
(Translated from Arabic)

Explanatory note in response to communication No. AL BHR 2/2021

With regard to joint communication AL BHR 2/2021 from the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, the Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, and the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, which contains allegations concerning five persons, we wish to provide the following clarifications:

1. Abdulhadi Abdullah Habeel al-Khawaja [REDACTED] has been detained in the Reform and Rehabilitation Centre since 28 November 2011 and is serving a sentence of life imprisonment.
2. Abduljalil Abdullah Yousef al-Singace [REDACTED] has been detained in the Reform and Rehabilitation Centre since 28 November 2011 and is serving a sentence of life imprisonment.
3. Abbas Abdulaziz Nasser al-Omran [REDACTED] has not been arrested or detained and he is currently outside the Kingdom of Bahrain.
4. Ali Hassan Abdullah Abduleman [REDACTED] was previously arrested in connection with another incident and was granted a royal pardon. He was not arrested or detained in connection with this case and he is currently outside the Kingdom of Bahrain.
5. Naji Ali Fateel [REDACTED] is detained in the Reform and Rehabilitation Centre pursuant to several judgments handed down against him in different cases (a term of imprisonment totalling 25 years and 6 months and a fine totalling 508,187,970 Bahraini dinars (BD)).

I. Information concerning the case of Abdulhadi al-Khawaja, Abduljalil al-Singace, Abbas al-Omran and Ali Abduleman

Case No. 11/2011/1415 concerning an attempt to overthrow the regime:

The charges filed against them:

- Establishment, administration and membership of an illegal group
- The aim of the group was to overthrow and change the country's political system by force, using terrorism as a means to achieve its goals
- Attempting to overthrow and change the Constitution of the State and the monarchy by force
- Promoting action to change the country's political system by force

The trial and the measures taken:

The Public Prosecutor's Office filed the above-mentioned charges against the persons concerned and referred them (21 defendants, including 7 fugitives) for trial on criminal charges. The competent court held a number of sessions to consider the case, in accordance with all legally established guarantees of a fair trial. On 22 June 2011, the court of first instance sentenced 14 accused in their presence and 7 accused, including Abbas Al-Omran and Ali Abdulemam, in absentia to terms of imprisonment ranging from 2 to 15 years and to life imprisonment, and decided to confiscate all seized items.

The accused lodged an appeal against the judgment, and the Court of Appeal decided, at a hearing on 29 September 2011, to reject the appeal and uphold the judgment of the court of first instance. The 14 accused, including Abduljalil al-Singace and Abdulhadi al-Khawaja, lodged an appeal against the judgment. The Public Prosecutor's Office informed the Court that it had dropped the charges concerning interference with the exercise of freedom of expression, incitement of hatred of the regime, propagation of false reports and malicious rumors, and incitement of non-compliance with the law. The Court of Cassation decided on 30 April 2012 to overturn the judgment and refer the case to the High Court of Appeal for reconsideration.

The High Court of Appeal considered the case and decided at a hearing on 4 September 2012 to uphold the previous rulings concerning the appellant defendants (Abduljalil al-Singace and Abdulhadi al-Khawaja). The defendants were acquitted of the charge of communicating with a foreign country and promoting regime change, and another defendant was acquitted of the charges of joining a terrorist group and attempting to overthrow the regime. The convicted persons lodged an appeal against the judgment with the Court of Cassation. The Court considered the appeals, and decided at a hearing on 7 January 2013 to accept the appeals in formal terms and to reject them on the merits. Accordingly, it upheld the judgment handed down against Abduljalil Al-Singace and Abdulhadi Al-Khawaja, which became final.

