



# General Assembly

Distr.: General  
7 May 2014

Original: English

---

## Human Rights Council Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances

### Post-sessional document

102nd session (3–7 February 2014)

#### I. Introduction

1. The present document reflects the communications and cases examined and other activities by the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances at its 102nd session, held from 3 to 7 February 2014.

#### II. Communications

2. Between its 101st and 102nd sessions, the Working Group transmitted eight cases under its urgent action procedure to Bahrain (4), Bangladesh (2), Mexico (1) and Pakistan (1).

3. At its 102nd session, the Working Group decided to transmit 87 newly reported cases of enforced disappearance to 11 States. The Working Group also clarified three cases, in Bahrain and Sri Lanka. Of the three cases, one was clarified on the basis of the information provided by the Government, and two on the basis of information provided by sources.

4. Between its 101st and 102nd sessions, the Working Group, following its prompt intervention procedure, transmitted, jointly with other special procedures mechanisms, three communications, to El Salvador (2) and Thailand (1). The Working Group also transmitted, jointly with other special procedures mechanisms, 10 urgent appeals concerning persons who had been arrested, detained, abducted or otherwise deprived of their liberty or who had been forcibly disappeared or were at risk of disappearance in Algeria, Bahrain, China, Egypt, the Russian Federation, the Syrian Arab Republic, Ukraine and the United Arab Emirates.

5. At its 102nd session, the Working Group also reviewed two general allegations concerning Algeria and Sri Lanka.

### III. Other activities

6. At its 102nd session, the Working Group adopted its revised methods of work (A/HRC/WGEID/102/2).

7. The Working Group decided to discuss and adopt the thematic study on enforced disappearance and economic, social and cultural rights during its 103rd session.

### IV. Information concerning enforced or involuntary disappearances in States reviewed by the Working Group during the session

#### 1. Algeria

##### Standard procedure

8. The Working Group transmitted 17 cases to the Government.

9. The first case concerned Mr. **Sadek Sadki**, allegedly last seen on 11 September 1996 at the headquarters of the El Aouana National Gendarmerie Brigade, where he was being detained.

10. The second case concerned Mr. **Salah Sameh**, allegedly last seen on 22 June 1994 at the headquarters of the 17th Rapid Response Unit of the National Gendarmerie of Bouhamdounne, based in Bouhamdounne – Tassoust.

11. The third case concerned Mr. **Ahcène Saada**, allegedly last seen on 12 September 1994 at an army barracks in Ziamia Mansouriah, in the centre of Jijel.

12. The fourth case concerned Mr. **Abdeslam Sloubi**, allegedly last seen on 9 June 1994 at the headquarters of the 17th Rapid Response Unit of the National Gendarmerie of Bouhamdounne.

13. The fifth case concerned Mr. **Hocine Sameh**, allegedly last seen on 25 March 1994 at the headquarters of the 17th Rapid Response Unit of the National Gendarmerie of Bouhamdounne.

14. The sixth case concerned Mr. **Abdelaziz Souilah**, allegedly last seen on 10 September 1996 at the headquarters of the El Aouana National Gendarmerie Brigade.

15. The seventh case concerned Mr. **Cherif Temiza**, allegedly last seen on 8 January 1994 at a barracks in the centre of Texenna.

16. The eighth case concerned Mr. **Samir Tiar**, allegedly abducted on 8 March 1994 from his residence by members of the gendarmerie and army officers.

17. The ninth case concerned Mr. **Bilal Touafek**, allegedly last seen on 12 September 1996 at the Territorial Centres for Research and Investigation, opposite El Koudia prison.

18. The tenth case concerned Mr. **Kamel Yedri**, allegedly last seen on 20 September 1994 at the headquarters of the operational military sector of Jijel.

19. The eleventh case concerned Mr. **Farid Yedri**, allegedly last seen on 30 September 1995 at the headquarters of the operational military sector of Jijel.

20. The twelfth case concerned Mr. **Ferhat Zeghoud**, allegedly last seen on 27 January 1996 at the headquarters of the operational military sector of Jijel.

21. The thirteenth case concerned Mr. **Haroun Sabou**, allegedly last seen on 22 October 1995 at the headquarters of the operational military sector of Jijel.
22. The fourteenth case concerned Mr. **Tayeb Khelifa**, allegedly last seen in April 1996 at his workplace in the Fifth Military District, Constantine.
23. The fifteenth case concerned Mr. **Abdallah Belkacem**, allegedly arrested at his residence on 22 February 1994 by military personnel in uniform, together with an officer from the anti-terrorist brigade.
24. The sixteenth case concerned Mr. **Farid Belhadj**, allegedly arrested on 21 December 1994 by police officers in El Makkaria, in the street near his residence.
25. The seventeenth case concerned Mr. **Hocine Arab**, allegedly last seen in May 1995 at Ouadia gendarmerie.

#### **Information from the Government**

26. On 16 December 2013, the Government responded to a prompt intervention letter sent jointly with four other special procedures mechanisms on 20 August 2013 concerning the excessive use of force and subsequent arrest of relatives of victims of enforced disappearance during a peaceful demonstration on 27 June 2013, on the occasion of the International Day in Support of Victims of Torture. Concerning the juridical reasons for detention and the use of violence, the Government confirmed in its response that, in order to disperse the crowd, the “police forces proceeded with the detention of five subordinate individuals, which were identified by their violent behaviour and their instigation of the crowd”. The Government also mentioned the results of the investigations conducted and that the case against the five detained individuals had been closed after it decided to drop the charges against them.
27. On 29 December 2013, the Government transmitted updated information in relation to 2,722 outstanding cases.
28. The Working Group continued to process the information that had been transmitted by the Government on 5 February and 29 December 2013. Information concerning 110 outstanding cases was reviewed and was considered not sufficient to lead to the clarification of the cases.

#### **Urgent appeals**

29. The Working Group transmitted, jointly with two other special procedures mechanisms, one urgent appeal on 20 December 2013 to the Government. The urgent appeal concerned the alleged enforced disappearance of Mr. Djamel Ameziane, after he was transferred from Guantanamo Bay to Algeria on 5 December 2013.

#### **General allegation**

30. On 30 December 2013, the Working Group transmitted, jointly with three other special procedures mechanisms, a general allegation to the Government concerning the discovery of a mass grave near Ras El-Ma, Azzaba, Wilaya of Skikda.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The full content of the allegation will be published in the communications report of the special procedures submitted to the Human Rights Council at its twenty-sixth session (A/HRC/26/21).

