Excellency,

We have the honour to address you in our capacity as Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention; Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression; Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association; Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders; Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers; and Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 15/18, 16/4, 15/21, 16/5, 17/2, and 16/23.

In this connection, we would like to draw the attention of your Excellency’s Government to information we have received regarding the trial of 94 individuals on charges of state security offences in the Federal Supreme Court in Abu Dhabi, case number 17/2013, as well as the alleged sentencing of Mr Abdullah Al-Hadidi for his reports on the trial.

Among the 94 individuals are many members of the civil society organisation Al-Islah (Society for Reform and Social Guidance), a long-standing civil society organisation in the United Arab Emirates operating in sectors such as education and charity peacefully calling for political debate and greater adherence to Islamic precepts. The group reportedly includes prominent human rights defenders, jurists and other people active in civil society. For a complete list of the 94 defendants, please see the attached Annex 1.

Some of the persons mentioned in this appeal have previously been the subject of communications to your Excellency’s Government. On 18 April 2012, a joint urgent appeal was sent to your Excellency’s Government expressing concern about the arrest, detention and stigmatisation of Mr Saleh Al Dhufairi, an online activist who frequently
criticised actions by the United Arab Emirates security forces on the social network Twitter. In a further joint urgent appeal sent to your Excellency’s Government on 15 May 2012, serious concern was expressed regarding the alleged detention and withdrawal of the Emirati nationality from Al-Islah members Mr Sheick Mohammad Abdel Razzak Al-Sadick, Dr. Ali Hussein Al-Hamadi, Dr. Shahin Abdallah Al-Huwsseni, Mr Hussein Mounif Al-Jaberi, Mr Hassan Mounif Al Jaberi, Mr Ibrahim Hassan Marzouki, Mr Ahmed Ghaith Al-Suwaidi, the alleged disappearance of Dr Ahmed Yousef Al-Zaabi following his detention, and the alleged renewed arrest of Mr Al Dhufairi. We regret that to date no response has been received to either communication, especially in light of the grave nature of the allegations described.

On 7 November 2012, a further joint urgent appeal was sent to your Excellency’s Government expressing grave concern regarding allegations of the mass arrest and detention of forty-one human rights defenders, judges and lawyers, almost all of whom are also the subject of the present communication. While we thank your Excellency’s Government for the response transmitted on 26 March 2013, we regret that no substantive information was contained therein about the situation of most of the persons mentioned in the communication.

According to the information received:

The 94 individuals have been arrested at various moments over the year leading up to the start of trial proceedings in two hearings on 4 and 11 March 2013. Reports have indicated that several defendants were denied the opportunity to be released on bail without any reason being provided.

The charges against the defendants reportedly include charges of ‘founding and administering an institution aimed at overthrowing the government’, based on Article 180 of the Federal Penal Code. Reports indicate that these charges may relate to comments in the media made by the defendants and their activities in civil society organisations such as the above mentioned Al-Islah association peacefully calling for political debate in the United Arab Emirates. It is reported that the prosecution considers Al-Islah to have a subversive agenda and links to the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood, an organisation banned in the United Arab Emirates.

Sources have informed that no timeframe or schedule has been set out for the trial. In the light of the long periods of up to one year which some of the defendants have reportedly spent in pre-trial detention, it is alleged that this may lead to excessively protracted court proceedings before a verdict is reached.

It is reported that in the time immediately previous to the hearings, international observers from leading human rights organisations were denied entry into the country, that a further 20 international observers, including judges and human rights activists, were denied entry to the courtroom on both dates when hearings took place, and that journalists were allegedly prevented from interviewing...
relatives of some of the defendants in the immediate surroundings of the courthouse.

Allegations of the use of torture and/or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment

A confession by Mr. Ahmad Ghaith Al-Suwaidi allegedly constitutes a central piece of evidence supporting the charges. Nonetheless, it is reported that during the hearing of 4 March, Mr. Al-Suwaidi made a statement in court denying all charges and alleging that his previous confession had been extracted under torture and following threats to his life and that of his family. He reportedly mentioned believing that exposing this in court would put his and his family’s lives at risk.

