
(Translated from Arabic)

Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the United Nations Office at Geneva

I. With regard to the following request: Please provide any additional information or any comment on the above-mentioned allegations.

The Kingdom cooperates with all United Nations human rights mechanisms and responds to their inquiries and requests. It complies with its international obligations under the human rights treaties that it has ratified, and its actions are consistent with its obligations under international human rights law and with relevant international norms. It examines the allegations that it receives and clarifies all relevant facts. We wish to underscore in this context that the information contained in the joint communication is inaccurate and contains false allegations and assertions based on information received from the source that is devoid of support and evidence. We wish to clarify the following allegations in this connection:

- **The joint communication alleges that the two persons in question were held incommunicado for several months, that their families were not informed of their arrest, and that they were forced to sign self-incriminating confessions.**

These allegations are entirely unfounded. The two persons were arrested for committing terrorist crimes, as will be explained in section II. They were detained in Mabath (General Directorate of Investigation) Prison in the city of Dammam in the Eastern Province, which is a designated and well-known detention facility. They were permitted to exercise the right to communicate with whomever they saw fit, and the right to receive visits and have regular and continuous contacts with their families, representatives and lawyers. They confessed of their own free will to the investigating authority and confirmed their confessions to the charges filed against them before the judiciary, in accordance with article 101 (2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure. They enjoyed full legal capacity and were not coerced.

It should be noted that there are no secret or unknown places of detention in the Kingdom. All detention facilities and prisons are known and designated for the purpose. Article 2 of the Code of Criminal Procedure stipulates that no person shall be arrested, searched, detained or imprisoned except in cases specified by law, and that detention or imprisonment shall be confined to places designated for the purpose and shall be limited to the period prescribed by the competent authority. Article 37 of the Code of Criminal Procedure stipulates that: "No person shall be detained or imprisoned except in the places designated for that purpose by law. The administration of any prison or detention centre shall not receive any person except pursuant to an order, duly signed by the competent authority, that specifies the reasons and period for such imprisonment. The accused shall not remain in custody following the expiry of the period specified in the order." All prisons and detention centres in the Kingdom are inspected by judicial, administrative, health-care and social-care authorities, in accordance with article 5 of the Prison and Detention Act. The Public Prosecution Service is required, pursuant to article 3 (f) of its Statute, to monitor and inspect prisons, detention centres and any places where criminal sentences are enforced, to listen to the complaints of prisoners and detainees, to ascertain the lawfulness of their imprisonment or detention and the lawfulness of their continued detention in prison or detention facilities after the expiry of the period, to take the requisite steps to release those detained on unlawful grounds, and to apply the appropriate legal provisions to those responsible. Article 40 of the Code of Criminal Procedure stipulates that: "Anyone who becomes aware that a person is unlawfully or improperly imprisoned or detained, or is imprisoned or detained in a place not designated for imprisonment or detention, shall notify the Public Prosecution Service. Upon being informed of such a case, the competent officer of the Service shall visit the location where the prisoner or

detainee is being held, conduct an investigation, and order the release of the prisoner or detainee if his or her imprisonment or detention is illegal. The officer shall prepare a report on the incident and submit it to the competent authority so that legal action may be taken against those responsible.”

- **The joint communication states that the Grand Fourth Criminal Court in Bahrain sentenced Mr. Jaafar Sultan and Mr. Thamer to life imprisonment in absentia on charges of joining a terrorist group; importing and possessing explosive materials; and agreeing to and assisting in training individuals to commit terrorist acts. The sentence was allegedly based on confessions from both extracted under duress.**

The Court reviewed the judgments handed down against the defendants by the Grand Fourth Criminal Court in the Kingdom of Bahrain and took the convictions into account in its judgment.

