

**Mandates of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention; the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances; the Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health; the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders and the Working Group on discrimination against women and girls**

Ref.: AL CHN 17/2024  
(Please use this reference in your reply)

3 January 2025

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 right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health; Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders and Working Group on discrimination against women and girls, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 51/8, 54/14, 51/21, 52/4 and 50/18.

In this connection, we would like to bring to the attention of your Excellency's Government information we have received concerning the **sentencing in October 2024 by the Huixian Municipal Court in Xinxiang, Henan Province, of woman human rights defender He Fangmei to five years and six months in prison and the apparent disappearance of two of her children.**

Ms. **He Fangmei** is a health rights defender, who has been advocating for vaccine safety and access to remedies for victims of defective vaccines. She started seeking accountability and compensation after her daughter, who was born in 2016, was diagnosed with a neurological disease which paralyzed her after receiving defective vaccines in March 2018. Ms. He co-founded the "Home for Vaccine Babies", an informal network of families whose children developed a serious illness or disability after being injected defective vaccines. The network advocates for accountability, financial compensation, assistance with medical bills, as well as legislative action.

Special Procedures mandate holders have previously raised their concerns with your Excellency's Government concerning the alleged enforced disappearance, detention and charges against Ms. He in a communication ([AL CHN 10/2022](#), sent on 1 December 2022). We thank your Excellency's Government for the [response](#), dated 12 January 2023, received to this communication.

An earlier case of detention of Ms. He in 2018-2019 was addressed by the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention in its [opinion No. 32/2020](#). The Working Group determined that Ms. He's detention was arbitrary and fell into categories I, II, III and V. In particular, her secret detention at an extrajudicial location was considered arbitrary *per se*, given that it involved elements of incommunicado detention and enforced disappearance.

According to the information received:

*Previous detention in 2019*

On 25 February 2019, Ms. He Fangmei was seized by the police while she was demonstrating in front of the National Health Commission in Beijing with other families of children who had been stricken with illness or disability due to faulty vaccines.

On 4 March 2019, Ms. He was forcibly returned from Beijing to her home Province of Henan by the Henan police and subsequently detained. On 5 March 2019, she was ordered to serve a 15-day administrative detention sentence.

On 20 March 2019, Ms. He's husband was informed that she had been formally placed in criminal detention by the Huixian county Public Security Bureau in Xinxiang for "picking quarrels and provoking trouble" and was detained at the Xinxiang detention centre. Ms. He was told that she would be released if she admitted guilt, but she refused to do so.

On 26 April 2019, Ms. He was formally arrested. Her husband was only informed about her arrest two days later, without ever receiving an arrest notice.

Ms. He did not have access to a lawyer for three and a half months after the start of her criminal detention. When a lawyer requested to meet Ms. He in June 2019, they were reportedly told by the authorities that such a visit would "endanger national security".

On 3 July 2019, a lawyer was finally able to meet with Ms. He.

On 26 July 2019, the Procuratorate indicted Ms. He and assigned the case to the Huixian City People's Court. According to the indictment, prosecutors accused her of "picking quarrels" for soliciting donations, shouting slogans outside the Beijing offices of two government departments, unfurling a banner with slogans and disseminating an image of the banner online. After that, her lawyer applied twice for her release on "bail pending investigation", but the Procuratorate rejected the requests.

On 15 November 2019, Ms. He was put on trial at the Huixian County Court. At the hearing, she pleaded not guilty. Prosecutors recommended a one-year prison sentence. The trial ended without a verdict being pronounced.

On 10 January 2020, the Huixian County prosecutors dropped the charges against Ms. He, and she was subsequently released.

*Current case against Ms. He Fangmei*

On 2 October 2020, Ms. He went to the Huixian Municipal Government Office and splashed black ink at the front entrance, to protest the lack of

remedies for her daughter's illness and failure to provide compensation for her previous detention in 2019. She was also protesting the close police surveillance and the restrictions to freedom of movement she and her family were subjected to, which obstructed their travel to Beijing, where her daughter could have obtained better quality medical care. Ms. He was detained by the local public security office and initially handed down a 10-day administrative detention, but the police released her without enforcing the sentence because she was five months pregnant.

