

Mandates of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention; the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances; the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression; the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders; the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers; and the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment

REFERENCE:
AL CHN 20/2020

4 December 2020

Excellency,

We have the honour to address you in our capacities as Working Group on Arbitrary Detention; Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances; Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression; 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 42/22, 45/3, 43/4, 43/16, 44/8 and 43/20.

In this connection, we would like to bring to the attention of your Excellency's Government information we have received concerning **the detention, arrest and charging of human rights defender and lawyer Qin Yongpei and the alleged arbitrary detention and enforced disappearance of human rights defender and lawyer Chang Weiping in "residential surveillance at a designated location"**.

Mr. **Qin Yongpei** is a human rights defender and lawyer from Nanning City in the Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region. In his legal work, he has defended other human rights lawyers and acted on behalf of protestors detained in connection with demonstrations against pollution allegedly attributable to State-owned mining companies. He has been a vocal critic on social media of alleged Government corruption, human rights violations and abuse of power in China.

Mr. **Chang Weiping** is a human rights defender and lawyer from Baoji City, Shanxi Province. He has been a vocal advocate for the rights of lawyers in China and the rule of law. In his work as a lawyer, he has defended cases of human rights defenders, discrimination based on health status, sex, gender identity and sexual orientation. Mr. Weiping has also provided pro bono legal counsel for victims of defective vaccines, as well as women, LGBT persons, and persons living with HIV/AIDS and hepatitis B who face discrimination in the workplace.

The alleged enforced disappearance of Mr. Chang Weiping has already been brought to the attention of Your Excellency's Government, through an urgent action procedure transmitted by the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances on 5 November 2020.

Previous communications raising concerns as to alleged violations of the rights of Chinese human rights lawyers by State authorities have been addressed to your Excellency's Government by multiple Special Procedures mandate holders, including on:

- 13 August 2020 (JAL CHN 16/2020), concerning the trial and behind-closed-doors sentencing of human rights lawyer Mr. Yu Wensheng.
- 20 May 2019 (JUA CHN 9/2019), concerning alleged surveillance of human rights lawyer Mr. Jiang Tianyong following the completion of his prison sentence.
- 6 April 2018 (JAL CHN 7/2018), concerning the arrest, investigation and alleged detention of Mr. Chen Wuquan and the disbarment of Mr. Sui Muqing.
- 6 March 2018 (JUA CHN 5/2018), concerning the arrest, incommunicado detention and charges brought against Mr. Yu Wensheng.
- 22 March 2017 (JUA CHN 3/2017), concerning allegations of arbitrary arrest, short-term disappearance and prolonged incommunicado detention of four human rights lawyers.
- 28 December 2016 (JUA CHN 15/2016) and 2 December 2016 (JUA CHN 13/2016), concerning the bringing of compulsory criminal measures against Mr. Jiang Tianyong and his apparent incommunicado detention.
- 26 October 2016 (JAL CHN 9/2016), concerning intimidation and harassment of Ms. Li Wenzu and Mr. Wang Quanzhang, believed to be aimed at further intimidating their spouses, both human rights lawyers.
- 15 July 2015 (JUA CHN 6/2015), concerning the arrest and detention, including incommunicado detention, of more than 140 persons involved in the legal profession.
- 16 July 2014 (JUA CHN 7/2014), concerning the arrest, detention and harassment of multiple human rights lawyers.

We thank your Excellency's Government for its replies to the majority of the above-mentioned communications. While we welcome the commitment of the Government to defend the right of lawyers to practice their profession in China, we express concern at the continued receipt, subsequent to these responses, of information as to alleged violations of the rights of human rights lawyers in the country.