## 2. Angola

### Information from the Government

31. On 8 January 2014, the Government transmitted a communication regarding two outstanding cases. The information provided was considered not sufficient to lead to the clarification of the cases.

### Information from sources

32. Sources provided information on the above-mentioned outstanding cases.

## 3. Bahrain

### Urgent actions

33. On 7 January 2014, the Working Group, following its urgent action procedure, transmitted one communication concerning two cases to the Government of Bahrain. The two cases were later clarified during the session on the basis of the information provided by the sources. The communication concerned Messrs. **Mohsen Ebrahim Marzooq** and **Ahmed Mohamed Habeeb Al Asfoor**, who were allegedly abducted on 2 January 2014 from an apartment in the area of Duraz by police officers and masked individuals wearing police jackets.

34. On 22 January 2014, the Working Group, following its urgent action procedure, transmitted another case to the Government, concerning Mr. **Ahmed Mohammed Saleh Al Arab**, who was allegedly abducted on 9 January 2014 by plain-clothed police officers from an apartment in Hamad town.

35. On 30 January 2014, the Working Group, following its urgent action procedure, transmitted a fourth case to the Government, concerning Mr. **Ali Abdulameer Ali Hasan Ahmed Khamis Abdulameer**, who was allegedly abducted on 8 January 2014 by Bahraini police and security forces from the Ministry of the Interior.

### Information from sources

36. Sources provided information on two outstanding cases. Both cases were clarified as a result.

### Clarification

37. Following the information provided by the sources, the Working Group decided to clarify two cases.

### Urgent appeals

38. The Working Group transmitted, jointly with two other special procedures mechanisms, one urgent appeal on 17 January 2014 to the Government. The urgent appeal concerned the alleged arrest and detention of Mr. **Aqeel Abdul Rasool Mohamed Ahmed**, as well as the alleged enforced disappearance of an individual below the age of 18 and of Messrs. **Ahmed Mohammed Saleh Al Arab**, **Mansoor Ali Mansoor Al Jamri** and **Hussain Al Ghasra**.

## 4. Bangladesh

### Urgent actions

39. On 10 December 2013, the Working Group, following its urgent action procedure, transmitted one communication concerning two cases to the Government. The communication concerned Messrs. **Parvez Humayun Kabir** and **Mohammed Saiful Islam Hero**, who were allegedly abducted on 27 November 2013 by individuals in military uniform on their way from Laksam to Comilla Hospital.

## 5. Chile

### Information from the Government

40. On 5 August 2013, the Government of Chile transmitted a communication regarding 16 cases. On the basis of the information provided by the Government, the Working Group decided, at its 102nd session, to apply the six-month rule to 10 cases. The information provided on the remaining cases was considered not sufficient to lead to their clarification.

## 6. China

### Information from the Government

41. On 7 January 2014, the Government of China responded to two joint urgent appeals. The first communication (see annex) was the response to an urgent appeal sent jointly with three other special procedures mechanisms on 1 October 2013 concerning allegations that two individuals, Ms. Cao Shunli and Ms. Chen Jianfang, had been prohibited from travelling to Geneva in order to attend a training seminar on United Nations mechanisms, and further allegations that Ms. Cao Shunli had been subjected to enforced disappearance.<sup>2</sup> In its reply, the Government stated that Cao Shunli had disrupted social administrative order on many occasions. On 21 October 2013, the Public Prosecutor's Office of Chao Yang issued an order for her arrest, and she was taken into custody. Regarding Chen Jianfang, the Government stated that, on 3 September 2013, pursuant to article 12 of the Exit and Entry Administration Law of China, the Shanghai Municipality Public Security Office stopped Ms. Cao at the border.

42. The second communication (see annex) responded to an urgent appeal sent jointly with four other special procedures mechanisms on 22 October 2013 concerning the arrest and detention, and in some instances disappearances, of 20 individuals in connection with their participation in peaceful assemblies or human rights campaigns in different parts of the country. In its reply, the Government provided information regarding Yang Wei, Xu Zhiyong, Gu Yimin, Song Guangqiang, Guo Feixiong, Sun Desheng and Zhou Weilin.

### Urgent appeals

43. On 3 February 2014, the Working Group transmitted, jointly with six other special procedures mechanisms, an urgent appeal to the Government concerning the alleged

<sup>2</sup> Ms. Cao Shunli passed away on 14 March 2014. A group of United Nations experts, including the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances, issued a public statement in which they deplored the events leading to the death of Ms. Cao and requested a full investigation. The statement is available from [www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=14394&LangID=E](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=14394&LangID=E).

enforced disappearance of **Gongpo Tsezin, Trinley Tsekar, Pema Trinley, Chakdor, Khenrap, Nyagdompo, Shawo Tashi and Achok Phulshung.**

### **Observations**

44. The Working Group thanks the Government for its replies. With regard to the allegations mentioned in the communications, the Working Group is concerned that the situation seems to reveal a pattern of short-term enforced disappearances. The Working Group reiterates articles 2 and 10 of the Declaration, which provide that “no State shall practise, permit or tolerate enforced disappearances”, and that “accurate information on the detention of any person deprived of liberty and their place or places of detention shall be made promptly available to their family members, their counsel”. It also recalls article 13 (3) and (5) of the Declaration, which states that “steps shall be taken to ensure that all involved in the investigation, including the complainant, counsel, witness and those conducting the investigation, are protected against ill-treatment, intimidation or reprisal”, and that “steps shall be taken to ensure that any ill-treatment, intimidation or reprisal or any other form of interference on the occasion of the lodging of a complaint or during the investigation procedure is appropriately punished”; and Human Rights Council resolution 21/4, in which the Council urged States to take steps to provide adequate protection to, among others, human rights defenders acting against enforced disappearances and families of disappeared persons against any intimidation, persecution, reprisals or ill-treatment to which they might be subjected.

## **7. Colombia**

### **Information from the Government**

45. On 14 November 2013, the Government of Colombia transmitted a communication responding to a prompt intervention letter sent jointly with four other special procedures mechanisms on 2 August 2013 concerning alleged death threats against Roció Campos, Elizardo Badillo and other members of the “movement for human rights in Barrancabermeja”. In its reply, the Government transmitted information from the General Prosecutor regarding the ongoing investigation of threats made against the victims.