- **The joint communication alleges that the persons in question could not resort to any remedy to challenge the lawfulness of their detention (in accordance with article 9 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights).**

The Kingdom underscores that the right to challenge the lawfulness of a person’s arrest or detention is guaranteed by article 115 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which stipulates that: “Upon the arrest of the accused, the original text of the arrest warrant shall be delivered to the director of the detention centre, who shall sign a copy of the warrant as an acknowledgement of receipt. Pretrial detainees may lodge a complaint against the order to detain them or to extend their detention. The complaint shall be submitted to the head of the investigating authority, the head of the branch or the head of the department, as appropriate, and a decision shall be taken within five days of the date of submission.” The Public Prosecution Service is independent and forms part of the judiciary in legal terms. According to the Statute of the Public Prosecution Service, no one has the right to interfere in its work. All the Kingdom’s laws fully guarantee the rights of defendants from the time of their arrest until their release, and all defendants are entitled to institute proceedings before a court to determine the legality of their detention. These provisions are consistent with articles 3, 8, 9 and 10 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

- II. With regard to the following requests: Please explain whether Mr. Sultan’s and Mr. Thamer’s arrest and subsequent detention are in compliance with international human rights law and standards, and whether their trial was conducted in a manner consistent with international due process and fair trial norms and standards. Within this context, please provide information on whether there has been any investigation, and if so, what was the result, on the allegations of torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. If no investigation was conducted, please explain why.**

The persons in question were arrested for smuggling explosive materials into the Kingdom from the Kingdom of Bahrain. Following their interrogation, they confessed to having committed the crime as well as a number of terrorist crimes that threatened the security of the Kingdom, including participation in training courses in foreign terrorist camps with a view to perpetrating terrorist crimes. These constituted valid grounds for their detention and trial. The Terrorist Crimes and their Financing Act (2013) requires action to combat such crimes and to punish the perpetrators in order to preserve the security and safety of both the internal community and the international community. Such measures are consistent with international norms and with the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy to prevent and combat terrorism.

With regard to the question as to whether the detention of the persons in question complies with international human rights law and standards:

The persons in question were arrested pursuant to article 33 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and they were detained pursuant to article 2 of the Terrorist Crimes and their Financing Act (2013). Their detention was extended pursuant to article 5 of that Act, since they were accused of committing a number of terrorist crimes, including those listed below:

- Smuggling of 11 bags containing 30.87 kilograms of explosive materials and 50 detonating capsules, and hiding them away with a view to carrying out terrorist crimes aimed at undermining the security of the Kingdom and targeting law enforcement officers and vital installations;
- Membership of a terrorist entity that planned to carry out belligerent terrorist operations in the Kingdom;
- Communicating with terrorists inside the Kingdom and supporting them in the perpetration of terrorist crimes;
- Receiving training in terrorist camps outside the Kingdom in the use, manufacture and supply of weapons and explosives, and in the conduct of military operations with a view to perpetrating terrorist crimes in the Kingdom for the benefit of an enemy State;
- Smuggling raw materials for the manufacture of explosives into the Kingdom by placing them in a secret vehicle storage compartment and then burying them in a sandy area; storing the site coordinates in a mobile phone and providing them to a terrorist for use in the perpetration of terrorist crimes.

On completing the investigations, the investigating authority (the Public Prosecution Service) decided that the evidence was sufficient to charge the two suspects pursuant to article 126 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which stipulates that: "If the Public Prosecution Service is of the opinion, once the investigation has been concluded, that there is sufficient evidence against the accused, the case shall be referred to the competent court and the accused shall be summoned to appear before it." The Public Prosecution Service referred the casefile to the competent court and the two accused were summoned to appear before it, in accordance with article 15 of the Code, which stipulates that: "The Public Prosecution Service shall, pursuant to its Statute, institute and pursue criminal proceedings before the competent court." Articles 3 (b) and (c) of the Statute also authorize the Public Prosecution Service to institute proceedings, close cases and conduct prosecutions before judicial bodies, in accordance with the law and all implementing regulations. When the two accused appeared before the court in the presence of the Public Prosecutor, the Public Prosecutor's charges were read out to them and they were provided with a copy thereof, in accordance with article 160 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which stipulates that: "During the arraignment, the court shall inform the accused of the charges against him, read out and explain the indictment, provide him with a copy thereof, and call upon the accused to plead thereto." The court informed them that they were entitled to seek the assistance of a lawyer to defend them in the case, in accordance with article 4 (1) of the Code. If they lacked the financial means to seek the assistance of a lawyer, they could ask the court to appoint a lawyer to defend them at the State's expense, in accordance with article 139 of the Code. They requested the appointment of a number of lawyers to defend them in the case. At another hearing they requested the appointment of a lawyer at the State's expense and their request was granted. The trial continued, and the court refrained from issuing a verdict until it had heard the statements of all parties, including all defence pleas that had been presented orally and in writing, and had examined the records of the evidence collected. The court then closed the proceedings in their presence. The casefile was studied in accordance with article 172 of the Code, which stipulates that any of the parties may provide the court with written information regarding the case for inclusion in the casefile, and article 173 of the Code, which stipulates that the court shall first hear the prosecutor's indictment and then the plea by the defendant or his legal representative or lawyer. The court shall then hear the claimant regarding the private right of action, to be followed by the response of the defendant or his legal representative or lawyer. Each of the parties shall be