According to the information received:

Concerning Mr. Qin Yongpei:

In May 2018, Mr. Yongpei's lawyer's license was revoked by the Guangxi Justice Bureau and he was ordered to shut down his legal practice. Following this, he submitted a complaint to the Central Commission of Discipline Inspection against the Minister of Justice, Mr. Fu Zhenghua, claiming that the Minister had ordered the disbarring of human rights lawyers. The human rights

defender also took a civil suit against the Guangxi Justice Bureau for its decision concerning his lawyer's license. He subsequently established a legal consulting company.

On 31 October 2019, Mr. Yongpei was detained by ten police officers at the offices of his legal consulting company in Nanning City. The police involved in the operation searched the company's office, seizing computers. No warrant was shown by the police for the arrest of Mr. Weiping or the search of the office.

On the same date, police carried out a search, with a search warrant, at Mr. Yongpei's home and seized personal items, including electronic devices, belonging to him. No inventory of the seized items was provided to Mr. Yongpei's family.

Prior to his detention, Mr. Yongpei had been calling for the release of lawyers in detention in China, and was vocal on politically-sensitive subjects such as the pro-democracy protests in Hong Kong.

On 1 November 2019, Mr. Yongpei was placed in pre-trial detention, and was not informed of the reasons for his arrest or the charges against him. During the following month, requests by his two lawyers to meet with their client were refused by the Nanning Public Security Bureau. No written reasons for the refusals were provided. Further requests for information as to the alleged crime under which Mr. Yongpei had been detained were denied, on the basis that State secrets may be potentially leaked as a result. Subsequent challenges submitted by the two lawyers at the Nanning public prosecutor's department as to the conformity of these refusals with Chinese law and the rights of lawyers and suspects were ruled against.

On 3 December 2019, Mr. Yongpei was formally arrested on the charge of "inciting subversion of state power" under article 105(2) of the Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China (hereafter 'the Criminal Law'), with the indictment allegedly making reference to postings by Mr. Yongpei on social media platforms, as well as alleged plans by a group of disbarred Chinese lawyers, including Mr. Yongpei, to organize a moot court. Article 105(2) states the following: "Whoever incites others by spreading rumours or slanders or any other means to subvert the State power or overthrow the socialist system shall be sentenced to fixed-term imprisonment of not more than five years, criminal detention, public surveillance or deprivation of political rights; and the ringleaders and the others who commit major crimes shall be sentenced to fixed-term imprisonment of not less than five years."

In January and February 2020, requests by Mr. Yongpei's lawyers to meet with the human rights defender were again denied.

On 26 February 2020, Mr. Yongpei's two daughters were summoned for questioning by Nanning Police as to their father's social media posts and statements he may have made inside their home. A written summons was provided by police, however the family were not permitted a copy of it. The

questionings, which took place separately, were conducted at a Nanning police station. Neither were allowed legal assistance during the questioning.

On 30 April 2020, Mr. Yongpei was formally charged by the Nanning City Procuratorate under article 105(2) of the Criminal Law.

In May 2020, Mr. Yongpei was permitted a first meeting with his lawyers.

On 31 August 2020, the human rights defender was allowed a second meeting with his lawyers. He is currently detained at Nanning Municipal Detention Centre No.1. At the time of writing, there is no information known regarding the trial date. No pre-trial meeting has been held, nor has a hearing date been registered.

Concerning Mr. Chang Weiping

On 14 October 2018, the Baoji City Judicial Bureau suspended Mr. Weiping's law license, supposedly in retaliation for his professional work and being outspoken about and criticism of human rights violations. Once the three month suspension period lapsed, Mr. Chang Weiping began seeking employment with other law firms. His applications were rejected, in what is alleged to be a response to political pressure on law firms not to hire lawyers who dissent.

On 12 January 2020, Mr. Weiping was forcibly disappeared by officers of the Baiji City PSB Gaoxin District Sub-bureau and placed in "residential surveillance at a designated location" (RSDL). Mr. Weiping was reportedly detained on suspicion of "subversion of state power", allegedly in response to his attendance at a meeting held on 7-8 December 2019 in Xiamen City, Fujian. Following the meeting, a number of participants were detained and placed in RSDL.