On 9 October 2020, Ms. He returned to the same Government building and once again splashed black paint at the front entrance. She was then taken by the police and became unreachable sometime between 9 and 10 October 2020.

On 14 October 2020, Ms. He's husband was taken away in Beijing by individuals believed to be Huixian local police and became uncontactable as well.

In the subsequent weeks, acquaintances and families of victims of defective vaccines made multiple phone calls to the local public security office to enquire about Ms. He's fate and whereabouts, to no avail. Ms. He's family made several visits to the local police station and the Prosecutor's Office, among other places, to inquire about her fate and whereabouts, but the authorities consistently refused to provide any information. Her state of health and whether she has had access to healthcare services is also unknown.

In March 2022, in what was the first known official statement about her detention since her enforced disappearance in October 2020, Ms. He's family received an arrest notice issued by the Huixian Public Security Bureau, dated 23 March 2022, stating that she had been arrested on the charges of "bigamy" and "picking quarrels and provoking trouble". The notice indicated she was detained at the Xinxiang City Detention Centre, in Henan province.

Reports also indicated that Ms. He's case had already gone to trial at a court of first instance in Huixian, during which the prosecutors recommended a sentence of between five and seven years. No verdict was announced. Her family-appointed lawyers only found out about the trial after it had already been concluded, and they were reportedly denied access to the case files. The authorities did not allow them to meet Ms. He on grounds of "COVID-19 prevention measures". The court in Huixian also later denied the lawyer's request to review the case files, on the basis that the trial had already taken place and that the panel of judges had already concluded their deliberations. The court asked the lawyer to submit his opinions in writing.

Ms. He's family then learned that since October 2020, the human rights defender had been detained along with her then 6-year-old son and 4-year-old daughter with a disability at the Henan Xinxiang Gongji Psychiatric Hospital, where she gave birth to her third child, a girl, in February 2021. At an unknown date between 2020 and 2022, Ms. He's son was moved into foster care in a rural area, without his parents or any relatives' consent, while her two daughters remained in the psychiatric hospital despite Ms. He's family's pleas

to have them released into their care.

At an unknown date around March 2022, Ms. He was transferred to Xinxiang City Detention Centre and forcibly separated from her daughters, who reportedly remained confined in the psychiatric hospital with no access to education nor to specialized care for the elder daughter with a disability. The younger daughter, born in detention in 2021, has reportedly never been officially registered, on the pretext that the birth certificate was not provided to the household registration authority.

In January 2023, a lawyer appointed by Ms. He's family was finally able to meet the human rights defender at the Xinxiang City Detention Centre for the first time since her enforced disappearance in October 2020. He learned that Ms. He had no legal representation during her trial in March 2022. Ms. He also informed her lawyer that during her trial hearing, she was told that her husband had been convicted on the same charges as the ones she was facing and had been sentenced to five years in jail. However, the court did not give her a copy of the verdict and only "flipped through it" in front of her briefly during the trial.

On 19 May 2023, Ms. He wrote to her older sister to entrust her three children to her care. However, neither the Henan Xinxiang Gongji Psychiatric Hospital nor the Huixian Public Security Bureau allowed the children's relatives to visit them. Ms. He's family members were not allowed to visit the human rights defender's son in his foster family either.

On an unknown date in April 2024, Ms. He's two daughters, who were then approximately seven-and-a-half and three years old, were reportedly taken from the psychiatric hospital to an unknown location. Their family has not been able to locate them nor obtain information about their well-being, despite multiple attempts to contact local authorities.

On 23 October 2024, more than 30 months after her trial in first instance, the Huixian Municipal Court in Xinxiang, Henan Province pronounced a verdict in Ms. He Fangmei's case and sentenced her to one year and nine months in prison for "bigamy" and four years for "picking quarrels and provoking trouble", amounting to a total term of five years and six months in prison. Her sentence is scheduled to end on 1 January 2027.

As of the time of writing, the fate and whereabouts of Ms. He's daughters are still unknown.