Guarantees on behalf of the accused:

It should be underscored that the accused who were present enjoyed all legally established guarantees from the opening of the investigations by the Public Prosecutor's Office until the handing down of the final judgment against them. They were entitled to seek the assistance of lawyers and each accused could hold individual meetings with his lawyer, either in the place of detention or in the courtroom. During the proceedings, the lawyers were entitled to present all legal and objective defence pleas and rebuttals, as well as any requests they wished to make. The courts at all levels responded by scrutinizing all aspects of their defence pleas, and granted their requests. Competent physicians were assigned to conduct medical examinations of the accused with a view to investigating

their allegations of abuse. The Special Investigation Unit also investigated those complaints. All witnesses requested by the defence were called to testify, and their testimony was heard again whenever the lawyers so requested. The Court responded in detail in its judgment to all the defence pleas. The Court of Cassation, which is the highest court in the Bahraini judicial system, monitored all the proceedings and overturned the judgment on the first occasion. It then upheld the judgment that was handed down on review after verifying that it was devoid of any procedural or substantive defects, and that the court had provided all legal guarantees to the defendants during the proceedings.

It should be noted that none of the accused was convicted of an offence of interfering with the right to freedom of expression after the Public Prosecutor's Office dropped those charges against them.

The accused benefited from the following procedures from the beginning of their trial until the final judgment was handed down by the Court of Cassation on 7 January 2013:

- A number of public trials were held in the presence of representatives of local and foreign human rights organizations and representatives of some countries' embassies. A total of five trials were held before diverse judicial bodies: two before the National Security Court of First Instance and the National Security Court of Appeal; one before the High Criminal Court of Appeal; and two before the Court of Cassation. More than 19 judges participated in the proceedings and in the delivery of judgments.
- The verdicts were delivered after the case was deliberated by several courts of different grades, indicating that all the judges who heard the case were fully convinced of the strength of the evidence against the accused and harboured no doubts about its authenticity. This confirms that the judges were completely satisfied and provides assurance that the verdicts were just and based upon their convictions, beliefs and the dictates of their conscience.
- During the legal proceedings, the accused enjoyed all legally established guarantees, including the presence of lawyers of their own choosing, who reviewed and were fully aware of all aspects of the case, and who pleaded for them either orally or by submitting written memoranda. The court also permitted the accused to present lengthy oral arguments that lasted for several hours, in addition to their lawyers' arguments. The court agreed to all their requests to hear witnesses, call specialized physicians and present documents. They were also provided with all necessary health care.

-
- Abdulhadi al-Khawaja requested that witnesses for the defence should be heard. His request was granted and he was provided with the opportunity to bring them before the court, but the witnesses failed to appeal during the trial proceedings.
 - The Public Prosecutor's Office did not lodge an appeal during the trial against any verdict that acquitted the accused of some of the charges against them or reduced the penalty imposed on some of the accused.

II. Information concerning the case of Naji Ali Fateel [REDACTED]

Case No. 7201305737:

The charges filed against him:

- Establishment of a group whose purpose is to undermine the provisions of the Constitution and the law and to restrict the personal freedoms of citizens, using terrorism as a means to achieve its goals
- Unlawful assembly in order to commit crimes or undermine security
- Furtherance of the use of weapons and explosives with the intent to commit a terrorist crime
- Arson
- Intentionally damaging buildings or public property
- Use of force, violence or threats to compel a public official to perform or refrain from performing an act

The trial and the measures taken:

The person in question was arrested on 2 May 2013 in response to an order from the Public Prosecutor's Office based on investigations indicating his involvement in terrorist activity. He was confirmed to be a prominent member of the so-called February 14 Coalition, which used terrorism as a means to conduct their activities through acts of sabotage, intimidation of security forces and assaults on law enforcement officers. He played a major role in uniting various movements under the Coalition's umbrella and is deemed to be one of the foremost media and human rights leaders. He has organized many events and is viewed as the media spokesperson within the country. He also has close foreign contacts whom he keeps informed of the Coalition's activities. The record of the investigations and an audio recording of a speech that he delivered at the so-called February 14 commemoration confirmed his incitement of those present to participate in the Coalition's activities and his invitation to various bodies to participate in the strike and to return to the Roundabout.

On 3 May 2013, the Public Prosecutor's Office interrogated him, charged him with the above-mentioned offences and ordered his detention for 30 days pending the investigations. He was presented to the forensic physician on 6 May 2013.