46. In the same communication, the Government also responded to a prompt intervention letter sent jointly with four other special procedures mechanisms on 13 September 2013 concerning the alleged murder of Juan Carlos Canizales Ocampo, a lawyer, as well as acts of intimidation and death threats against lawyers working on human rights issues, inter alia, Sneither Cifuentes, who is currently in charge of the representation of victims in multiple criminal investigations for human rights violations, including enforced disappearances. In its reply, the Government noted that Mr. Cifuentes was not linked to the protection programme and not enrolled as a beneficiary. The Government also transmitted information from the Minister of the Interior regarding the Government’s measures to guarantee that human rights defenders can safely continue their work. The Minister of the Interior made reference to the national process of guarantees for the work of human rights defenders, as well as of social and community leaders.

47. On 24 December 2013, the Government provided a further response to the above-mentioned prompt intervention letter dated 13 September 2013 and transmitted information about the measures taken to defend human rights defenders and lawyers, as well as about the measures to publically support those individuals who had been subject to stigmatization and discrediting campaigns.

## Observations

48. The Working Group thanks the Government for its replies. Regarding the issued addressed in the prompt intervention letters, the Working Group recalls article 13 of the Declaration, which provides that “steps shall be taken to ensure that all involved in the investigation, including the complainant, counsel, witnesses and those conducting the investigation, are protected against ill-treatment, intimidation or reprisal”, and that “steps shall be taken to ensure that any ill-treatment, intimidation or reprisal or any other form of interference on the occasion of the lodging of a complaint or during the investigation procedure is appropriately punished”. In addition, the Working Group also recalls Human Rights Council resolution 21/4, in which the Council urged States to take steps to provide adequate protection to, among others, human rights defenders acting against enforced disappearances and families of disappeared persons against any intimidation, persecution, reprisals or ill-treatment to which they might be subjected.

## 8. Democratic People’s Republic of Korea

### Standard procedure

49. The Working Group transmitted 10 cases to the Government of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea. In accordance with the methods of work of the Working Group, the Government of the Republic of Korea also received copies of the said cases.

50. The first case concerned Mr. **Ahn Hak-soo**, who allegedly disappeared on 9 September 1966 after he left for a regular trip to Saigon to collect medical supplies when he was serving in Viet Nam. In accordance with the methods of work of the Working Group, the Government of Viet Nam was also provided with a copy of this case.

51. The second case concerned Ms. **Kim Hee-yeon**, below the age of 18 at the time of the alleged disappearance, who was allegedly abducted on 27 September 1950 by the army of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea from the Red Cross hospital in Seoul, where she was working as a trainee nurse.

52. The third case concerned Mr. **Kim Kyeong-du**, who was allegedly abducted on 6 June 1968 by forces of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea when the fishing boat on which he was working, the “Bukil-ho”, was reportedly captured.

53. The fourth case concerned Mr. **Kim Seok-man**, who was allegedly abducted on 4 February 1972 by forces of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea when the fishing boat on which he was working, the “Anyoung 36”, was reportedly captured.

54. The fifth case concerned Mr. **Son Hae-kyeong**, who was allegedly abducted on 28 September 1950 by the army of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea from 372 Jigok-ri, Chungju-eup Chungcheongbuk-do, Republic of Korea, where he was staying at the time.

55. The sixth and seventh cases concerned Messrs. **Kim Yong-cheol** and **Park Du-nam**, who were allegedly abducted on 28 December 1972 by forces of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, when the fishing boat on which they were working, the “Odaeyang 61-ho”, was reportedly captured.

56. The eighth, ninth and tenth cases concerned Messrs. **Park Du-hyeon**, **Seo Young-gu** and **Yoo Kyeong-chun**, who were allegedly abducted on 28 December 1972 by forces of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, when the fishing boat on which they were working, the “Odaeyang 62”, was reportedly captured.

**Information from the Government**

57. On 18 December 2013, the Government transmitted information in relation to 13 outstanding cases. The information provided was considered not sufficient to lead to clarification of the cases.

**9. Ecuador****Standard procedure**

58. The Working Group transmitted one case to the Government of Ecuador concerning Mr. **José del Carmen Molano Ríos**, a national of Colombia, who was allegedly abducted on 4 May 2013 by members of the Jungle Battalion No 55 “Putumayo”, Operating Element 1.1.3.4 “COBRA”, of the Ecuadorian Army Intelligence, at Puerto del Carmen, Cantón Putumayo. In accordance with the methods of work of the Working Group, the Government of Colombia was provided with a copy of this case.

**10. Egypt****Urgent appeals**

59. The Working Group transmitted, jointly with three other special procedures mechanisms, one urgent appeal on 27 December 2013 to the Government of Egypt. The urgent appeal concerned the alleged enforced disappearances of Messrs. Khaled al-Qazzaz, Ayman al-Serafy and Abdelmeguid Mashali, and the alleged incommunicado detention of Messrs. Essam al-Haddad and Ayman Ali.

**11. El Salvador****Prompt intervention letter**

60. On 25 November 2013, the Working Group transmitted, jointly with two other special procedures mechanisms, a prompt intervention letter concerning the closure of the Legal Protection Office of the Archbishop of San Salvador (Oficina de Tutela Legal del Arzobispado de San Salvador).

61. On 28 November 2013, the Working Group transmitted, jointly with two other special procedures mechanisms, another prompt intervention letter concerning the violent attack on the Association for the Search of Disappeared Children (Asociación Pro-Búsqueda de Niñas y Niños Desaparecidos) and the destruction of information essential to the process of truth, justice and reparation in the country.

**Observations**

62. With regard to the issues addressed in the prompt intervention letters, the Working Group recalls article 13 of the Declaration, which states that “steps shall be taken to ensure that all involved in the investigation, including the complainant, counsel, witnesses and those conducting the investigation, are protected against ill-treatment, intimidation or reprisal”, and that “steps shall be taken to ensure that any ill-treatment, intimidation or reprisal or any other form of interference on the occasion of the lodging of a complaint or during the investigation procedure is appropriately punished”. The Working Group also recalls Human Rights Council resolution 21/4, in which the Council urged States to take steps to provide adequate protection to, among others, human rights defenders acting against enforced disappearances and families of disappeared persons against any



intimidation, persecution, reprisals or ill-treatment to which they might be subjected. These norms do not only protect the physical integrity of human rights defenders but also the normal functioning of human rights organizations.

