls in accordance with the Reform and Rehabilitation Institution Act and its implementing regulations. However, due to the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, visits have been suspended in order to ensure the safety of all prisoners and avoid the spread of the virus. Videoconferencing has been introduced to ensure that inmates continue to communicate with their families. Mohamed Ramadan Issa received his last visit on 4 February 2020, and Hussain Ali Moosa received his on 26 February 2020.