The person in question did not state during the interrogation that he had a lawyer, nor did he request the assistance of a lawyer when asked by the Public Prosecutor's Office whether he wished to do so. He admitted that he had called for participation in the Coalition's activities and engaged in mobilization to demand the overthrow of the regime. He had also provided support to the terrorist Coalition by delivering the organization's donation boxes to other persons and by establishing a branch abroad. When the interrogation was concluded, the Public Prosecutor's Office ordered his placement in pretrial detention. It also ordered the forensic physician to conduct a medical examination in order to determine whether there were any traces of injuries and, if so, to determine their causes. The forensic physician concluded that there were no traces of ill-treatment.

He was referred to the competent court, which held a number of sessions to conduct the proceedings, during which he was provided with all the guarantees prescribed for accused persons. On 29 September 2013, the High Criminal Court sentenced him to 15 years' imprisonment. The verdict was upheld on appeal. The accused then lodged an appeal with the Court of Cassation, which rejected the appeal.

Guarantees on behalf of the accused:

It should be underscored that the accused enjoyed all legally established guarantees from the opening of the investigations by the Public Prosecutor's Office until the handing down of the final judgment against him. He was also asked whether he wished to appoint a lawyer, but he failed to submit such a request (during the interrogation). He was also examined by a forensic physician to ensure that he had not been subjected to any form of ill-treatment.

During the proceedings, the lawyer was entitled to present all legal and objective defence pleas and rebuttals orally and in writing, as well as any requests he wished to make. The courts at all levels responded by scrutinizing all aspects of the defence pleas and by granting his requests. The judgment was examined at two levels of litigation, and the Court of Cassation, which is the highest court in the Bahraini judicial system, monitored the legality of the proceedings and upheld the judgment.

III. The justification for the so-called group trial referred to in the communication

The principle of personal criminal responsibility is enshrined in the Constitution and the legislation. Thus, persons are not responsible for a crime and are not liable to a penalty unless they

are the perpetrators of or accomplices to the crime. Article 20 of the Bahraini Constitution stipulates that punishment is personal. The basic principle is that no one shall be liable to a criminal penalty unless he or she has been convicted of a crime. Accordingly, the principle of personal punishment guaranteed by article 20 of the Constitution presupposes personal criminal responsibility, inasmuch as a person shall not be held responsible for a crime and shall not be subjected to a penalty unless he or she is the perpetrator or accomplice.

In light of the foregoing, joint criminal responsibility does not exist, since each individual is responsible for the crime that he or she has committed, whether as a perpetrator or an accomplice, in accordance with articles 43 and 44 of the Bahraini Criminal Code, as amended. According to article 44 of the Criminal Code, there are diverse forms of participation in a crime, such as agreement, aiding or abetting. Article 45 of the Criminal Code stipulates that any person who participates in an offence, as a perpetrator or as an accomplice, shall be liable to the prescribed penalty.

Accordingly, in the event that many persons have participated in the commission of a crime, they must be referred to a criminal court for the same incident. This is only the case after it has been proved that each one of them was materially involved in the crime, and they all enjoy legally established guarantees of a fair trial. The referral of a large number of persons to a criminal court for a specific act depends on each person's criminal responsibility for its perpetration, and on the role played in material terms, either in the context of the original act or through participation in the crime. Accordingly, the use of the term group trial to describe a case involving multiple participants is unfounded, since criminal proceedings are based on criminal responsibility, and the guarantees of a fair criminal trial ensure that each accused person has the right to refute the evidence that he joined the other accused in the same criminal activity, and the right to respond to the allegations against him and to defend other accused persons.

It should be noted that the above-mentioned charges against the accused were not all based, as alleged, on their exercise of human rights activities, but rather on their commission of acts that legally constitute the crimes in respect of which the charges were filed.