While we do not wish to prejudge the accuracy of these allegations, we express our serious concern regarding the conviction and sentencing of Ms. He Fangmei on charges of "bigamy" and "picking quarrels and provoking trouble", in apparent retaliation to exercising her right to freedom of expression and freedom of peaceful assembly as part of her legitimate human rights work, in particular her advocacy for vaccine safety and remedy for victims of defective vaccines. The use of vaguely worded provisions such as "picking quarrels and provoking trouble" and their persistent use against human rights defenders to unduly criminalize their legitimate

activities and the exercising of their freedom of expression is cause for serious concern, as has been communicated by Special Procedures mandate holders to your Excellency's Government on a number of occasions in recent years (AL [CHN 12/2024](#), UA [CHN 12/2021](#), AL [CHN 4/2021](#), UA [CHN 11/2020](#), AL [CHN 22/2019](#), AL [CHN 15/2019](#), UA [CHN 14/2019](#)).

We also wish to express concern for the alleged lack of adherence to due process guarantees in the trial of Ms. He Fangmei and the reported obstacles preventing Ms. He from meeting with her legal representative in order to prepare her legal defense prior to the trial. We call on your Excellency's Government to ensure that lawyers are able to perform all their professional functions without improper interference and that all persons are entitled to access a lawyer of their choice to defend them in all stages of criminal proceedings.

Furthermore, we wish to express our utmost concern about the apparent disappearance of Ms. He Fangmei's two youngest daughters, one of whom has a disability, and the placement in foster care of her eldest son, reportedly with no access to Ms. He's family, despite clearly expressed wishes by Ms. He to have her children placed in the care of her sister.

We are reiterating our long-standing concern about the continuing practice in China of enforced disappearance and prolonged incommunicado detention, often in solitary confinement, of individuals who have been exercising their right to freedom of expression and freedom of peaceful assembly by peacefully expressing their concerns regarding matters affecting their lives, drawing local and other authorities' attention to their situation, and protesting against their lack of response. The widespread denial by the authorities of due process rights and judicial safeguards, the withholding of information about human rights defenders' detention, health and well-being to their families, legal representatives or persons with a legitimate interest constitute serious violations under international human rights law.

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.
2. Please provide detailed information on the factual and legal grounds for the arrest, charges and conviction of Ms. He Fangmei. Please also provide detailed information on the detention condition and state of health of Ms. He, as well as the measures undertaken to ensure her access to appropriate and adequate healthcare while in detention.

3. Please provide detailed information on the reasons for Ms. He's prolonged incommunicado detention and enforced disappearance, and for the denial of her due process rights and judicial safeguards, particularly her right to a legal defense of her own choosing and to communicate with her family, legal representatives and persons with a legitimate interest. Please provide detailed information clarifying how these practices are compatible with China's international obligations and their adherence to peremptory norms of international law.
4. Please provide detailed information on the whereabouts and state of health of Ms. He's daughters. Please also provide information on measures taken to ensure that children are not arbitrarily deprived of their liberty when their parents are detained, especially when they are infants or are of young age, and what measures are put in place to ensure continued communication and support from their parents, so they are not in turn themselves victimized.
5. Please provide information on the measures in place to protect the legitimate work of independent human rights organizations, activists and human rights defenders in the country and of persons expressing opinions in a peaceful manner and protesting and criticizing the lack of response by relevant authorities to what appear to be their legitimate grievances. In this regard, please provide specific details in relation to any measure or public engagement by the authorities aimed at ensuring that activists and human rights defenders can freely carry out their legitimate human rights work without fear of arbitrary detention, judicial harassment or other reprisals.

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 unveil the fate and whereabouts of Ms. He's daughters, 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.

The case of Ms. He was already transmitted to Your Excellency's Government under the humanitarian procedure of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances. This communication is without prejudice to the consideration of these cases under this procedure through separate correspondence.

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

Ganna Yudkivska  
Vice-Chair on communications of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention

Gabriella Citroni  
Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances

Tlaleng Mofokeng  
Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable  
standard of physical and mental health

Mary Lawlor  
Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders

Laura Nyirinkindi  
Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group on discrimination against women and girls

## **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 their rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against them.

We would like to refer to articles 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, 19, 21 and 22 of the ICCPR, read alone and in conjunction with article 2.3, which guarantee the right to life; the prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment; the right to liberty and security of person; the right to be recognized as a person before the law; the right to a trial within a reasonable time, to challenge the legality of the detention before the courts, to be released subject to guarantees to appear for trial, to a fair and public trial before an independent and impartial tribunal without undue delay and with legal assistance of their choosing; the right to be treated with humanity and with respect for the inherent dignity of the human person; the right to an effective remedy, the right to freedom of opinion and expression; and the rights to peaceful assembly and of association.

