Excellency,

We have the honour to address you in our capacity as 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.

In this connection, we would like to draw the attention of your Excellency’s Government to information we have received regarding the alleged enforced disappearance and torture of Mr. Omar Mohamed Mamoun Arnous and the incommunicado detention and denial of medical treatment of Mr. Khalil Matouk. Both individuals have been the subject to a previous communication sent to your Excellency’s Government on 2 November 2012 (SYR 9/2012) by the Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention; Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions; Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders; Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 16/4, 15/21, 16/5, 17/2, and 16/23.

According to new information received:

On 7 October 2012, Mr. Omar Mohamed Mamoun Arnous, a member of the Syrian Network for Human Rights (SNHR), was arrested at his place of residence, located in the District of Dummar, by members of the Military Security Branch of the Mezzeh district of Damascus.
He was reportedly last seen in February 2013 in a military hospital of the Syrian capital bearing serious signs of torture, and would have then been transferred to another unknown military hospital. It is reported that so far, the Syrian authorities have failed to disclose his whereabouts and information regarding his health condition.

It is also reported that on 2 October 2012, a group of armed men in civilian clothes arrested Mr. Khalil Matouk, human rights lawyer and executive director of the Syrian Centre for Legal Studies and Research. Following the arrest, Mr. Khalil Matouk was taken into incommunicado detention. It is reported that the human rights lawyer is being detained at State Security Branch 285 in Kafr Soussa in Damascus, however authorities have denied that this is the case.

It is alleged that Mr. Matouk has been in detention ever since, despite the fact that Syrian law only allows a person to be detained for a maximum of sixty days for the purposes of investigation. It is reported that when this sixty-day detention period expired a group of lawyers in the country wrote to the Attorney General in Damascus demanding the release of the human rights defender. The Attorney General allegedly replied that Mr. Matouk was not being held in detention despite the fact that recently released detainees confirmed that they had seen him in State Security Branch 285 within the past month. This raises concerns that the human rights lawyer has been subjected to an enforced disappearance..Reportedly, neither family nor lawyers have been permitted to see him to date and the recent statement from the Attorney General that he is not being held by the State raises serious and urgent questions regarding his safety and health.

It is also reported that Mr. Matouk suffers from a serious lung disease, which diminishes his lung capacity by 60% and has severe breathing difficulties due to reduced lung function. He is reportedly being denied medication, which he took regularly prior to his detention to help his condition.

We express grave concern at the aforementioned cases which form part of a much broader pattern of ongoing arrests and disappearances, on a daily basis, in the Syrian Arab Republic since protests broke out in February 2011. Our concerns are reinforced by serious reasons to believe that many of the detained or disappeared may have been tortured, otherwise ill-treated or denied adequate medical treatment.

Without in any way implying any conclusion as to the facts of the case, we should like to appeal to your Excellency’s Government to seek clarification of the circumstances regarding the case of Mr. Arnous and Mr. Matouk. 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 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT), which your Excellency’s Government acceded on 19 August 2004.
With regard to the unknown whereabouts and incommunicado detention of Mr. Arnous and Mr. Matouk, we would like to draw the attention of your Excellency’s Government to paragraph 8b of Human Rights Council Resolution 16/23, which reminds States that “Prolonged incommunicado detention or detention in secret places can facilitate the perpetration of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment and can in itself constitute a form of such treatment, and urges all States to respect the safeguards concerning the liberty, security and the dignity of the person and to ensure that secret places of detention and interrogation are abolished.”

With regard to the alleged torture of Mr. Arnous, 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 the attention of your Excellency’s Government 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 further like to draw your Excellency’s Government’s attention to paragraph 7b of Human Rights Council Resolution 16/23, which urges States “(t)o take persistent, determined and effective measures to have all allegations of torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment investigated promptly, effectively and impartially by an independent, competent domestic authority, as well as whenever there is reasonable ground to believe that such an act has been committed; to hold persons who encourage, order, tolerate or perpetrate such acts responsible, to have them brought to justice and punished in a manner commensurate with the gravity of the offence, 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 and the updated set of principles for the protection of human rights through action to combat impunity as a useful tool in efforts to prevent and combat torture.”

With regard to the alleged denial of medical care to Mr. Arnous and Mr. Matouk, we would like to draw the attention of your Excellency’s Government to the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners. Rule 22(2) provides that, “(s)ick prisoners who require specialist treatment shall be transferred to specialized institutions or to civil hospitals. Where hospital facilities are provided in an institution, their equipment, furnishings and pharmaceutical supplies shall be proper for the medical care and treatment of sick prisoners, and there shall be a staff of suitable trained officers. Furthermore, Rule 25(1) provides that, “(t)he medical officer shall have the care of the
physical and mental health of the prisoners and should daily see all sick prisoners, all who complain of illness, and any prisoner to whom his attention is specially directed” (approved by the Economic and Social Council by resolutions 663 C (XXIV) of 31 July 1957 and 2076 (LXII) of 13 May 1977).

In this connection, we would like to refer your Excellency's Government to article 9(3) of the ICCPR, which states: “Anyone arrested or detained on a criminal charge shall be brought promptly before a judge or other officer authorized by law to exercise judicial power and shall be entitled to trial within a reasonable time or to release. It shall not be the general rule that persons awaiting trial shall be detained in custody, but release may be subject to guarantees to appear for trial, at any other stage of the judicial proceedings, and, should occasion arise, for execution of the judgement.”; and article 9(4) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which states: “Anyone who is deprived of his liberty by arrest or detention shall be entitled to take proceedings before a court, in order that that court may decide without delay on the lawfulness of his detention and order his release if the detention is not lawful.”

We would further like to refer your Excellency's Government to the Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers, adopted by the Eighth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, Havana, Cuba, 27 August to 7 September 1990, and in particular principle 7, which states: “Governments shall further ensure that all persons arrested or detained, with or without criminal charge, shall have prompt access to a lawyer, and in any case not later than forty-eight hours from the time of arrest or detention.”; and principle 8, which states: “All arrested, detained or imprisoned persons shall be provided with adequate opportunities, time and facilities to be visited by and to communicate and consult with a lawyer, without delay, interception or censorship and in full confidentiality. Such consultations may be within sight, but not within the hearing, of law enforcement officials.”

In this connection, 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, and in particular to the 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 also 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 ICCPR, which provides that “Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media of his choice.”

We would further like to appeal to your Excellency's Government to take all necessary steps to ensure the right to freedom of association, as recognized in article 22 of the ICCPR, which provides that “Everyone shall have the right to freedom of association with others, including the right to form and join trade unions for the protection of his interests”.

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 aforementioned persons in compliance with the above international instruments.

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 information concerning the legal grounds for the arrest and detention of Mr. Arnous and Mr. Matouk and how these measures are compatible with international norms and standards as stated, inter alia, in the UDHR and the ICCPR.

4. Please provide the details, and where available the results, of any investigation, medical examinations, and judicial or other inquiries carried out in relation to this case. If no inquiries have taken place, or if they have been inconclusive, please explain why.

5. Please disclose the whereabouts of Mr. Arnous and Mr. Matouk.

6. Please provide the full details of any prosecutions which have been undertaken. Have penal, disciplinary or administrative sanctions been imposed on the alleged perpetrators?

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 above mentioned 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.
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Gabriela Knaul
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