IV. Investigations undertaken by national redress mechanisms into allegations of torture and ill-treatment of the aforementioned persons

1. Abdulhadi al-Khawaja

The Special Investigation Unit:

-
- **The allegations that he was arrested without an arrest warrant, that he was tortured while in prison, and that the Public Security Forces assaulted him during his arrest, causing four fractures to the side of the face:**

The Special Investigation Unit investigated the allegations that the said person was subjected to torture and ill-treatment during his arrest. It found that the injuries inflicted on him by members of the Public Security Forces were unrelated to his claim, since they were due to the use by the members of the Public Security Forces of the requisite force during his arrest at his daughter's home owing to his resistance and refusal to comply with the judicial arrest warrant. It therefore decided to archive the documents. The Unit draws attention to the following:

1. The Special Investigation Unit paid several visits to the detainee from 23 October 2012 in order to request details of his allegations of torture and ill-treatment. Yet he refused to make any statements, although the Unit had informed him about the nature of its work, its independence from any entity involved in the investigations or judicial proceedings, and its mandate to investigate the validity of such allegations in terms of national and international legal obligations to prevent torture or ill-treatment.
2. The person in question was arrested at his daughter's home pursuant to an arrest warrant. The Public Security officers informed him of their status and of the arrest warrant issued against him, but he refused to comply with the warrant. When he resisted and attempted to attack the officers, they used the requisite physical force to control him, as a result of which he fell and his jaw was injured. He was provided with all necessary medical care, in accordance with the applicable legal provisions.
3. The person in question claimed, during his interrogation by the Public Prosecutor's Office, that he had been physically assaulted, beaten and kicked during his arrest. He did not claim that he had been tortured to extract a confession. The Public Prosecutor's Office ordered an examination by the forensic physician at the Office's Department of Physical Evidence. The physician confirmed that the injury was due to his collision with a solid object on a date that coincided with the date of his arrest.
4. The person in question claimed before the court of first instance that his confession was invalid, since it was the result of physical and moral coercion. The High Court of Appeal, to which the case was referred for a new ruling pursuant to a judgment by the Court of Cassation, heard a statement by the said person at a session on 22 May 2012, and decided, inter alia, that he had been subjected to torture and ill-treatment. The allegations were considered in five different courts and before 19 judges and, according to the evidence contained in the record, no judgment was based on his confession.

The Office of the Ombudsman:

- **The Office of the Ombudsman received a number of requests for assistance concerning health care:**

The Office requested medical records and information concerning medical appointments and medication, with the following results:

1. It was confirmed that the person in question received the necessary medical care following his admission to the Reform and Rehabilitation Centre.
2. He receives regular and continuous medical supervision.
3. According to his medical records, he had nine medical appointments at the Military Hospital in 2018 and 32 medical appointments at the clinic of the Reform and Rehabilitation Centre.

It should be noted that the Office had previously received a number of complaints and requests for assistance regarding diverse issues, all of which were investigated and archived owing the lack of any wrongful act or because they were duly resolved.

2. Abduljalil al-Singace**The Special Investigation Unit:**

- **The allegation that he was arrested without an arrest warrant, and that he was subjected to physical and moral torture to extract a confession:**

The Special Investigation Unit investigated the allegation that the said person was subjected to torture in order to extract a confession. It ordered that the documents should be archived based on the following facts:

1. The Special Investigation Unit paid several visits to the detainee from 23 October 2012 in order to request details of his allegation of torture. Yet he refused to make any statements, although the Unit had informed him about the nature of its work, its independence from any entity involved in the investigations or judicial proceedings, and its mandate to investigate the validity of such allegations in terms of national and international legal obligations to prevent torture or ill-treatment.
2. The person in question was arrested at his home pursuant to an arrest warrant issued on 16 March 2011.
3. He claimed during his interrogation by the Public Prosecutor's Office that he had been physically assaulted and beaten during his arrest and during his detention from 17 to 29 March 2011. The Public Prosecutor's Office ordered an examination by the forensic physician at the Office's

Department of Physical Evidence. According to the record of the medical examination, he was not suffering from any injuries nor were there any indications that he had been beaten.