entitled to comment on the statements of the other parties, the defendant being the last to address the court. The court shall then deliver its judgment, either of acquittal or of conviction with the imposition of a penalty, and in both instances the court shall also rule on the civil party's petition. The case of the two persons in question was considered by three judges in the court of first instance, in accordance with article 20 of the Judiciary Act, which stipulates that: "The criminal court shall be composed of the following specialized chambers: chambers for *qisas* and *hudud* cases [which carry, respectively, retaliatory and predetermined penalties]; chambers for *ta'ziri* cases [which carry discretionary penalties]; and chambers for juvenile cases. Each chamber shall be composed of three judges, except for cases specified by the Supreme Judicial Council, which shall be considered by a single judge." The court of first instance sentenced them to death.

After the judgment by the court of first instance was handed down, the persons in question were granted the right to lodge an appeal against the judgment within 30 days of the date on which they received a copy thereof, in accordance with article 192 (1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which stipulates that: "The convicted person, the prosecutor or the civil claimant may, within the legally prescribed time limit, appeal or request scrutiny of judgments handed down by courts of first instance. The court that hands down the judgment shall inform them of this right when delivering the judgment." Once the objection was filed, it was considered by the judges of the court of first instance, who confirmed their judgment. The entire file was then referred to the appeal court, in accordance with article 196 of the Code, which stipulates that: "The chamber that rendered the challenged judgment shall examine the grounds on which the objection is based without hearing submissions, unless necessary, and may amend or uphold the judgment as it sees fit. If it upholds the judgment, it shall refer the case, together with copies of all its records and documents, including the statement of objection, to an appeal court. If it amends the judgment, all the parties to the case shall be so informed and the normal procedural rules shall apply." Whenever a death sentence is imposed, the casefile must be referred to a court of appeal even if none of the parties has lodged an appeal. Article 194 of the Code stipulates that: "The time limit for filing an appeal or a request for review is 30 days. If no appeal is filed during that period, the right of appeal and review shall expire. If a death sentence is handed down, it shall be submitted to the court of appeal for review, even if none of the parties submits a request." The chamber assigned to hear the case in the appeal court was composed of five judges, in accordance with article 15 (1) of the Judiciary Act, which stipulates that: "Each district shall have one or more appeal courts, which shall comprise various specialized chambers, each consisting of three judges, with the exception of the criminal chamber hearing cases involving the death penalty, which shall be composed of five judges." The several sessions held to consider the case of the persons in question in the Appeal Court were attended by the Public Prosecutor, the defendants and their lawyers, in accordance with article 197 (1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which stipulates that: "The Appeal Court shall schedule a session to consider the petition for appeal or scrutiny and, if it decides to hear submissions, it shall notify the parties concerned to attend that session." The Court then examined the casefile of the persons in question and heard the statements of all the parties involved, in accordance with article 197 (2) of the Code, which stipulates that: "The Appeal Court shall consider the petition for appeal or scrutiny on the basis of the documents contained in the casefile and on the basis of new pleadings or information submitted by the parties to support their challenge, as per the memorandum of appeal. Having heard from the parties to the petition for appeal or scrutiny (if it has decided to hear submissions), the Court shall decide either to uphold the judgment or to overturn it, either fully or in part, and shall issue its own judgment in that regard." The Appeal Court upheld the ruling to impose the death sentence on the persons concerned. Should an appeal court impose a death sentence or uphold such a ruling, it is legally mandatory under article 199 of the Code to refer the casefile to the Supreme Court, even if none of the litigants so request. It was referred to the Supreme Court in accordance with article 10 of the Code, which stipulates that: "Death sentences imposed or upheld by an appeal court shall not be final until