It is further alleged that several of the detainees were kept in conditions that, if found to be accurate, may amount to torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment. Reports allege that some detainees were kept in small cells of 2.5 x 3 metres with lights kept on during the night, permitted to wear virtually no clothing despite powerful airconditioning being on, had access to insufficient toilet facilities, were kept in lengthy interrogation sessions while blindfolded and in some cases subject to physical abuse including beatings and the extraction of fingernails. It is alleged that during court hearings, detainees including Messrs. Mohammed Abdulrazzaq Alsidiq, Ahmed Al-Zaabi and Essa Al-Sari reported having been targeted with such practices.

It is reported that a number of detainees displayed physical signs of torture during hearings, and that during the hearing on 11 March, relatives of Mr. Essa Al-Sari in particular were alarmed at the deterioration in his mental health that he appeared to have suffered since being detained. It is reported that some of the defendants have spent a period of up to one year in such conditions while in pre-trial detention.

Sources have informed that the judges have refused to set up an investigation into these allegations. Nonetheless, it has been alleged that the secretary to the presiding judge in the case previously worked as registrar of the state security prosecution team, and that in this capacity he would have had knowledge of first-hand reports from detainees complaining of harsh prison conditions such as the allegations detailed.

Fair trial concerns

Reports have been received of irregularities during the trial which could, if accurate, indicate that international minimum standards for the conduct of a fair trial have not been adhered to at all times.
Sources have informed that the judges of the Federal Supreme Court are appointed by the ruling royal families of the United Arab Emirates, who have reportedly delivered numerous statements to national news media condemning the defendants in case 17/2013. It is further reported that the judges are not Emirati nationals, but foreign judges working on temporary contracts whose employment and residence in the United Arab Emirates is therefore dependent on their visas being extended. These circumstances give rise to concerns that the independence of the judges might be compromised.

It is further reported that on at least two occasions, in July 2012 and on 4 March 2013, judges’ orders were temporarily overruled by security forces.

Sources have informed that on several occasions, the principle of equality of arms may have been compromised. It has been reported that:
- the indictment of the defendants was only supplied to the defence team after the first hearing on 4 March 2013;
- the presiding judges initially refused to accept the submission of the defence’s documents and to include them in the court bundle;
- the prosecution team retires to the same chamber as the presiding judges during breaks in the court proceedings while the defence team is not permitted to do this.

It is further alleged that there have been significant breaches of lawyer-client privilege. Allegations have been received that:
- not all of the defendants were afforded an opportunity to meet with the lawyers representing them prior to the start of the hearings;
- all legal conferences between the defendants and their legal representatives have taken place in the presence of State security officials;
- opportunities for the defendants to give instructions to their legal team are severely restricted due to the presence of security officials physically separating the defendants from their lawyers.

Reportedly, there is no right to appeal the decisions of the Federal Supreme Court. Furthermore, it is reported that the wide and ambiguous definitions of certain crimes allow for the arbitrary and undue restrictions of the legitimate exercise of human rights. Notably, it is alleged that any criticism of the Government can be enlisted under the crime of weakening the State's morale, and any criticism of the ruling elite can be prosecuted under the crime of sedition, which would constitute serious limitations to the right to freedom of opinion and expression.

Mr Abdullah Al-Hadidi
Mr Abdullah Al-Hadidi was reportedly permitted to attend the courtroom sessions of case 17/2013 and as such he fulfilled an important role in documenting the trial, including through posts on the social network Twitter. It is reported that he
also coordinated the compilation of evidence for the defence between the various families of the defendants.

Reports indicate that on 22 March 2013, Mr Abdullah Al-Hadidi was arrested at his family home in Sharjah by plainclothes policemen who failed to produce an official arrest warrant. Mr Al-Hadidi was then reportedly brought to Sharjah police station and subsequently to Abu Dhabi later that day.