On 13 January 2020, the Baoji City Judicial Bureau annulled Mr. Weiping's law license, as he had been unable to secure employment with a law firm, a requirement for his suspended law license to be reinstated.

Mr. Weiping was held in RSDL for 10 days, before being released on 21 January 2020 under "bail pending further investigation".

On 16 October 2020, Mr. Weiping published a video on YouTube, detailing his experience in RSDL in January. In the video, he alleged that he had been tortured by being tied to a "tiger chair", a torture device and well-documented practice by different UN human rights mechanisms, including by the Committee against Torture, for 24 hours a day throughout the 10 days. Mr. Weiping still suffers both psychological and physical affects from the torture, including numbness in his fingers, insomnia and difficulty concentratingⁱ. In the video, he asserted that, "Just in case I lose my freedom, I want to state in advance that I will not commit suicide, and I will not do anything to harm myself. Although I am disconcerted, I do not suffer from any fatal health problems. I will not accept any assigned lawyers. I have already appointed my own."

He also disclosed that in the ten months since being released from detention in RSDL, he and his family have been subjected to police harassment. The harassment against Mr. Weiping reportedly included almost daily calls from security officers regarding his whereabouts and activities that day, and weekly in-person interviews with security officials, which was transcribed. The conditions of Mr. Weiping's bail have also meant that he is restricted from leaving Baoji City, and so has not been able to reunite with his family in Shenzhen. The harassment of Mr. Weiping's family has included restricting the movement of his parents, and twice police have visited Mr. Weiping's wife, threatening her against speaking publicly about the case or giving foreign media interviews and if she did so, she risked being dismissed by her employer. Mr. Weiping's family have also suffered economically due to his inability to work in his profession and to provide for his household, since his law license was annulled in January.

During the afternoon of 22 October 2020, officers from Baoji City PSB Gaoxin District Sub-bureau detained Mr. Weiping at his home in his native village Shaanxi. No arrest warrant was presented by police, nor was any reason for his arrest reportedly given. That evening, Mr. Weiping's wife received a phone call, informing her that her husband was suspected of a "criminal offence" and had been placed under "residential surveillance in a designated location". She was not informed of any specific charges against him.

On 26 October 2020, the Baoji City PSB Gaoxin District Sub-bureau denied Mr. Weiping's lawyers' requests to meet with him and told the lawyers orally that he was suspected of "subversion of state power" and the case involved "state secrets". On 28 October 2020, the Baoji City PSB Gaoxin District Sub-bureau issued a written notice, denying the bail application made by Mr. Weiping's lawyers two days prior. The notice stated that due to "requirements in processing this case, it is more appropriate to subject the suspect to residential surveillance at a designated location." No specification was given as to what the "requirements" were.

On 1 November 2020, Mr. Weiping's family received a written RSDL notice, dated 22 October 2020. The notice stated that he is suspected of "inciting subversion of state power (Art. 105(2) of the Criminal Law) and had been placed in RSDL.

On 11 November 2020, the deputy chief of the National Security Bureau of Baoji City, Yang Yongke and Xiang Xianhong, deputy director of the Gaoxin District Sub-Bureau of the Baoji City Public Security Bureau visited Mr. Weiping's wife at her workplace in Shenzhen. They threatened her to delete her Weibo account and not to engage in activity online, and that her employers would "discipline" her if she did not comply.

On 23 November 2020, the two lawyers initially hired by Mr. Weiping's family to represent him, reportedly withdrew from the case due to pressure they had received from the respective justice departments in their areas, the Chongqing Municipal Bureau of Justice and the Hubei Provincial Bureau of Justice, for their involvement in his case. Neither of the lawyers had been granted the

opportunity to meet Mr. Weiping before withdrawing from the case. The family of Mr. Weiping have hired two new lawyers to represent him, neither of whom have been granted access to or contact with their client.