4. The person in question claimed before the court of first instance that his confession was invalid, since it was the result of physical and moral coercion. The High Court of Appeal, to which the case was referred for a new ruling pursuant to a judgment by the Court of Cassation, heard a statement by the said person at a session on 29 May 2012, in which he claimed, inter alia, that he had been arrested on 17 March 2011 without a warrant and that he had been subjected to torture and ill-treatment. He concluded by stating that he would not attend the next court sessions. The allegations were considered in five different courts and before 19 judges. It emerged that the judgment convicting the person in question had been based on his own confession concerning himself and the rest of the accused. The validity and integrity of the arrest and search procedures were confirmed since they were based on an arrest warrant issued on 16 March 2011. Furthermore, the confession was unblemished, since there had been no coercion. The said person's allegation was mere hearsay and was unsupported by any documentary evidence, especially since the forensic medical report proved that there were no traces of torture.

- **The allegation that he was ill-treated in prison during the month of May 2016 and was confined to his cell for a week without being allowed to walk around or go outside:**

The Unit received no complaint concerning ill-treatment of the said person or denial of medical treatment during 2016. It should be noted that the Unit had received a complaint on 17 June 2013 concerning denial of medical care in the prison. It visited him in prison several times to request details of the complaint, but he refused to respond.

The Office of the Ombudsman:

- **The Office of the Ombudsman did not receive any personal complaint or request for assistance from Abduljalil al-Singace concerning denial of access to health care. However, it received inquiries from a number of international organizations on his behalf concerning allegations of denial of access to health care:**

1. The Office of the Ombudsman therefore initiated investigations into the allegations it had received. An investigator from the Office arranged a meeting with Mr. Al-Singace in its independent office at the Jau Reform and Rehabilitation Centre, but the inmate refused to cooperate and denied having any connection with the organizations in question. He also denied having submitted or wishing to submit any request or complaint to the Office of the Ombudsman.

2. The Office nonetheless proceeded with its investigations into the allegations concerning health care. It requested medical records and information concerning medical appointments and medication, with the following results:

- It found that the said person does not suffer from any chronic diseases. The records indicated that his health condition was regularly monitored in the clinic of the Reform and Rehabilitation Centre. According to the records, he had 42 medical appointments at the clinic in 2018, but attended only 19, while refusing to attend the other appointments.
- The medical records for 2019 indicated that his health condition was being monitored by specialists in external hospitals. According to the records, he had 256 medical appointments and refused to attend 32.
- **The Office received requests on several occasions from international organizations for assistance in providing rubber padding for the said person's crutches:**

The Office of the Ombudsman contacted the competent department in order to grant the request.

It should be noted that the Office had previously received a number of complaints and requests for assistance regarding diverse issues from international organizations that were acting on behalf of Abduljalil al-Singace. All of them were investigated and archived owing the lack of any wrongful act or because they were duly resolved, notwithstanding the said person's persistent refusal to cooperate with the Office of the Ombudsman and to meet with its investigators.

3. **Naji Ali Fateel**

The Special Investigation Unit:

- **The allegation that the person in question was subjected to torture in the Criminal Investigations Directorate and that, following his refusal to be interrogated at the Public Prosecutor's Office without a lawyer being present, he was returned to the Criminal Investigations Directorate and his torture continued:**

On 14 May 2013, the Unit received from the Public Prosecutor's Office a complaint that the person in question had been subjected to torture during his interrogation in order to extract a confession. On the same day, a member the Unit went to the Dry Dock Detention Centre and questioned him. He testified that he had been subjected to physical torture in the Criminal Investigations Directorate with a view to coercing him to confess. On being questioned again on 2 July 2013 after claiming before the court that he suffered from back injuries due to torture at the Criminal Investigations Directorate to extract a confession, he testified that he had been informed of

the injuries after being questioned during the Unit's investigations. A medical examination by the Unit's forensic physician indicated that he was not suffering from injuries attributable to criminal violence or resistance. He was also examined by the Unit's psychiatrist, who found that he was not suffering from any psychological impact. As the investigations by the judicial police failed to produce any information or evidence regarding his allegations, and as he had not accused any individual, the Unit questioned the arresting officer and the officer who had interrogated the complainant in the building of the General Directorate of Criminal Investigation and Forensic Evidence. They both denied the charges. The Unit finally archived the documents owing to the lack of evidence and because his statements were mere hearsay and were unsupported by any other evidence.