Sources inform that Mr Al-Hadidi was officially charged on 28 March with publishing details of a public trial session “without probity and in bad faith” under Article 265 of the Penal Code. The court reportedly invoked Article 46 of the Federal Decree on Cyber-Crime as well.

It is reported that on 8 April 2013, Mr Al-Hadidi was sentenced to ten months imprisonment by the Abu Dhabi Court of First Instance, although he was acquitted of a second charge of using force against police personnel, relating to a complaint by a courtroom guard who forcibly ejected Mr Al-Hadidi from the courtroom during the 19 March 2013 hearing of case 17/2013.

We are deeply concerned at the allegations received indicating that that torture and/or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment may have occurred during pre-trial detention and that the court has failed to adequately investigate these allegations, in particular in the light of the fact that the reliability of a central piece of evidence appears to have been called into question and tainted by allegations that it was obtained under torture. Very serious concern is expressed that breaches of the principles of equality of arms and lawyer-client privilege may have occurred, thus raising concerns that international minimum standards for fair trial conduct may not have been adhered to at all times. In this connection, concern is further expressed at reports of the imprisonment of Mr Al-Hadidi for publishing reports of the trial on Twitter and at reports that international observers were denied access to at least two hearings. In addition, concern is expressed at the allegations that the criminal charges against the ninety-four individuals and their current situation may stem from their involvement in peaceful calls for greater political reforms in Emirati society, particularly as it will not be possible for defendants to appeal a verdict.

Without expressing at this stage an opinion on the facts of the case and on whether the detention of the aforementioned persons is arbitrary or not, we would like to appeal to your Excellency's Government to take all necessary measures to guarantee their right not to be deprived arbitrarily of their liberty and to fair proceedings before an independent and impartial tribunal, in accordance with articles 9 and 10 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR).

Furthermore, we would like to stress that each Government has the obligation to protect the right to physical and mental integrity of all persons. This right is set forth inter alia in the UDHR and the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT).
We would also like to draw your Excellency’s Government’s attention to the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (adopted by the Economic and Social Council by resolutions 663 C (XXIV) of 31 July 1957 and 2076 (LXII) of 13 May 1977). We would also like to draw your attention to the Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment adopted by the General Assembly on 9 December 1988 (adopted by General Assembly resolution 43/173 of 9 December 1988). The Committee against Torture and the Human Rights Committee have consistently found that conditions of detention can amount to inhuman and degrading treatment.

In this context, we would like to draw the attention of your Excellency’s Government to paragraph 1 of Human Rights Council Resolution 16/23 which “Condemns all forms of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, including through intimidation, which are and shall remain prohibited at any time and in any place whatsoever and can thus never be justified, and calls upon all States to implement fully the absolute and non-derogable prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.”

We would also like to draw your Excellency’s Government’s attention to article 12 of the CAT, which requires the competent authorities to undertake a prompt and impartial investigation wherever there are reasonable grounds to believe that torture has been committed, and article 7 of the CAT, which requires State parties to prosecute suspected perpetrators of torture. We would also like to draw your Excellency’s Government’s attention to paragraph 6b of Human Rights Council Resolution 8/8, which urges States “To take persistent, determined and effective measures to have all allegations of torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment promptly and impartially examined by the competent national authority, to hold those who encourage, order, tolerate or perpetrate acts of torture responsible, to have them brought to justice and severely punished, including the officials in charge of the place of detention where the prohibited act is found to have been committed, and to take note in this respect of the Principles on the Effective Investigation and Documentation of Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (the Istanbul Principles) as a useful tool in efforts to combat torture”.

Regarding allegations received indicating that confessions were obtained under torture, we would further like to draw the attention of your Excellency’s Government to article 15 of the CAT, which provides that, “Each State Party shall ensure that any statement which is established to have been made as a result of torture shall not be invoked as evidence in any proceedings, except against a person accused of torture as evidence that the statement was made.”