## 12. Guinea

### Standard procedure

63. The Working Group transmitted seven cases to the Government of Guinea.
64. The first case concerned an individual under the age of 18 at the time of the alleged disappearance, allegedly last seen on 28 September 2009 at his residence in Soloprino (Koloma III).
65. The second case concerned Mr. **El Hadj Hassane Bah**, allegedly last seen next to political leaders during a demonstration held on 28 September 2009 at the Stade de Conakry.
66. The third case concerned Mr. **Midiaou Barry**, allegedly last seen on 28 September 2009 at his residence.
67. The fourth case concerned another individual under the age of 18 at the time of the alleged disappearance, allegedly last seen on 28 September 2009 at the Stade de Conakry.
68. The fifth case concerned Mr. **Mamadou Aliou Bah**, allegedly last seen on 28 September 2009 at his workplace in Taouyah, Commune de Ratoma.
69. The sixth case concerned Mr. **Mamadou Micka Diallo**, allegedly last seen on 28 September 2009 at the Stade de Conakry during a demonstration.
70. The seventh case concerned Ms. **Aïssatou Diallo**, allegedly last seen on 28 September 2009 at the Stade de Conakry, sitting in the official tribune during a demonstration.

## 13. Iraq

### Information from the Government

71. On 3 January 2014, the Government of Iraq provided information in relation to seven outstanding cases. The information provided was considered not sufficient to lead to clarification of the cases.

### Press release

72. On 9 December 2013, the Working Group issued, jointly with five other special procedures mechanisms, a press release in which it urged the Government of Iraq to establish the fate and whereabouts of the seven residents of Camp Ashraf, who were allegedly abducted in September 2013 after an attack in which 52 people were killed. In the press release, the special procedures mandate holders expressed serious concern at the lack of information from the Iraqi authorities regarding the results of ongoing investigations into the attack.

### Observations

73. The Working Group reiterates its concerns about the seven residents of Camp Ashraf who were allegedly abducted in September 2013. It encourages the Government of Iraq to continue its investigations into the cases, establish the fate and whereabouts of these

individuals, ensure that the perpetrators are held accountable and publish the results of such investigations.

## 14. Kenya

### Standard procedure

74. The Working Group transmitted 10 cases to the Government of Kenya.

75. The first case concerned Mr. **Thomas Kimtai Kotut**, allegedly arrested at his home while he was reading on his front porch, on 15 March 2008, by more than 20 heavily armed military personnel in uniform believed to be from the Para 20 Regiment of the Kenyan Army.

76. The second, third and fourth cases concerned Messrs. **Richard Chepkoy Rutto**, **Stephen Wasama Chemaimak** and **Benard Tuikong**, allegedly arrested at their homes on 13 March 2008 by heavily armed military personnel believed to be from the Para 20 Regiment of the Kenyan Army.

77. The fifth, sixth and seventh cases concerned Messrs. **Benson Ngweiywa Koroko**, **Patrick Nalianga Ndiema** and **Gideon Cherop Kwemboi**, allegedly arrested while he was grazing cattle near his home on 12 March 2008 by military personnel believed to be from the Para 20 Regiment of the Kenyan Army.

78. The eighth case concerned Mr. **Peter Oliver Osikata**, allegedly arrested on 11 March 2008 from his place of work by military personnel in uniform believed to be from the Para 20 Regiment of the Kenyan Army.

79. The ninth case concerned Mr. **Geoffrey Jacob Kaptunwo**, allegedly arrested from home on 10 March 2008, by 15 military personnel in uniform believed to be from the Para 20 Regiment of the Kenyan Army.

80. The tenth case concerned Mr. **Vincent Wasama Kirunyi**, allegedly arrested from Chebtaturbur market on 4 September 2007 by armed police officers in uniform believed to be from the General Service Unit of the Kenya police.

## 15. Lao People's Democratic Republic

### Information from the Government

81. On 3 January 2014, the Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic transmitted information in relation to two outstanding cases. The information provided was considered not sufficient to lead to clarification of the cases.

### Press release

82. On 16 December 2013, the Working Group issued, jointly with three other special procedures mechanisms, a press release urging the Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic to increase its efforts in investigations into the enforced disappearance on 15 December 2012 of Mr. Sombath Somphone, a development worker. In the press release, the special procedures mandate holders also expressed concern about the safety and security of Mr. Somphone, and urged the Government to hold the perpetrators accountable.

### Observations

83. The Working Group encourages the Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic to continue its investigations into the case of Mr. Sombath Somphone and to keep the Working Group informed thereon. The Working Group hopes that the Government will intensify its cooperation with the mechanism. In that respect, the Working Group recalls Human Rights Council resolution 21/4, in which the Council urged States to cooperate with the Working Group and to help it to carry out its mandate effectively, and resolution 7/12, in which the Council urged the Governments concerned to intensify their cooperation with the Working Group on any action taken pursuant to recommendations addressed to them by the Working Group.

## 16. Mexico

### Urgent actions

84. On 3 December 2013, the Working Group transmitted one case to the Government of Mexico concerning Mr. **Daniel Ramos Alfaro**, who was allegedly abducted on 2 October 2013 by agents of the Mexican Army in a deserted field near Betania Community, Michoacán.

### Standard procedure

85. The Working Group transmitted 12 cases to the Government.

86. The first case concerned Mr. **Mario Jorge Tovar Martinez**, allegedly abducted on 14 May 2008 by agents of the municipal police of San Nicolas de los Garza, Nuevo León.

87. The second case concerned Mr. **Jorge Homero Flores Quintana**, allegedly abducted on 22 June 2007 at the home of friends, in Nueva Castilla 3999, colonia residencial Lincoln, Monterrey, by a commando group that violently entered the house.

88. The third case concerned Mr. **Miguel Orlando Muñoz Guzmán**, allegedly last seen in May 1993 at the 26th Infantry Battalion, in Ciudad Juárez, Chihuahua.

89. The fourth, fifth and sixth cases concerned Messrs. **Daniel Cabrera Peñaloza**, **Orlando Rebolledo Téllez** and **Nicomedes Villa Santana**, allegedly abducted on 14 February 2005 by armed civilians of the group Unión Ganadera Regional de Guerrero and then allegedly handed over to the Mexican Army.

90. The seventh case concerned Mr. **Marco Antonio Zuñiga Solis**, allegedly abducted on 19 June 2007 by agents of the Santa Catarina municipal police.

91. The eighth and ninth cases concerned Messrs. **Pedro Enrique Huerta Flores** and **Javier Alejandro Treviño Pedroza**, allegedly last seen on 25 July 2010 leaving the house of the latter, in San Pedro, and heading towards La Huasteca Park, in Santa Catarina, Nuevo León.

92. The tenth and eleventh cases concerned Mr. **Roberto Ivan Hernandez Garcia** and Ms. **Yudith Yesenia Rueda Garcia**, allegedly abducted on 11 March 2011 by agents of the Federal and State Police together with at their residence, located in Privada Sotelo 6025, Col. Loma Bonita, Monterrey, Nuevo León.