At the time of the present communication, the whereabouts of Mr. Weiping remain unknown.

While we do not wish to prejudge the accuracy of the information received, we express serious concern that Mr. Yongpei was charged with “inciting subversion of state power” and that Mr. Weiping was detained on suspicion of the same offense. The basis for these charges seem to be the legitimate exercise of Mr. Yongpei and Mr. Weiping’s legal profession and their right to freedom of expression. This criminalisation of the legitimate exercise of human rights with reference to national security would be incompatible with international human rights law. Our concerns are heightened by information previously received as to the prosecution of other human rights lawyers based on their exercise of the legal profession and their right to freedom of expression. These cases reveal what seems to be a broader pattern of restrictions on space for discussion and debate in China, whereby critical or dissenting opinions are characterised as threats to national security. As such, there appears to be a systematic stifling of dissent and targeting of those who exercise their right to freedom of expression, as well as those who promote it.

We express particular concern with regards to the prosecution of Mr. Weiping, given that his most recent detention appears to be in retaliation for his disclosure of his experience of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment and other human rights violations he was subjected to by the authorities while he was forcibly disappeared. We also wish to express our serious concern regarding the detention of Mr. Weiping in RSDL, the use of which has been found by the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances and the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, to amount to a form of enforced disappearance¹. A point of particular concern is the denial of Mr. Weiping’s guarantees to due process, placing him at risk of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment, punishment or torture whilst detained in RSDL. Furthermore, the detention of Mr. Weiping in RSDL is in contravention of his right not to be arbitrarily detained or deprived of liberty.

In connection with the above alleged facts and concerns, please refer to the **Annex on Reference to international human rights law** attached to this letter which cites international human rights instruments and standards relevant to these allegations.

As 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, we would be grateful for your observations on the following matters:

1. Please provide any additional information and/or comment(s) you may have on the above-mentioned allegations.

¹ See: https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Detention/Opinions/Session84/A_HRC_WGAD_2019_15.pdf, CHN 15/2018, A/HRC/36/39, para. 71 and A/HRC/19/58/rev.1 pages 36-37

2. Please provide information as to the factual basis for the arrest and bringing of the charge of “inciting subversion of State power” against Mr. Yongpei and how it is consistent with international human rights law.
3. Please provide information as to the legal basis for the searches conducted at the office of Mr. Yongpei's legal consulting company and his home, as well as for the seizure of any objects during said searches.
4. Please provide information about the legal assistance Mr. Yongpei is afforded as well as the forthcoming trial.
5. Please provide information as to the current whereabouts of Mr. Weiping, the legal and factual basis of his detention and placement in RSDL, as well as information as to why Mr. Weiping is suspected of “inciting subversion of state power”.
6. Please provide information as to the refusal of requests by Mr. Yongpei's lawyers to meet with him in November 2019 and January and February 2020, and by Mr. Weiping's lawyers in October 2020, as well as details of how access to legal representation of their choosing has been assured for the human rights defenders since these incidents.
7. Please provide the details, and where available the results, of any investigation, and judicial or other inquiries carried out in relation to consistent allegations of torture and/or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment of Mr. Weiping while in custody. If no investigation has been initiated, please explain why and how this is compatible with the international human rights obligations of China.
8. Please provide information as to the legal and factual basis for the questioning of Mr. Yongpei's daughters in February 2020 and the visit by officials to the workplace of Mr. Weiping's wife in November 2020.
9. Please provide details as to measures taken by the authorities to ensure the right of lawyers to practice their profession in a safe and enabling environment is guaranteed, including for human rights lawyers and those who may be working on issues deemed politically sensitive. If no such measures have been taken, please indicate a manner in which we may engage with your Excellency's Government as to the development of such measures.
10. Please provide an explanation as to how your Excellency's Government reconciles its narrative at the Human Rights Council on “poverty alleviation as a mean to promote and protect human rights” and the fact that restricting professional lawyers from their basic rights, including to practice their profession, is forcing them and their relatives into poverty.