- **The allegation that on 2 September 2019 he was placed in solitary confinement and was prohibited from receiving visits and telephone calls:**
- **The statement that on 9 August 2020 he went on hunger strike for 10 days to protest against lack of proper medical care and the denial of his right to practise his religion, following which he was promised by prison officers that he would receive appropriate medical care:**

The Special Investigation Unit received no complaint concerning the two points listed above.

The Office of the Ombudsman:

- **The Office of the Ombudsman received a number of requests for assistance with respect to health care:**

The Office requested medical records and information concerning medical appointments and medication, with the following results:

1. It was confirmed that the person in question had received the necessary medical care since his admission to the Reform and Rehabilitation Centre.
2. He visited the clinic in the Reform and Rehabilitation Centre 21 times during 2018 and 15 times during 2019. He also had a number of appointments with consultants and specialists in external hospitals.
3. It was found that he underwent a number of examinations, x-rays and laboratory analyses.
4. He underwent medical examinations by an orthopaedic and fracture specialist.

It should be noted that the Office had previously received a number of complaints and requests for assistance regarding diverse issues, all of which were investigated and archived owing the lack of any wrongful act or because they were duly resolved.

V. Additional information concerning allegations of torture, ill-treatment and arbitrary detention

We underscore that these allegations are unsubstantiated, especially given that the Reform and Rehabilitation Centre is equipped with security cameras in all areas where inmates are to be found. There is no evidence that any of them have been subjected to torture, or that they have been investigated in the Centre in the absence of the authorities responsible for investigatory and other legal procedures or for the procedures conducted by the Public Prosecutor's Office. Furthermore, no person may be admitted to the Centre wrongfully and without a court ruling based on article 11 of the Reform and Rehabilitation Institution Act, which stipulates that: "No person may be admitted to the centre save on the basis of a written order issued by the legally competent authority and within the period specified in the order. Persons may not be detained in centres other than those that have been established in accordance with this Act." The Reform and Rehabilitation Centre inmates enjoy all the rights stipulated in Act No. 18 of 2014 concerning the Reform and Rehabilitation Institution Act, including the right to free medical care, the right to contacts and visits, and other basic rights.

All authorities mandated to supervise reform and rehabilitation centres in the Kingdom of Bahrain and abroad perform the duties entrusted to them in accordance with the laws governing their establishment. The centre's management and staff cooperate in full transparency and impartiality with the authorities, including the Office of the Ombudsman, the Special Investigation Unit, the National Institution for Human Rights and the International Committee of the Red Cross.

Chapter IV of the above-mentioned Act entitled "Judicial Oversight and the Enforcement of Sentences" stipulates in section 1, article 63, that: "The President of the Court of Cassation, the Prosecutor General, the President of the High Court of Appeal, the President of the High Criminal Court, the President of the High Civil Court, the judge for the enforcement of sentences and the public prosecutors are entitled, within their areas of jurisdiction, to visit and inspect reform and rehabilitation centres, review their records, ensure that no one is being detained illegally, receive and hear complaints or grievances from any inmate or remand detainee, and ensure that all orders issued by the Public Prosecutor's Office and the investigating judge and all judicial rulings are implemented in the prescribed manner."

VI. The wide ambit of freedom of opinion and expression in the Kingdom of Bahrain

Freedom of expression, opinion and belief, and freedom of peaceful assembly and association are fully protected by the Constitution and domestic legislation, in accordance with international norms, and constitute the bedrock of the reform process launched by His Majesty the King. The process was approved by the Bahraini people by 98.4 per cent in a vote on the National Action Charter, which explicitly stipulates that all such rights are inherent rights of the Bahraini people. However, the exercise of these rights and freedoms must, as in all civilized societies, be consistent with national laws and regulations, and any deviation therefrom constitutes a criminal offence.