93. The twelfth case concerned Mr. **Geovanni Alexis Barrios Hernández**, allegedly abducted from the Super Siete shop of Reynosa, Tamaulipas, located in Av. Lazaro Cardenas, Colonia Anzalduez on 24 April 2008 by more than 15 armed individuals accompanied by federal and municipal police officers of Tamaulipas.

## **17. Morocco**

### **Information from the Government**

94. On 15 November 2013, the Government of Morocco transmitted information in relation to one outstanding case. The information provided was considered not sufficient to lead to clarification of the case.

## **18. Pakistan**

### **Urgent actions**

95. On 9 January 2014, the Working Group transmitted one case to the Government of Pakistan concerning an individual under the age of 18, who was allegedly abducted on 19 October 2013 from a house located on Qambrani Road, Killi Nichari Abad, Quetta.

### **Standard procedure**

96. The Working Group transmitted three cases to the Government of Pakistan.

97. The first case concerned Mr. **Hamid Nehal Ahmed Ansari**, an Indian national, who was allegedly abducted in November 2012 in Pakistan. In accordance with the methods of work of the Working Group, the Government of Afghanistan and the Government of India were provided with a copy of this case.

98. The second case concerned Mr. **Abdul Saffa**, allegedly abducted on 15 August 2010 by individuals believed to belong to the Frontier Corps or other State security forces near Zaheer Medical College Road, Balochistan.

99. The third case concerned Mr. **Samee Ullah**, allegedly abducted from Dr. Bano Road, Quetta, Balochistan on 16 November 2009 by plain-clothed individuals believed to belong to the security forces.

## **19. Peru**

### **Information from the Government**

100. The Working Group continued to process the information transmitted by the Government on 11 July 2011. The information concerning 182 outstanding cases was reviewed and considered not sufficient to lead to clarification of the cases.

101. On 14 November 2013, the Government transmitted a communication concerning one outstanding case. The information provided was considered not sufficient to lead to clarification of the case.

102. In the same communication, the Government informed the Working Group about the measures taken by the Public Prosecutor with regard to the search for disappeared persons.

### **Information from sources**

103. Sources provided information on six outstanding cases.

## 20. Russian Federation

### Urgent appeals

104. On 9 December 2013, the Working Group transmitted, jointly with another special procedures mechanism, one urgent appeal to the Government of the Russian Federation concerning Mr. Ismon Azimov, a citizen of Tajikistan allegedly abducted to an unknown location from the premises of a State-run temporary accommodation centre for foreigners in the Russian Federation.

## 21. Spain

### Standard procedure

105. The Working Group transmitted one case to the Government of Spain concerning Ms. **Maria Argüelles Lorca**, allegedly last seen on 7 February 1947 near Riofrio station, in a place called Casilla Zapatero, in Granada.

### Information from sources

106. Sources provided information on one outstanding case.

## 22. Sri Lanka

### Standard procedure

107. The Working Group transmitted 21 cases to the Government of Sri Lanka.

108. The first case concerned Mr. **Nimalraj Anantharajah**, allegedly last seen on 28 April 2009 in a welfare centre in zone 6, Vavuniya District, Northern Province, which was under government control.

109. The second case concerned Ms. **Vijitha Atputhanathan**, allegedly last seen on 21 April 2009 at the army-controlled Omanthai checkpoint, Vavuniya District, Northern Province.

110. The third and fourth cases concerned Ms. **Karunadevi Elayathamby** and Mr. **Sukumaran Krishnakuddy**, allegedly last seen on 18 May 2009 in Vadduvagar, Mullaitivu District, Northern Province, after surrendering to the Sri Lankan Army.

111. The fifth case concerned Mr. **Santhiraruban Jeyarajah**, allegedly last seen on 16 April 2009 at Omanthai Army checkpoint, Vavuniya District, Northern Province. According to the information received, the Sri Lankan Army may be responsible for his alleged disappearance.

112. The sixth case concerned Mr. **Thangaraja Kaalimuthu**, allegedly last seen on 18 May 2009 when he surrendered to the Sri Lankan Army in the army-controlled area of Vadduvagal, Mullaitivu District, Northern Province.

113. The seventh case concerned Ms. **Yogeswary Kanthasamy**, allegedly last seen on 13 April 2009 in Mathathalan, Mullaitivu District, Northern Province. According to the information received, the Sri Lankan Army was responsible for her alleged disappearance.

114. The eighth case concerned Mr. **Thajinthan Kunasingam**, allegedly last seen on 19 May 2009 in Vavuniya Rambaikulam Ladies Maha Vidyalayam, Vavuniya, Northern Province. According to the information received, the Sri Lankan Army is responsible for his alleged disappearance.

115. The ninth case concerned Mr. **Vijayakanth Maheswaran**, allegedly last seen on 18 May 2009 in Omanthai, Vavuniya District, Northern Province, after he allegedly surrendered to the Sri Lankan Army.

116. The tenth case concerned Mr. **Maruthai Selvaraj**, allegedly last seen on 12 May 2009 in Mullivaikal Hospital, Mullativu District, Northern Province, after he was reportedly arrested by the Sri Lankan Army while being treated in the Hospital.

117. The eleventh case concerned Mr. **Balasubramaniam Nadarasa**, allegedly last seen on 20 April 2009 in Maththalan, Mullaitivu District, Northern Province. According to the information received, the Sri Lankan Army is responsible for his alleged disappearance.

118. The twelfth case concerned Mr. **Prabakar Pathmanathan**, allegedly last seen on 26 June 2008 in Velikandhai, Thirukoonamadu (also known as “Trikonamadu”) detention camp, North Central district. According to the information received, the Sri Lankan Army is responsible for his alleged disappearance.

119. The thirteenth case concerned Mr. **Krishnapillai Prabakaran**, allegedly last seen on 17 May 2009 in Vadduvahal, Mullaitivu District, Northern Province after he was allegedly arrested by government security forces.

120. The fourteenth case concerned Ms. **Thanoja Selvarajah**, allegedly last seen on 5 May 2009 in the area controlled by the Sri Lankan Army, in Nandhikadal, Mullaitivu District, Northern Province.

121. The fifteenth case concerned Mr. **Jegatheeswaran Selvarajah**, allegedly last seen in February 2009 in Puthukudiyiruppu, Mullaitivu District, Northern Province, after he was allegedly arrested by the Sri Lankan Army.

122. The sixteenth case concerned Mr. **Ratheesh Sountharajan**, allegedly last seen in June 2009 in Vavuniya Government Hospital, Vavuniya District, Northern Province after he was taken there by the Sri Lankan Army.