they have been confirmed by the Supreme Court.” Article 198 of the Code stipulates that: “The convicted person, the public prosecutor or the civil claimant may lodge an objection in cassation with the Supreme Court against judgments or rulings delivered or upheld by an appeal court.” The chamber assigned to hear the case in the Supreme Court is composed of five judges, in accordance with article 10 (4) of the Judiciary Act, which states that, without prejudice to the provisions of article 13 of the Act, the Supreme Court shall exercise its jurisdiction through specialized chambers, each of which shall be composed of three judges, with the exception of the criminal chamber that hears cases involving the death penalty, which shall be composed of five judges. Each chamber has a president. The persons in question are currently detained on the basis of their conviction of terrorist crimes. Their cases remain under judicial review in the Supreme Court.

The procedures and safeguards observed in the case of the persons in question are consistent with international fair trial and due process standards, including safeguards guaranteeing protection of the rights of persons facing the death penalty, in accordance with the provisions of Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) resolution No. 50/1984 of 25 May 1984.

It should be noted that the death penalty is imposed only for the most serious crimes and in extremely limited circumstances. It is not imposed or implemented until judicial proceedings at all levels of jurisdiction have been completed. The Kingdom’s legislation provides all guarantees of a fair trial and due process that are consistent with the Kingdom’s international human rights obligations. The case must be heard by a bench of three judges in the court of first instance. The judgment is then referred to the appeal court, even if no party has filed an appeal, and is reviewed by a bench of five judges. If the appeal court endorses the death sentence, the case is referred to the Supreme Court and is reviewed by a bench of five judges. If the Supreme Court endorses the judgment, all stages of the proceedings have been completed and the judgment becomes final and enforceable, pursuant to article 210 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Judgments are also deemed to be final pursuant to article 212 of the Code.

We wish to underscore in this connection that the Kingdom’s legislation guarantees the right of all accused persons to a fair and public trial before an independent judiciary by providing numerous statutory safeguards, including those guaranteed by article 38 of the Basic Law of Governance, which states that there can be no offence and no penalty save on the basis of sharia or statutory provisions. In addition, article 3 of the Code of Criminal Procedure stipulates that no one may be sentenced to a criminal penalty save for an act that is prohibited by sharia or statutory law. Accordingly, Kingdom’s legislation contains many procedural guarantees that control the conduct of criminal proceedings and guarantee the rights of the accused by ensuring that all persons are presumed innocent until proven guilty by a final judgment. The allegations of torture are entirely unfounded. The persons in question were not tortured, since the Kingdom’s legislation prohibits the infliction of physical or moral harm on persons under arrest and their subjection to torture or degrading treatment. The interrogation of accused persons must be conducted in a manner that does not influence their will to make statements. They may not be required to take an oath or be subjected to coercive measures. Torture is criminalized and punishable under the Kingdom’s legislation. The Public Prosecution Service is required to investigate crimes in accordance with its legally prescribed mandate. It is independent and forms part of the judiciary in legal terms. According to the Statute of the Public Prosecution Service, no one has the right to interfere in its work. We wish to underscore that the Kingdom complies with its international obligations under the human rights treaties that it has ratified. Pursuant to article 47 of the Basic Law of Governance, citizens and residents have equal rights of recourse to law. Persons who have suffered damages are entitled to seek compensation pursuant to articles 153 and 215 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, and persons whose rights have been violated can lodge a complaint in accordance with the available legal remedies. The State institutions have a legal obligation to ensure that all individuals

are treated fairly, regardless of their religion, race, gender or nationality. If any such institution or its representative violates any rights, there are a number of mechanisms that guarantee effective human rights safeguards, in accordance with the applicable legal procedures. They include the judiciary and governmental and non-governmental human rights institutions. This is consistent with article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and with articles 2, 15 and 16 of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