Accordingly, the competent authorities in the Kingdom refrain from taking action against any natural or legal person for engaging in political, rights-related or social activities. As criminal liability is determined in accordance with the law, nobody is charged unless there is clear evidence that he or she has committed an offence defined by law. The Kingdom of Bahrain therefore reaffirms that political activity and the expression of opinions in public are not criminalized by law. The allegation that arbitrary measures have been adopted against persons who exercise such rights is therefore unfounded.

The Kingdom also underscores that existing national legislation and redress mechanisms are capable of preventing violations of these rights, and that all national strategies are designed to promote the comprehensive advancement of human rights in the Kingdom of Bahrain and the exercise of such rights through the national regulatory channels.

VII. Health condition and medical appointments

1. Abdulhadi al-Khawaja

The health condition of the person in question is regularly monitored in the medical clinic of the Reform and Rehabilitation Centre. Since the beginning of 2021, he has been examined six times by the general practitioner and three times by the physician who specializes in treating chronic diseases.

The inmate was previously diagnosed with the following chronic diseases:

1. [REDACTED]
2. Chronic pain in the left part of the lower jaw;
3. [REDACTED]

It should be noted that he does not suffer from diabetes, high blood pressure, yeast deficiency, sickle cell anaemia, thalassaemia or asthma, and he is not undergoing psychotherapy.

4. [REDACTED]

5. [REDACTED]

It should be noted that he does not suffer from diabetes, high blood pressure or asthma, and he is not undergoing psychotherapy.

Laboratory analyses of the inmate's health condition are undertaken on a regular basis. Comprehensive analyses were undertaken on 22 February 2021 and all the results were within the normal range.

All medications required to treat the above-mentioned chronic diseases that were diagnosed in the case of the inmate are regularly dispensed.

When the inmate complained of pain in his knees, an x-ray was performed and displayed friction in the knee joint due to the fact that he was diagnosed with poliomyelitis. He also complained of toothache and the necessary treatment was provided. He was referred for an examination and monitoring by a specialist in dental illnesses at the clinic in the Reform and Rehabilitation Centre.

He received the Sinopharm COVID-19 vaccine of his own free will.

The patient's last visit to the clinic at the Reform and Rehabilitation Centre took place on 30 May 2021. The inmate was found to be in good condition and to be aware of the place and time and the persons involved. All his external and internal organs appeared to be in normal condition, and his vital signs were stable and within the normal range. The inmate requested a refill of his medication and his request was granted.

3. Naji Fateel

The health condition of the person in question is regularly monitored in the medical clinic of the Reform and Rehabilitation Centre. Since the beginning of 2021, he has been examined four times by the general practitioner.

The inmate was previously diagnosed with the following chronic diseases:

1. [REDACTED]

2. [REDACTED]

It should be noted that he does not suffer from diabetes, high blood pressure, yeast deficiency, sickle cell anaemia, thalassaemia or asthma.

He was examined by a specialist in internal diseases at Salmaniya Medical Complex on 12 January 2021 and was provided with the necessary medicines. He was also examined by a chronic disease specialist and a special diet was prescribed.

Laboratory analyses of the inmate's health condition are undertaken on a regular basis. Comprehensive analyses were undertaken on 1 December 202 and all the results were within the normal range.

All medications required to treat the above-mentioned chronic diseases that were diagnosed in the case of the inmate are regularly dispensed.

He received the COVID-19 vaccine of his own free will.

The patient's last visit to the clinic at the Reform and Rehabilitation Centre took place on 18 May 2021. The inmate was found to be in good condition and to be aware of the place and time and the persons involved. All his external and internal organs appeared to be in normal condition, and his vital signs were stable and within the normal range.