123. The seventeenth case concerned Mr. **Suthagar Suganthiran**, allegedly last seen on 1 May 2009 in Mullivaikal (“Safe zone” or “No fire zone”), Mullaitivu District, Northern Province, where he was allegedly taken by the Sri Lankan Army.

124. The eighteenth case concerned Mr. **Sujevaraj Thangavel**, allegedly last seen on 12 February 2009 in Kombavil village, Puthukkudiyiruppu, Mullativu District, Northern Province. The Sri Lankan Army was reportedly responsible for his alleged disappearance.

125. The nineteenth and twentieth cases concerned Mr. **Kenthirakumar Thiruneelakandan** and Mr. **Muththaiya Thiruneelakandan**, allegedly last seen in April 2009 at Omanthai Army checkpoint, Vavuniya District, Northern Province. The Sri Lankan Army may be responsible for their alleged disappearance.

126. The twenty-first case concerned Mr. **Pravinth Thiyagarajah**, allegedly last seen on 4 April 2009 in Maththalan (“No fire zone”), Northern Province. The Sri Lankan Army was reportedly responsible for his alleged disappearance.

#### **General allegation**

127. The Working Group received information from credible sources concerning reported obstacles encountered in the implementation of the Declaration in Sri Lanka.

128. Sources reported that there were many problems with the Presidential Commission on Disappearances currently operating in the country.

129. It was reported that, the duration of the Commission was far too short, because to undertake a comprehensive inquiry process involving thousands of individuals wishing to

give testimony, six months was an inadequate amount of time. It was alleged that the fact that Commission hearings began only five months after it was established, and that only a select number of applicants had been invited to appear before it, demonstrated that insufficient time had been allocated to the process.

130. It was reported that, given that the Commission would only cover cases of disappearance in the Northern and Eastern Provinces between 1990 and 2009, many cases reported in Colombo and other parts of the country in recent years would fall outside its scope.

131. It was alleged that the public information campaign had been inadequate and that many people in different places had not heard about the Commission or been provided with information on where, when and how to submit complaints. It was reported that there was considerable confusion among the families of the disappeared about how to submit a complaint, who would be able to appear before the Commission, and when and where the hearings would be held. It was also reported that military and plain-clothed security personnel had been registering people. Complaints were reportedly received because people had been asked to sign forms in English, which some could not read or understand, and that many had refused to sign, while others had signed despite the fact that they did not understand what they were signing. It was further claimed that very few people submitting complaints had received letters to appear before the Commission, and that the criteria for selection was unclear and not publicly available.

132. It was claimed that, for the process to be credible, the Commission should hear all those who have lodged a complaint about a disappearance, rather than just a sampling of cases, regardless of the time required to register and hear all complaints.

133. The source reported that, while some of the Commission's hearings had been held in public, in other occasions the hearings had been held behind closed doors, which diminished transparency and eroded public confidence in the process.

134. It was further reported that, on occasion, there had been an inadequate number of interpreters, and that those who were interpreting were doing so inaccurately and at times summarized, cut short the testimony of the complainants or pre-empted the answers to questions. It was also claimed that interpreters sometimes argued with people's account of what had occurred and exhibited excessive aggression when engaging with the complainants. It was also reported that there were many leading questions, that complainants felt that they were being cross-examined rather than being given the time and space to recount events, and that the focus of the questioning was consistently on the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE), resulting in inadequate attention being paid to other aspects of the testimony. It was further alleged that some officials tasked with gathering information and completing the forms of the complainants did not speak Tamil and that the forms were in English. There were therefore claims that information had possibly been misunderstood and forms completed erroneously.

135. The source claimed that there ought to be a comprehensive public information campaign conducted well in advance of scheduled hearings. It was suggested that not only local officials should disseminate the information but also that provincial and national dissemination campaigns should be carried out as well. It was also stated that a process should be established to prepare families to appear before the Commission, including by providing information on the documentation and supporting documents to be submitted with their complaints.

136. The source recommended that sufficient time should be provided for the dissemination, registration and preparation phases so that each complainant has the opportunity to appear before the Commission, and that people should be given information

on what documents they need to bring, what the process would involve and for how long they would have to speak.

137. It was further stated that military and security personnel should not be involved in any of the processes of public information campaigns, registration, signing of forms or escorting people to and from the hearings. They should also not be allowed to take photographs outside the Commission as people enter, or be present while people are giving testimony to the Commission.

138. It was alleged that some people had been offered compensation and been promised 300,000 Sri Lanka rupees if they registered for a death certificate for their disappeared family member. It was further reported that, while some people had received compensation, it was unclear what criteria had been used to select these people and not others who had registered. It was therefore suggested that processes to provide relief for families of the disappeared should not be held on the same day as the hearings or at the same venue, as it created confusion. It was stated that this should not be a selective process, but that a clear reparations policy should be formulated. It was also argued that everyone should be provided information on how to gain access to compensation and that clear information should be given in advance to permit informed choices.

#### **Information from the Government**

139. On 10 January 2014, the Government of Sri Lanka transmitted a communication regarding 200 outstanding cases. On the basis of the information provided by the Government, the Working Group decided, at its 102nd session, to apply the six-month rule to three cases. With regard to the remaining cases, the information provided was considered not sufficient to lead to clarification of the cases.

140. On 23 December 2013, the Government transmitted a reply to a prompt intervention letter sent jointly with four other special procedures mechanisms dated 29 December 2011 regarding the arrest and detention of 42 human rights and political activists, including members of the Committee to Investigate Disappearances, a non-governmental organization. In its response, the Government of Sri Lanka stated that it had been informed by the Sri Lanka Police Department that “no arrest has been made by the police of any person involved in the said protest” on 10 December 2011, that “there is no credible evidence to prove any intimidation by the police of the protestors as alleged”, and that, “as alleged, there had been no arrest or confiscation of any material carried by the protesters and the police had in fact given protection to the protesters to engage in their protest freely.”

141. On 1 March 2014, the Government transmitted a reply to the above-mentioned general allegation regarding the problems encountered by the Presidential Commission on Disappearances. The Working Group will review this reply at its 103rd session.

#### **Information from sources**

142. Sources provided information on two outstanding cases. One case, to which the six-month rule had been applied by the Working Group, was clarified before the expiration of the six-month rule, given that the source was able to confirm the information provided by the Government.

#### **Clarification**

143. On the basis of information provided by the Government, following confirmation from the source, the Working Group decided to clarify one outstanding case before the expiration of the period prescribed by the six-month rule.