We wish to reiterate in this context that torture is criminalized and punishable under the Kingdom's legislation, which includes a number of safeguards and measures aimed at ensuring that no detainee or prisoner is subjected to torture, ill-treatment or any other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment. Article 2 of the Code of Criminal Procedure stipulates that arrested persons shall not be subjected to physical or mental harm and shall not be subjected to torture or degrading treatment. Article 36 of the Code requires that detained persons be treated decently and that they should not be subjected to physical or mental harm. They must be informed of the reasons for their detention and they are entitled to notify a person of their choice thereof. Article 102 of the Code requires the interrogation of accused persons to be conducted in a manner that does not influence their will to make statements. They may not be required to take an oath or be subjected to coercive measures. Furthermore, they may not be interrogated outside the premises of the investigating authority unless the investigator deems such action to be necessary.

Article 28 of the Prison and Detention Act prohibits the use of violence of any kind against prisoners or detainees and requires disciplinary measures to be taken against any civilian or military officials who perpetrate such acts, without prejudice to any criminal penalty that they may also incur. Pursuant to article 2 (8) of Royal Decree No. 43 of 1377 A.H. (1958 A.D.), public officials who, in the course of their duties, inflict ill-treatment or use coercion such as torture, cruelty, confiscation of property or denial of personal liberties, including exemplary punishment, imposition of fines, imprisonment, exile or mandatory residence in a certain place and illegal entry into private dwellings, face imprisonment for up to 10 years. All prisons and detention facilities in the Kingdom are subject to oversight and inspection, and the necessary measures are taken in the event of any violation. Members of the Public Prosecution Service monitor criminal investigation officers in the performance of their investigative duties, in accordance with article 25 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

With a view to enhancing oversight mechanisms and safeguarding the rights of prisoners and detainees, the Human Rights Commission, pursuant to article 5 (6) and (7) of its Statute, is entitled to visit prisons and detention centres at any time, without the need for permission from the competent authority, to receive and verify complaints relating to human rights, and to take the corresponding legal measures. In addition, the National Society for Human Rights, which is a civil society association, visits prisons and detention facilities and receives complaints. Offices have been opened in prisons for the Public Prosecution Service, and in some of them also for the Human Rights Commission and the National Society for Human Rights, so that they can monitor inmates' conditions of detention and receive complaints on the spot. The Kingdom's legislation requires all State bodies to guarantee justice for all, regardless of their religion, race, gender or nationality. If any such authority or its representative violates any rights, there are a number of mechanisms that guarantee effective human rights safeguards, in accordance with the applicable legal procedures. They include the judiciary and governmental and non-governmental human rights institutions.

The Kingdom is committed to the human rights treaties that it has ratified, including the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, which is deemed to constitute part of its legislation. This is consistent with the Kingdom's human rights obligations.

The persons in question confessed of their own free will to the investigating authority and confirmed their confessions to the charges filed against them before the judiciary, in accordance with article 101 (2) of the

Code of Criminal Procedure. They enjoyed full legal capacity and were not coerced, as already stated in section I above. The Court concluded, on taking the necessary measures to investigate the allegations, that they did not appear to be valid. The judge does not rely solely on the confession as evidence, but rather on the proof obtained from the evidence, including the records of the arrest and investigations, witness statements, and the discussions and statements stemming from the legal proceedings. A number of measures may be taken to that end, including hearings of witnesses, and recourse to experts, including forensic experts, for inspections and assistance, inasmuch as the trial is the final investigation requiring safeguards and protection for the parties to the case. Article 161 of the Code of Criminal Procedure stipulates that if the accused at any time confesses to the offence with which he is charged, the court shall hear his statements in detail and discuss them with him. Evidence that is proven to have been obtained through torture contravenes the provisions of the Islamic sharia and relevant legislation. According to article 187 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, any action that is inconsistent with the provisions of the Islamic sharia and the legislation derived therefrom is null and void.