With regard to article 9 of the UDHR, we would also like to remind your Excellency's Government that it is both a norm of customary international law and peremptory norm of international law. In this regard, the use of prolonged incommunicado detention, including in unknown or unofficial detention settings that routinely deny access of detainees to their families or legal representatives of their choice could constitute one of the worst forms of arbitrary detention. The reported consistent failure to present detainees promptly before an impartial judge inherently violates the international standards relating to the right to liberty and security of the person and to arbitrary detention. In this regard, detention pending trial shall be the exception, not the rule, and it should be based on the individual circumstances of the case and subject to judicial oversight.

We would also 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 regardless of frontiers".

We would like to refer your Excellency's Government to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), ratified by China on 27 March 2001, which in its article 12 provides for the right to mental and physical health. This includes an obligation on the part of all States parties to, inter alia, refrain from denying or limiting equal access for all persons, including prisoners or detainees, to medical care (general comment 14 of the Committee on Economic, Social, and Cultural rights, para 34). In this connection, we would like to refer to the UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners adopted unanimously by the UN General Assembly (A/Res/70/175) in December 2015 ("Mandela Rules").

Rules 24 to 35 establish that healthcare for prisoners is a State responsibility; prisoners should be ensured prompt access to medical attention in urgent cases and those requiring specialized treatment or surgery shall be transferred to specialized institutions or to civil hospitals.

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.

Notably, the prohibition of enforced disappearance has attained the status of *jus cogens*. In this regard, we wish to recall that the [United Nations Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearances](#) establishes that "all acts of enforced disappearance shall be offences under criminal law punishable by appropriate penalties which shall take into account their extreme seriousness (article 4), no order or instruction of any public authority, civilian, military or other, may be invoked to justify an enforced disappearance (article 6). Furthermore, 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), and the right to a prompt and effective judicial remedy must be guaranteed as a means of determining the whereabouts or state of health of persons deprived of their liberty and/or identifying the authority ordering or carrying out the deprivation of liberty is required to prevent enforced disappearances under all circumstances (article 9).

We would also like to point out that the United Nations Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearances recognizes the right to be held in an officially recognized 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. 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).

Moreover, articles 9 to 12 of the Declaration spell out the rights of detained persons to a prompt and effective judicial remedy to determine the whereabouts of persons deprived of their liberty. Access by competent national authorities to all places of detention must be ensured and any deprivation of liberty be held in officially recognized places of detention. Detainees have the right to be released also in a manner permitting verification of whether their human rights have been fully ensured. Article 13 further stipulates that any person having knowledge or a legitimate interest who alleges that a person has been subjected to enforced disappearance has the right to complain to a competent and independent State authority and to have that complaint promptly, thoroughly and impartially investigated by that authority.

The Declaration also establishes that States should take any lawful and appropriate action to bring to justice persons presumed to be responsible for acts of enforced disappearance (article 14), and that the persons responsible for these acts shall be tried only by ordinary courts and not by other special tribunal, notably military courts (article 16); not benefit from any amnesty law (article 18); the victims or family relatives have the right to obtain redress, including adequate compensation (article 19); and shall prevent and suppress the abduction of children of parents subjected to enforced disappearance and of children born during their mother's enforced disappearance (article 20).

We also wish to recall that the [Guiding Principles for the Search for the Disappeared](#) of the United Nations Committee on Enforced Disappearances establish that the search for the disappeared should be undertaken without delay (principle 2); respect the right to participation of the family of the disappeared (principle 5); be considered a continuing obligation (principle 7); and be interrelated with the criminal investigation (principle 13).

In its [general comment](#) on the right to recognition as a person before the law in the context of enforced disappearance, the Working Group noted that when a person deprived of liberty is not acknowledged by the State, the legal rights of this person are placed in a legal limbo, a situation of total defencelessness. The crime of enforced disappearance puts the detainee outside of the protection of the law, denies the person of legal existence and prevents the enjoyment of their rights, including due process rights and judicial safeguards, and other fundamental rights and freedoms.