## 23. Syrian Arab Republic

### Standard procedure

144. The Working Group transmitted cases to the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic.

145. The first case concerned Mr. **Mohamed Al Shelby**, allegedly arrested on 3 November 2012 by Syrian military personnel at the Al Bahaldeya military checkpoint, Al Bahaldeya District, Al Seyed Zeinab.

146. The second case concerned Ms. **Ghazala Aly Shabo**, allegedly arrested on 4 July 2013 by Syrian Military Intelligence or the State security forces at Al Bateekha Military checkpoint, at the entrance to Al Yarmouk camp.

147. The third case concerned Ms. **Wahida Al Shelby**, allegedly arrested on 28 March 2013 by Syrian military personnel at Al Huseyna Military checkpoint, Al Sayeda Zeinab, Rif Dimashq Governorate.

### Information from sources

148. Sources provided information on eight outstanding cases.

### Information from the Government

149. On 31 December 2013, the Government transmitted a communication regarding four outstanding cases. The information provided was considered not sufficient to lead to clarification of the cases.

150. In the said communication, the Government also replied to two joint urgent appeals, dated 16 and 29 August 2013.

151. The urgent appeal dated 16 August 2013, sent jointly with another special procedures mechanism, concerned the alleged enforced disappearance of Mr. **Bassam Bahrah** and his son **Sameeh**. In its reply, the Government stated that “the competent authorities have no information about the fate and whereabouts of Messrs. Bahrah”.

152. The urgent appeal dated 29 August 2013, sent jointly with two other special procedures mechanisms, concerned the alleged enforced disappearance of Messrs. **Youssef Abdelke** and **Adnan al-Dibs**, members of the National Coordination Body for Democratic Change, who were reportedly arrested by Syrian security forces at a Military Intelligence checkpoint. In its reply, the Government stated that “Mr. Youssef Abdelke has been released by the competent authorities” and that “Mr. Adnan al-Dibs [...] was arrested for joining an unauthorized political party, and he still under investigation by the competent judicial authorities.”

### Urgent appeals

153. On 25 November 2013, the Working Group transmitted, jointly with another special procedures mechanism, an urgent appeal concerning the alleged disappearance of Mr. **Abdulwahab Almullah**, allegedly abducted by a group of unidentified armed men from his home in Aleppo, and Mr. **Rami Al-Razzouk**, allegedly abducted by a group of armed men at a checkpoint between the cities of Raqqa and Toubqa.

154. On 17 December 2013, the Working Group transmitted, jointly with another special procedures mechanism, a second urgent appeal concerning Messrs. **Razan Zaitouneh**, **Wa'el Hamada**, **Nazem Hamadi** and Ms. **Samira Khalil**, allegedly abducted by unknown individuals in Douma, Rif Dimashq.

155. On 22 January 2014, the Working Group transmitted, jointly with five other special procedures mechanisms, a third urgent appeal, concerning the alleged arrest and detention of Mr. **Akram Raslan**, a political cartoonist for *Al-Fida* newspaper, who has been reportedly held incommunicado since his arrest, with conflicting reports about his fate and whereabouts, including that he may have been executed.

#### **Observations**

156. At its session, the Working Group considered the latest report of the independent international commission of inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic (A/HRC/24/46), and its thematic report entitled “Without a trace: enforced disappearances in Syria”. The Working Group expressed particular concern at the commission’s findings that there was reasonable grounds to believe that acts of enforced disappearances have been committed by government forces as part of widespread and systematic attacks against civilians, with knowledge of the attacks, therefore amounting to crimes against humanity; and that opposition forces had been resorting to practices that could be considered tantamount to enforced disappearances. The Working Group has been following the situation in the Syrian Arab Republic since the beginning of the conflict. In September 2011, an official communication was sent to the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic reporting systematic human rights violations committed by the Syrian authorities, including enforced disappearances. Since then, the Working Group has received an increasing number of cases under its different procedures.

157. As highlighted by the Working Group in its general comment on enforced disappearance as a crime against humanity (A/HRC/13/31, para. 39), when there are claims of practices of enforced disappearances which may amount to crimes against humanity, the Working Group will evaluate these claims and, if appropriate, will refer them to the competent authorities, be they international, regional or domestic. In the light of the seriousness of the situation in the Syrian Arab Republic, the Working Group decided at the session to express its grave concern in relation to the enforced disappearances in the country by writing to the President of the Human Rights Council, the President of the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Secretary-General and the Joint Special Representative for Syria to request the adoption of any appropriate action that they may deem appropriate. In particular, the Working Group requested the President of the Security Council to bring the matter to the attention of the Council for any appropriate action, including a possible referral of the matter to the International Criminal Court. The Working Group informed the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic on these letters on 5 March 2014.

## **24. Thailand**

#### **Information from sources**

158. Sources provided information on two outstanding cases.

#### **Prompt intervention letter**

159. On 2 January 2014, the Working Group transmitted, jointly with one other special procedures mechanism, a prompt intervention letter concerning the possible closure of the investigation of the enforced disappearance of Mr. **Somchai Neelaphaijit**, and consequently the removal of his wife from the witness protection programme.

## 25. Togo

### Information from the Government

160. On 13 January 2014, the Government of Togo transmitted a communication regarding one outstanding case. The information provided was considered not sufficient to lead to the clarification of the case.

## 26. Turkey

### Information from the Government

161. On 6 January 2014, the Government of Turkey transmitted a communication regarding eight outstanding cases. The information provided was considered not sufficient to lead to the clarification of the cases.

## 27. Ukraine

### Urgent appeals

162. On 10 December 2013, the Working Group transmitted, jointly with two other special procedures mechanisms, an urgent appeal to the Government concerning the alleged excessive use of force against peaceful protestors and alleged enforced disappearance of one individual under the age of 18 and of Ms. **Hryhoryan Inna, Ms. Khachaturova Lilya, Messrs. Brovko Oleh, Vokatiuk Volodymyr, Humeniuk Denys, Lavryk Fedir, Okhrymovych Volodymyr, Rosputnyi Vyacheslav, Tokaryev Vyacheslav, Shynkaruk Anatoliy, Rezba Mykola, Elvin Mansurov, Hrym Serhiy and Vink Mykola**. According to the information received, most of them are youth activists and students and were last seen on the night of 29 November 2013, at the protest on Maidan Square in Kyiv, which was reportedly dispersed by force by the police.

## 28. United Arab Emirates

### Urgent appeals

163. On 30 December 2013, the Working Group transmitted, jointly with one other special procedures mechanism, an urgent appeal to the Government of the United Arab Emirates concerning the alleged enforced disappearance, ill-treatment and the alleged risk of further torture or ill-treatment of Mr. **Abdulrahman al-Jaidah** by State security officers.