III. With regard to the request for information on the current conditions of detention of Mr. Sultan and Mr. Thamer, including with regard to contacts with their families and lawyers, and how these conditions are consistent with the provisions of the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (The Mandela Rules):

The persons in question are treated in a manner that preserves their dignity and guarantees all their rights, just like other detainees and prisoners, and they enjoy the right to receive visits and to have regular and continuous contacts with their families, representatives and lawyers. They also receive the necessary medical care. They are in good health and are not suffering from any illnesses.

All detainees and prisoners undergo a medical examination upon arrival in prison, and periodically thereafter, in accordance with article 5 of the Medical Services Regulations. Medical care is available for all prisoners and detainees, in accordance with article 22 of the Prison and Detention Act. All prisons and detention centres in the Kingdom are subject to judicial, administrative, health and social inspections, in accordance with article 5 of the Prison and Detention Act, which stipulates that: "All prisons and detention centres in the Kingdom are subject to judicial, administrative, health and social inspections, in accordance with the implementing regulations." They enjoy the right to visits and communications, in accordance with article 12 of the Act. Every detainee or prisoner has the right to lodge a complaint pursuant to article 39 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which stipulates that: "Any prisoner or detainee shall have the right to submit, at any time, a written or oral complaint to a prison or detention centre officer and request that he communicate it to a member of the Public Prosecution Service. The officer shall accept and promptly communicate the complaint after registering it in the relevant file, and shall provide the prisoner or detainee with an acknowledgement of receipt. The administration of the prison or detention centre shall reserve an independent office for the member of the Public Prosecution Service who is tasked with monitoring cases involving prisoners or detainees."

These provisions are consistent with those of the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (The Mandela Rules), rule 24 (1) of which stipulates that: "The provision of health care for prisoners is a State responsibility. Prisoners should enjoy the same standards of health care that are available in the community." They are also consistent with rule 56 (1), which stipulates that "every prisoner shall have the opportunity each day to make requests or complaints to the prison director or the prison staff member authorized to represent him or her", with rule 30 concerning medical examinations, with rule 58 concerning visits and communications, and with principle 24 of the Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment, which stipulates that: "A proper medical examination shall be offered to a detained or imprisoned person as promptly as possible after his

admission to the place of detention or imprisonment, and thereafter medical care and treatment shall be provided whenever necessary. This care and treatment shall be provided free of charge.”

It may be concluded from the foregoing that the conditions of detention of the persons concerned are consistent with the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (The Mandela Rules) and with the Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment.

IV. With regard to the request to provide information on the existing procedures for persons sentenced to death to seek clemency or a pardon, and to provide detailed information on how they can access such procedures:

We wish to underscore that the death penalty is imposed only for the most serious crimes and in extremely limited circumstances. It is not imposed or implemented until judicial proceedings at all levels of jurisdiction have been completed. Their cases remain under judicial review in the Supreme Court, as already stated in section II above.

V. With regard to the request to provide information in detail on how the Government’s counter-terrorism efforts comply with United Nations Security Council resolutions 1373 (2001), 1456 (2003), 1566 (2004), 1624 (2005), 2178 (2014), 2341 (2017), 2354 (2017), 2368 (2017), 2370 (2017), 2395 (2017) and 2396 (2017), as well as with Human Rights Council resolution 35/34, and General Assembly resolutions 49/60, 51/210, 72/123, 72/180 and 73/174, in particular with the international human rights law, refugee law and humanitarian law contained therein:

The Kingdom is committed to combating terrorism and is taking vigorous action to achieve that goal, in accordance with its obligations relating to the purposes and principles of the United Nations, particularly international human rights law, the resolutions of the United Nations Security Council, including those listed above, the Declaration on Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism (1994) and the Declaration to Supplement the 1994 Declaration (1996). The Kingdom has taken effective steps to combat terrorism and to protect human rights, and it is determined to shoulder its responsibility to combat terrorism and its financing and to protect its security. The Kingdom’s national legislation provides for the criminalization of terrorism and the prosecution of its perpetrators. The Terrorist Crimes and their Financing Act contains a clear definition of the crime of terrorism that is consistent with international norms and the Kingdom’s international obligations. The provisions of the relevant legislation contain no vague or ambiguous terms and they are published and disseminated on governmental and other websites, to which everyone has access. As the Kingdom’s legislation is continuously reviewed, updated and expanded, the Terrorist Crimes and their Financing Act was amended in 2017 in order to reflect local and international developments and adjustments.