In its [report](#) on standards and public policies for an effective investigation of enforced disappearances, the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances recommended that States define enforced disappearance as an autonomous crime in national legislation and establish different modes of criminal liability, including abetting, instigating, acquiescing and actively covering up an enforced disappearance, as well as criminal liability for command or superior responsibility; and create mechanisms that can promptly receive and process complaints of enforced disappearances, under the responsibility of authorities who are independent of the institutions to which the alleged perpetrators belong or may be

linked. These mechanisms should be empowered to trigger prompt investigations of the complaints received.

Additionally, in the [study](#) on enforced disappearances and economic, social and cultural rights, the Working Group observed that the enforced disappearance of activists, human rights defenders or persons actively promoting the enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights, are used as a repressive tool to deter the legitimate exercise, defence or promotion of the enjoyment of these rights. Due to their collective character, such measures also violate their economic, social and cultural rights, the rights of others engaged in related activities, and of the larger community of people who relied on the disappeared person to represent and fight for their rights. Similarly, in its [general comment](#) on women and enforced Disappearances, the Working Group also noted that States have an obligation to recognize the particular types of harm women suffer based on their gender and the resulting psychological damage and social stigma as well as the disruption of family structures. Similarly, in its [general comment](#) on children and enforced disappearances, the Working Group acknowledged the specific and especially serious lasting effects that the separation of children from their families has on their personal integrity. In this regard, many of the rights of children of disappeared parents are affected, including economic, social and cultural rights given the legal uncertainty created by the absence of the disappeared parents.

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, also known as the UN Declaration on Human Rights Defenders. In particular, we would like to refer to articles 1 and 2 of the Declaration which state that everyone has the right 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. Article 6(c) of the Declaration provides that everyone has the right, individually and in association with others to study, discuss, form and hold opinions on the observance, both in law and in practice, of all human rights and fundamental freedoms and to draw public attention to those matters. Article 12 requires the State to take all necessary measures to ensure the protection of everyone 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 (paragraph 2), and provides that "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" (paragraph 3).

Additionally, we would like to remind your Excellency's Government that the Working Group on Discrimination against Women and Girls, in a report to the Human Rights Council (A/HRC/41/33), stressed that deprivation of liberty is deeply linked to gender. Women human rights defenders, perceived as challenging traditional notions of family and gender roles in society, are increasingly at risk of facing criminalization and detention as a result of their legitimate public activism, and are likely to be subject to criminal prosecution and imprisonment. It recommended that States

eliminate any laws or policy measures aimed at criminalizing women's public role.

Furthermore, women human rights defenders warrant protection under the General Assembly resolution 68/181, which was adopted on 18 December 2013. Specifically, articles 7, 9, and 10 require States to publicly acknowledge the importance of women human rights defender and take practical steps to prevent threats, harassment, and violence against them. States must also combat impunity for such violations and abuses, and ensure that all legal provisions, administrative measures and policies affecting these defenders are compatible with relevant provisions of international human rights law.

Finally, we would like to refer your Excellency's Government to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, signed by China on 29 August 1990 and ratified on 2 March 1992. In particular, we wish to draw your attention to:

- Article 2, which states that “States Parties shall take all appropriate measures to ensure that the child is protected against all forms of discrimination or punishment on the basis of the status, activities, expressed opinions, or beliefs of the child's parents, legal guardians, or family members.”
- Article 5, which states that “States Parties shall respect the responsibilities, rights and duties of parents or, where applicable, the members of the extended family or community as provided for by local custom, legal guardians or other persons legally responsible for the child, to provide, in a manner consistent with the evolving capacities of the child, appropriate direction and guidance in the exercise by the child of the rights recognized in the present Convention.”
- Article 7, which states that “The child shall be registered immediately after birth and shall have the right from birth to a name, the right to acquire a nationality and, as far as possible, the right to know and be cared for by his or her parents.”
- Article 9(4), which states that in cases of detention or imprisonment of one or both parents or the child, the “State Party shall, upon request, provide the parents, the child or, if appropriate, another member of the family with the essential information concerning the whereabouts of the absent member(s) of the family.”
- Article 28, which recognizes the right of the child to education.
- Article 37(b), which states that “No child shall be deprived of his or her liberty unlawfully or arbitrarily.”