This communication and any response received from your Excellency's Government will be made public via the communications reporting [website](#) within

60 days. They will also subsequently be made available in the usual report to be presented to the Human Rights Council.

While awaiting a reply, we urge that all necessary interim measures be taken to halt the alleged violations and prevent their re-occurrence and in the event that the investigations support or suggest the allegations to be correct, to ensure the accountability of any person(s) responsible for the alleged violations.

We may publicly express our concerns in the near future as, in our view, the information upon which the press release will be based is sufficiently reliable to indicate a matter warranting immediate attention. We also believe that the wider public should be alerted to the potential implications of the above-mentioned allegations. The press release will indicate that we have been in contact with your Excellency's Government's to clarify the issue/s in question.

We would like to inform your Excellency's Government that having transmitted an allegation letter to the Government, the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention may transmit the case through its regular procedure in order to render an opinion on whether the deprivation of liberty was arbitrary or not. Such communications in no way prejudice any opinion the Working Group may render. The Government is required to respond separately to the allegation letter and the regular procedure.

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

Elina Steinerte
Vice-Chair of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention

Tae-Ung Baik
Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances

Irene Khan
Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression

Mary Lawlor
Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders

Diego García-Sayán
Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers

Nils Melzer
Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment

Annex

Reference to international human rights law

In connection with above alleged facts and concerns, we would like to draw the attention of your Excellency's Government to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), signed by China on 5 October 1998. While China is yet to ratify the ICCPR, as a signatory to the ICCPR, China has an obligation to refrain from any acts which would defeat the object and purpose of the Covenant prior to its entry into force (article 18 of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties). We would like to refer to articles 9 and 10 of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights which prohibits in absolute terms arbitrary arrest and guarantees everyone the right to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him. In this context, we would also like refer to relevant provisions of the United Nations Basic Principles and Guidelines on remedies and procedures on the right of anyone deprived of their liberty to bring proceedings before a court. More specifically, Principles 7 and 10 refer to the right to be informed of the reasons justifying the deprivation of liberty as well as the right to bring proceedings before a court to challenge the arbitrariness and lawfulness of the deprivation of liberty

Furthermore, we would like to refer to article 19 of the UDHR, which guarantees the right to freedom of opinion and expression. The rights to freedom of opinion and expression are further expressed in all global and regional human rights treaties on civil and political rights, confirmed in declarations and resolutions, and is considered reflective of customary international law. As expressed in UDHR article 19, "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".

The conditions for permissible restrictions too are reflected in the UDHR and in numerous regional and global human rights treaties:

First, any restriction must pursue a legitimate objective. The UDHR in article 29, for example, limits those objectives strictly ("solely for the purpose of") to the "respect for the rights and freedoms of others and to meet just requirements of morality, public order and general welfare in a democratic society". Secondly, as expressed in UDHR art. 29, as well as in global and regional human rights treaties, any restriction must be "determined by law". Practice by international monitoring bodies have not only a requirement on the form, but also the quality of the law. Thus, for example, the Human Rights Committee has expressed that laws must be "formulated with sufficient precision to enable an individual to regulate his or her conduct accordingly and it must be made accessible to the public. A law may not confer unfettered discretion for the restriction of freedom of expression on those charged with its execution". With respect of criminal laws, the requirement of clarity is even more strict, see UDHR art. 11. Third, restrictions must be necessary and proportionate. The UDHR art. 30, for example, prohibits the use of overbroad restrictions which would destroy the essence of the right itself. This has been interpreted as an expression of the principle of proportionality. The requirement further entails that the measure must be the least intrusive measure

necessary amongst those which might achieve their protective function in order to protect a specified legitimate objective. Lastly, States have the burden of proof to demonstrate that any restriction is compatible with the requirements under customary international law.