The Kingdom has spared no effort in combating terrorism and extremism and in criminalizing such acts, which require deterrent penalties. Law enforcement officers have successfully prevented numerous acts of terrorist violence and have thwarted many heinous terrorist plans, while demonstrating due regard for human rights.

The King Abdulaziz Centre for National Dialogue, which plays an important role in spreading moderation and promoting tolerance and coexistence, has launched numerous projects designed to achieve its goals. These include the Tibyan Project on combating extremism, which seeks to spread the values of moderation, tolerance and repudiation of all forms of extremism.

At the regional and international level, the Global Centre for Combating Extremist Ideology (“Itidal”), inaugurated on 25 Sha’ban 1438 A.H. (21 May 2017 A.D.) by the Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King Salman bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, is one component of the institutional framework for fighting terrorism. Working in collaboration with relevant States and organizations, the Centre monitors and analyses extremist ideology in order to

confront and prevent it. These efforts are consistent with the Kingdom's aforementioned obligations.

The Kingdom has played an effective and influential role in maintaining security and tackling the phenomenon of terrorism by adopting the requisite measures, including security and intellectual strategies for confronting terrorism, the imposition of financial restrictions and the protection and promotion of human rights.

It is clear from the foregoing that the information contained in the joint communication is inaccurate and comprises false allegations and assertions. The measures taken against the persons in question are consistent with and do not violate the international human rights treaties and norms that are of relevance to the allegations. They are also consistent with the Kingdom's obligations, including those stemming from its accession to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and with the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and of Security Council and General Assembly resolutions aimed at combating terrorism.

The Kingdom draws the attention of the special procedures mandate-holders of the Human Rights Council who participated in the dispatch of the communication to the Code of Conduct for Special Procedures Mandate-holders of the Human Rights Council adopted by resolution 5/2 of 18 June 2007, in particular the following provisions:

1. The mandate-holders should carry out their mandate while fully respecting the national legislation and regulations of the country wherein they are exercising their mission. Where an issue arises in this regard, mandate-holders should adhere strictly to the provisions of Regulation 1 (e) of the Regulations (article 4 (3) of the Code of Conduct).
2. The mandate-holders should give due consideration to the information provided on cases in carrying out their mandates (article 6 (a) of the Code of Conduct).
3. The information provided by the Kingdom regarding cases should be taken into account in a comprehensive manner (article 6 (b) of the Code of Conduct).
4. All information regarding cases, particularly assertions and allegations that the mandate-holders receive from sources, should be evaluated in light of internationally recognized human rights standards relevant to their mandate, and of international conventions to which the State concerned is a party (article 6 (c) of the Code of Conduct).
5. They should ensure that communications are not manifestly unfounded or politically motivated (article 9 (a) of the Code of Conduct).
6. They should ensure that the person or group of persons submitting the communication are acting in good faith in accordance with human rights principles, are free from politically motivated stands or stands that are contrary to the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, and claim to have direct or reliable knowledge of the violations substantiated by clear information (article 9 (d) of the Code of Conduct).
7. They should ensure that the communication is not exclusively based on reports disseminated by mass media (article 9 (e) of the Code of Conduct).
8. They should bear in mind the need to ensure that their personal political opinions are without prejudice to the execution of their mission, and to base their conclusions and recommendations on objective assessments of human rights situations (article 12 (a) of the Code of Conduct).
9. In implementing their mandate, they should show restraint, moderation and discretion so as not to undermine the recognition of the independent nature of their mandate or the environment necessary for the proper discharge of the said mandate (article 12 (b) of the Code of Conduct).

10. It is important to comply with article 13 (a) of the Code of Conduct by indicating fairly and without undue brevity what responses were submitted by the Kingdom.

11. They should ensure that their declarations on the human rights situation in the country are at all times compatible with their mandate and the integrity, independence and impartiality which their status requires and are likely to promote a constructive dialogue among stakeholders, as well as cooperation for the promotion and protection of human rights (article 13 (b) of the Code of Conduct).