Regarding allegations received indicating that the situation of the persons mentioned is linked to their legitimate human rights work, we would like to refer your Excellency’s Government to the fundamental principles set forth in the Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and
Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and in particular articles 1 and 2 which state that "everyone has the right individually or in association with others, to promote and to strive for the protection and realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms at the national and international levels” and that “each State has a prime responsibility and duty to protect, promote and implement all human rights and fundamental freedoms, inter alia, by adopting such steps as may be necessary to create all conditions necessary in the social, economic, political and other fields, as well as the legal guarantees required to ensure that all persons under its jurisdiction, individually and in association with others, are able to enjoy all those rights and freedoms in practice”.

Furthermore, we would like to bring to the attention of your Excellency’s Government the following provisions of the Declaration:

- article 5 points b) and c) which provide that for the purpose of promoting and protecting human rights and fundamental freedoms, everyone has the right to form, join and participate in non-governmental organizations, associations or groups, and to communicate with non-governmental or intergovernmental organizations.

- article 6 points b) and c) which provide that everyone has the right, individually and in association with others as provided for in human rights and other applicable international instruments, freely to publish, impart or disseminate to others views, information and knowledge on all human rights and fundamental freedoms; and to study, discuss, form and hold opinions on the observance, both in law and in practice, of all human rights and fundamental freedoms and, through these and other appropriate means, to draw public attention to those matters.

- article 9 para. 3 point c) which provides that everyone has the right, individually and in association with others to offer and provide professionally qualified legal assistance or other relevant advice and assistance in defending human rights and fundamental freedoms.

- article 12 paras 2 and 3 of the Declaration which provide that the State shall take all necessary measures to ensure the protection by the competent authorities of everyone, individually and in association with others, against any violence, threats, retaliation, de facto or de jure adverse discrimination, pressure or any other arbitrary action as a consequence of his or her legitimate exercise of the rights referred to in the Declaration. In this connection, everyone is entitled, individually and in association with others, to be protected effectively under national law in reacting against or opposing, through peaceful means, activities and acts, including those by omission, attributable to States that result in violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms, as well as acts of violence perpetrated by groups or individuals that affect the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms.
We would further like to appeal to your Excellency’s Government to take all necessary steps to secure the right to freedom of opinion and expression in accordance with fundamental principles as set forth in article 19 of the UDHR which provides that “[e]veryone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

We also recall that paragraph 7c of Human Rights Council Resolution 16/23 urges States “To ensure that no statement established to have been made as a result of torture is invoked as evidence in any proceedings, except against a person accused of torture as evidence that the statement was made, and calls upon States to consider extending that prohibition to statements made as a result of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, recognizing that adequate corroboration of statements, including confessions, used as evidence in any proceedings constitutes one safeguard for the prevention of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment;”

We would further like to call on your Excellency’s Government to take all necessary steps to secure the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association in accordance with fundamental principles as set forth in article 20 of the UDHR which provides that “[e]veryone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association. No one may be compelled to belong to an association.”

In this connection, we would like to refer to Human Rights Council resolution 21/16, and in particular operative paragraph 1 that “reminds States of their obligation to respect and fully protect the rights of all individuals to assemble peacefully and associate freely, online as well as offline, including in the context of elections, and including persons espousing minority or dissenting views or beliefs, human rights defenders, trade unionists and others, including migrants, seeking to exercise or to promote these rights, and to take all necessary measures to ensure that any restrictions on the free exercise of the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association are in accordance with their obligations under international human rights law.”

In view of the urgency of the matter, we would appreciate a response on the initial steps taken by your Excellency’s Government to safeguard the rights of the forementioned persons in compliance with the above international instruments.