## 29. Uzbekistan

### Information from the Government

164. On 14 November 2013, the Government of Uzbekistan transmitted a communication regarding seven outstanding cases. The information provided was considered not sufficient to lead to the clarification of the cases.

### **30. Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)**

#### **Standard procedure**

165. The Working Group transmitted two cases to the Government of Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

166. The two cases concerned Mr. **Andrés Bellos Moreno** and Ms. **Karen Alexandra Guédez Gámez**, who were allegedly arrested at their residence on 24 December 2009 by officers of the Scientific, Penal and Criminal Investigations Squad.

## Annex

*[Original: Chinese]*

### Replies from the Government of China to urgent appeals

#### I. First reply (transmitted on 7 January 2014)

1. Cao Shunli is a woman of 52 years of age. It was found that she had disrupted social administrative order on many occasions. On 14 September 2013, she was detained by the Chao Yang Branch of the Beijing Public Security Bureau on the charge of the crime of provocation. On 21 October 2013, a warrant was issued by the Chao Yang Public Prosecutor's Office for her arrest, and Cao was then arrested.

2. Chen Jianfang is a woman of 43 years of age. On 3 September 2013, pursuant to article 12 of the Exit and Entry Administration Law of the People's Republic of China, the Shanghai Municipality Public Security Office stopped her at the border control. The penalty against Chen by the public security organ is based on the relevant law. Her violation of the law is established by ample evidence and clear facts. The application of law in this case is correct, the punishment is appropriate and the procedure is legitimate.

3. Pursuant to article 12.1 of the Criminal Procedure Law of the People's Republic of China, people's courts cannot accept requests for lawsuits on subjects of State actions, such as defence and State diplomacy, brought about by citizens, legal persons or other organizations. The work carried out by the Foreign Ministry on behalf of the Government of China in submitting to the United Nations the national report on human rights is a diplomatic action of the State. The lawsuits filed by Cao and others accusing the Government of lack of transparency in the process of national human rights reviews did not fall within the competence of the people's court. On 23 August 2013, the Second Beijing Intermediate People's Court came to the decision that the lawsuits filed by Cao and others against the Foreign Ministry were not acceptable.

4. In the preparation work of the national human rights review, the Government of China attaches great importance to the participation of non-governmental organizations. Consultations were carried out with more than 20 representative institutions, such as the All China Trade Union, the All China Women's Federation, the Chinese Society for Human Rights' Studies and the Institute of Law of the Chinese Academy of Social Science. The National Human Rights Report was posted on the website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for public perusal. Whatever has been done in this regard by the Government of China was in strict accordance with the spirit of the resolutions approved by the Human Rights Council.

5. The Government of China would like to request that the above text be reflected in full in relevant United Nations documentation.

#### II. Second reply (transmitted on 7 January 2014)

6. Yang Wei, with the on-line name of Yang Tingjian, is a man of 26 years of age, originally from Zi Xi county, Jianxi Province. On 24 May 2013, he was detained for 15 days pursuant to the administrative detention law on the charge of instigating and plotting an illegal gathering, assembly and demonstration. On 8 June 2013, he was detained

pursuant to the criminal code by the Guang Dong public security organ on suspicion of inciting subversion of the power of the State. On 12 July 2013, a warrant for his arrest was issued and he was duly arrested. At the moment, this case is being further reviewed.

7. Xu Zhiyong is a man of 40 years of age. He originates from Min Quan County, He Nan Province. On 16 July 2013, Xu was detained by the Beijing public security organ, pursuant to the criminal code, on suspicion of a crime of gathering s crowd to disrupt public order. On 12 July, a warrant was issued for his arrest. His case is still being further reviewed for the time being.

8. Gu Yimin is a man of 36 years of age. He originates from Chang Shu city, Jiang Su province. On 2 June 2013, he was detained by the Jiangsu provincial public security organ on suspicion of inciting subversion of the power of the State. On 14 June 2013, a warrant was issued for his arrest, and he was duly arrested. The People's Prosecution of Su Zhou City, Jiangsu Province, charged Gu, the offender, with inciting subversion of the power of the State. The prosecution was conducted at the Su Zhou Intermediate People's Court on 29 August 2013. On 29 September 2013, the trial was held in public session at the Su Zhou People's Intermediate Count, as laid down by the law. This case is still being reviewed.

9. Song Guangqiang, also called Song Ze, is a man of 50 years of age. On 12 July 2013, he was detained by the Beijing public security organ on a criminal charge of gathering a crowd to disrupt public order. On 16 August 2013, a warrant was issued for his arrest, and he was duly arrested. At the moment, the proceedings are still going on to further review the case.

10. Guo Feixion's real name is Yang Maodong. He is a man of 47 years of age and he originates from Gucheng county, Hubei Province. On 18 August 2013, he was detained by the public security organ on suspicion of gathering a crowd to disrupt public order. On 11 September, a warrant was issued for his arrest, and he was duly arrested. At the moment, the proceedings are still going on to further review this case.

11. Son Desheng is a man of 22 years of age. He originates from Xian Chun county, Hubei Province. On 13 August 2013, he was detained by the Guang Dong public security organ on the charge of gathering a crowd to disrupt public order. On 16 October 2013, a warrant was issued for his arrest, and he was duly arrested. At the moment, this case is still being further reviewed.

12. Zhou Weilin is a man of 48 years of age. He originates from Jiang Du county, Jiangsu province. On 4 September 2013, he was detained by the An Hui public security organ on suspicion of the crime of gathering a crowd to disrupt public order. On 6 September, a warrant was issued for his arrest, and he was duly arrested. On 11 December, he was handed over to the prosecution for further consideration. His case is currently being further examined.

13. For some of the people mentioned in the letter, namely, Zhang Fuying, Liu Yuandong, Deng Zhipo, Ying Jixian, Zhang Jixin, Zhao Guanjun, Zhu Pingping, Xu Nailai, He Bin, Zhao Zhenjia, Shen Guodong, Yin Xijin and Yao Cheng (names are translated according to phonetics), there is a lack of valid data on them and we are unable to verify their real identity.

14. China is a country of the rule of law. Our judicial institutions examine each case strictly pursuant to the relevant law, which guarantees the legitimate rights and freedoms of the people involved in these cases. There are multiple letters sent by the special procedures of the Human Rights Council. The Government of China takes care to answering meticulously every one of them. This amply shows its respect for the Human Rights Council and its special procedures and its willingness to cooperate on these issues.

15. The Government of China would like to request that the above text be included in full in United Nations documentation.

---