The right to freedom of expression is a precondition for democracy, the enjoyment of other human rights and for the accountability of authorities. It follows that the systematic use of criminal law to silent dissent would be incompatible with the human rights obligations of the State.

Moreover, we would like to remind your Excellency's Government of the absolute and non-derogable prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment as codified in articles 2 and 16 of the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT), and also provided for in article 5 of the UDHR and article 7 of the ICCPR. In its resolution 3452 (XXX), the General Assembly rightly declared any act of torture or ill-treatment is an offence to human dignity and "a denial of the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations" (annex, para. 2).

The United Nations Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearances recognises the right to be held in an officially recognised place of detention, in conformity with national law and to be brought before a judicial authority promptly after detention in order to challenge the legality of the detention (article 10). The same article of the Declaration establishes the obligation of the detaining authorities to make available accurate information on the detention of persons and their place of detention to their family, counsel or other persons with a legitimate interest (article 10). The Declaration also establishes the obligation to maintain in every place of detention an official up-to-date register of detained persons (article 12) and provides that no circumstances whatsoever, whether a threat of war, a state of war, internal political instability or any other public emergency, may be invoked to justify enforced disappearances (article 7).

China has expressed on several occasions its support for the international community's efforts to eliminate and prevent enforced disappearances, including at the UN Human Rights Council.ⁱⁱ The Working Group observes that RSDL, where it consists of placing individuals under incommunicado detention for investigation for prolonged periods without disclosing their whereabouts amount to secret detention and is a form of enforced disappearance (A/HRC/36/39, para. 71 and A/HRC/19/58/rev.1 pages 36-37).

We would like to refer 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, held in Havana (Cuba) from 27 August to 7 September 1990.

The Basic Principles require governments to take all appropriate measures to ensure that lawyers are able to perform all of their professional functions without intimidation, hindrance, harassment or improper interference, and to prevent that lawyers be threatened with prosecution or administrative, economic or other sanctions for any action taken in accordance with recognized professional duties, standards and ethics (principle 16).

The Basic Principles include a specific provision on the exercise of fundamental freedoms, stating that like other citizens, lawyers “are entitled to freedom of expression, belief, association and assembly”, and have the right to take part in public discussion of matters concerning the law, the administration of justice and the promotion and protection of human rights. Lawyers are also free “to join or form local, national or international organizations and attend their meetings, without suffering professional restrictions by reason of their lawful action or their membership in a lawful organization” (principle 23).

We would also 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, also known as the UN Declaration on Human Rights Defenders. In particular we would like to refer to article 6 paragraph (b), which guarantees the right to freely publish, impart or disseminate views, information and knowledge on human rights and fundamental freedoms; and article 6 paragraph (c), which guarantees the right to study, discuss, form and hold opinions on the observance, both in law and practice, of all human rights and fundamental freedoms and to draw attention to these matters. We would also like to make explicit reference to article 9 of the Declaration, and its third clause in particular, which in its paragraph (c) states that everyone has the right, individually and association with others, to offer and provide professionally qualified legal assistance or other relevant advice and assistance in defending human rights and fundamental freedoms. Finally, we would like to reference article 11 of the Declaration, which states that everyone has the right, individually and in association with others, to the lawful exercise of his or her occupation or profession.

We would like to remind your Excellency's Government of principle 9 and guideline 8 of the United Nations Basic Principles and Guidelines on Remedies and Procedures on the Right of Anyone Deprived of Their Liberty to Bring Proceedings Before a Court, which state that all persons deprived of their liberty have the right to legal assistance by counsel of their choice at any time during their detention, including immediately after their apprehension, and such access shall be provided without delay. The denial of access to lawyers of one's choosing violates the right to legal assistance guaranteed under articles 10 and 11 (1) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, principles 15, 17 and 18 of the Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment and rule 61 (1) of the Nelson Mandela Rules.

i https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT/C/CHN/CO/5&Lang=En

ii Statement made at the 36th session of the Human Rights Council, September 2017