With regard to the alleged lack of independence of the judiciary, we would like to refer your Excellency’s Government to the Basic Principles on the Independence of the Judiciary, adopted by the Seventh United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders held at Milan from 26 August to 6 September 1985 and endorsed by General Assembly resolutions 40/32 of 29 November 1985 and 40/146 of 13 December 1985, and in particular principle 1, which states: “The independence of the judiciary shall be guaranteed by the State and enshrined in the Constitution or the law of the country. It is the duty of all governmental and other institutions to respect and observe the independence of the judiciary.”
In relation to the alleged fair trial concerns, we would like to refer your Excellency's Government to article 14(1) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which states: “All persons shall be equal before the courts and tribunals. In the determination of any criminal charge against him, or of his rights and obligations in a suit at law, everyone shall be entitled to a fair and public hearing by a competent, independent and impartial tribunal established by law. The press and the public may be excluded from all or part of a trial for reasons of morals, public order (ordre public) or national security in a democratic society, or when the interest of the private lives of the parties so requires, or to the extent strictly necessary in the opinion of the court in special circumstances where publicity would prejudice the interests of justice; but any judgement rendered in a criminal case or in a suit at law shall be made public except where the interest of juvenile persons otherwise requires or the proceedings concern matrimonial disputes or the guardianship of children.”

We would also like to refer your Excellency’s Government to article 14(3) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which states: “In the determination of any criminal charge against him, everyone shall be entitled to the following minimum guarantees, in full equality: (b) To have adequate time and facilities for the preparation of his defense and to communicate with counsel of his own choosing.” In its General Comment No. 32, the Human Rights Committee further indicated that: “Adequate facilities’ must include access to documents and other evidence; this access must include all materials that the prosecution plans to offer in court against the accused or that are exculpatory.”

Regarding the right of appeal, we would like to refer to article 14(5) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which states: “Everyone convicted of a crime shall have the right to his conviction and sentence being reviewed by a higher tribunal according to law.”

Moreover, it is our responsibility under the mandates provided to us by the Human Rights Council, to seek to clarify all cases brought to our attention. Since we are expected to report on these cases to the Human Rights Council, we would be grateful for your cooperation and your observations on the following matters, when relevant to the case under consideration:

1. Are the facts alleged in the summary of the cases accurate?
2. Has a complaint been lodged by or on behalf of the alleged victims?
3. Please provide details regarding the legal basis for the detention of and charges against the 94 individuals, as well as for the sentence against Mr Abdullah Al-Hamadi, and please explain how these charges are compatible with international human rights law, inter alia, especially with regard to the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to freedom of association.
4. Please provide the details, and where available the results, of any investigation, and judicial or other inquiries carried out in relation to reported allegations of torture and/or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment as well as reports of breaches of fair trial standards. If no inquiries have taken place, or if they have been inconclusive, please explain why.

5. Please explain what measures have been taken to ensure that all international minimum standards for the conduct of a fair trial are adhered to in these cases.

6. Please explain what measures have been taken to ensure that individuals, including human rights defenders in the United Arab Emirates, are able to carry out their peaceful and legitimate activities without fear of judicial harassment or other restrictions.

We undertake to ensure that your Excellency’s Government’s response to each of these questions is accurately reflected in the report we will submit to the Human Rights Council for its consideration.

While waiting for your response, we urge your Excellency's Government to take all necessary measures to guarantee that the rights and freedoms of the aforementioned persons are respected and, in the event that your investigations support or suggest the above allegations to be correct, the accountability of any person responsible of the alleged violations should be ensured. We also request that your Excellency’s Government adopt effective measures to prevent the recurrence of these acts.

Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of our highest consideration.

El Hadji Malick Sow
Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention

Frank La Rue
Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression

Maina Kiai
Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association

Margaret Sekaggya
Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders

Gabriela Knaul
Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers

Juan E. Méndez
Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment

Annex 1. List of names of the 94 defendants in case 17/2013

1. Mohamed Saqer Al-Zaabi
2. Abdulrahman Khalifah Bin Sobaih
3. Saeed Naser Al-Tunaiji
4. Mohamed Jassim Al-Nuaimi
5. Ahmed Mohammed Al-Shaibah
6. Hamad Mohammed Al-Shamsi
7. Khaled Fadel Ahmed
8. Salem Mousa Alhalyan Al-Tuniji
9. Ahmed Hajji Al-Qobaisi
10. Ahmed Hassan Al-Rostomani
11. Tawfeeq Yousif Al-Sheikh
12. Ahmed Knyed Al-Muhairi
13. Ismael Abullah Al-Hosani
14. Adel Ahmed Al-Zarouni
15. Fahad Abdulqader Al-Hajiri
16. Jassim Rashid Al-Shamsi
17. Mohammed Abdullah Al-Shaami
18. Ahmed Mohamed Saleh Al-Hammadi
19. Khalaf Abdulrahman Al Rumaithi
20. Ali Mohammed Bin Hajar Al-Shehhi
21. Saleh Al-Dhufairi
22. Mohammed Abdulrazzaq Alsidiq
23. Ahmed Ghaith Al-Suwaidi
24. Dr. Ali Al Hammadi
25. Dr. Shaheen Alhosani
26. Husain Al Jabiri
27. Hassan Al Jabiri
28. Ibrahim al Marzooqi
29. Dr. Ahmed Al Zaabi
30. Dr. Sultan Bin Kayed Al Qasimi
31. Salim Sahooh
32. Ahmed Al Tabour Al Nuaimi
33. Abdulrahman Al -Hadidi
34. Dr. Mohamed Al Mansoori
35. Khalifa Al-Nuaimi
36. Rashid Omran Al Shamsi
37. Khalid Al Sheiba Al-Nuaimi
38. Omran Al Radhwan
39. Dr. Ibrahim Al Yassi
40. Mahmoud Al Hosani
41. Husain Al-Najjar
42. Dr. Mohamed Abdulla Al-Roken
43. Rashid Al-Roken
44. Abdullah Al-Hajiri
45. Essa Al-Sari
46. Salim Hamdoon Al Shehhi
47. Dr. Issa Khalifa Al-Suwaidi
48. Juma Darwish Al-Felasi
49. Tariq Al-Qasim
50. Dr. Saif Al Egleh
51. Hamad Roqait
52. Mohammed Abdan Al-Naqbi
53. Dr. Adnan Julfar
54. Tariq Hassan Al-Qattan
55. Musabeh Al-Rumaithi
56. Abdulrahmeem Al-Zaroon
57. Abdulsalam Darwish
58. Saeed Nasser Al-Wahidi
59. Ali Abdullah Mahdi Al Manie
60. Khalid Mohammed Al Yammahi
61. Hassan Mohammed Al Hammadi
62. Ahmed Saqer Al Suwaidi
63. Saif Aletr
64. Najeeb Amiri
65. Bader Abdulrahman Al Hammadi
66. Fuad Mohammed Alhammadi
67. Ahmed Saif Almatri
68. Dr. Ali Humaid Al Nuaimi
69. Abdulaziz Hareb
70. Ali Abdulla Alkhaja
71. Ahmed Awad Alsharqi
72. Jamal Awad Alsharqi
73. Abdulla Al-Jabri
74. Rashid Khalfan Bin Sabt
75. Ali Salim Algawws Al-Zaabi
76. Ali Saeed Al-Kindi
77. Khamis Saeed Al-Sam Al-Zyoudi
78. Dr. Hadif Al-Owais
79. Mohammed Al-Abdouli
80. Abdulrahim Naqi
81. Mansoor Al Ahmadi
82. Fatima Al Salaqi
83. Hadia Abdul Aziz
84. Dr. Jameela Al Shamsi
85. Ameena Al Shaibah
86. Huda Bin Karmel
87. Naeema Al Marzouqi
88. Naeema Yahya
89. Najeeba Al Hashimi
90. Hessa Al Dhufairi
91. Dr. Mariam Al Dhufairi
92. Majidah Al Faris
93. Najeeba Al Refaie
94. Fatima Humaidan Al Zaabi