

#### THE UN WORKING GROUP ON ARBITRARY DETENTION

The United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention is the first comprehensive review of the contributions of this important institution to understanding arbitrary detention today. The Working Group is a body of five independent human rights experts that considers individual complaints of arbitrary detention, adopting legal opinions as to whether a detention is compatible with states' obligations under international law. Since its establishment in 1991, it has adopted more than 1,200 case opinions and conducted more than 50 country missions. But much more than a jurisprudential review, these cases are presented in the book in the style of a treatise, where the widest array of issues on arbitrary detention are placed in the context of the requirements of multilateral treaties and other relevant international standards. Written for both practitioners and serious scholars alike, this book includes five case studies and a foreword by Archbishop Desmond M. Tutu.

Jared Genser is Managing Director of Perseus Strategies, a public interest law firm, and an adjunct professor of Law at Georgetown University Law Center. He also founded Freedom Now, an independent nongovernmental organization, and has been referred to by the *New York Times* as "The Extractor" for his work freeing political prisoners around the world. Previously, he was a partner in the government affairs practice of the global law firm DLA Piper LLP and a management consultant with McKinsey & Company. Genser is a recipient of the American Bar Association's International Human Rights Award.



## Reviews and Endorsements for The UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention:

#### Commentary and Guide to Practice

Jared Genser is the leading attorney in the world on arbitrary detention in international law and established this reputation during the years I was a Member and Chair-Rapporteur of the UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention. His book makes an important contribution to understanding international law on arbitrary detention and offers a wealth of materials and clear and convincing analysis of the law and the major challenges that arbitrary detention poses to the international community today.

Mads Andenas Q.C.
Professor, University of Oslo and Institute of Advanced Legal Studies,
School of Advanced Study, University of London
Member and Chair-Rapporteur, UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention (2009–2015)
Director, British Institute of International and Comparative Law, London (1999–2006)

I have a rather unusual perspective on arbitrary detention because having been subjected to it by various authoritarian rulers of The Maldives has been a central and defining set of experiences in my life. Indeed, I've been arrested more than twenty times, repeatedly tortured, and have served more than three years in prison over various periods of arbitrary detention. . . . [A]t that point in 2015, [when I had been convicted on manufactured terrorism charges], I hired this book's author, Jared Genser, to serve as my pro bono counsel, alongside Amal Clooney and Ben Emmerson. The story of their extraordinary efforts is described in a compelling case study chapter in this book. The team submitted my case to the Working Group in April 2015 and in October 2015 it issued Opinion No. 33/2015, a scathing twenty-page judgment that rejected the Government's arguments on every point and demanded my immediate release. Hundreds marched in the streets of Malé supporting the Working Group's decision. With my team's relentless advocacy, the Government could not withstand the political pressure and it was forced to release me. I was greeted by Amal and Jared when I arrived in London on January 21, 2016. But that was not the end of the story . . . in September 2018 our country succeeded in defeating Yameen in a democratic election. My close friend and cofounder of our political party Ibrahim Mohamed Solih was elected President. I returned to The Maldives in November 2018 and was especially pleased that Jared was with me in our Supreme Court on the day it reversed my conviction and acquitted me on all charges, citing to the opinion of the Working Group as a key reason for its decision. In April 2019, I was elected to our Parliament, the People's Majlis, and in May 2019, I was elected and sworn in to be its new Speaker. . . . The greatest fear of any political prisoner is that they will be forgotten. This exceptional and meticulous work of scholarship will be an invaluable tool for advocates to make sure that doesn't happen.

> The Honorable Mohamed Nasheed Speaker of the People's Majlis, The Maldives (2019–Present) President of The Maldives (2008–2012)

We have seen substantial progress in reducing the phenomenon of arbitrary detention in the Americas but there still remain too many countries in our region with serious challenges to the rule of law and where especially repressive governments stubbornly persist in imprisoning their opponents against the tide of history. While the Inter-American Commission and Court of Human Rights have taken up many of these cases, the UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention has also highlighted some of the worst. This impressive book, authored by Jared Genser, who over the years has represented prominent political prisoners in countries like Bolivia, Colombia, Cuba, Nicaragua, and Venezuela, shines an important spotlight on a major gap between the commitments of states in the American Convention on Human Rights to end the practice of arbitrary arrest and imprisonment and their implementation in practice.

The Honorable Luis Almagro Secretary General, Organization of American States



Kudos to Jared Genser for bringing to life the inner workings and substantial accomplishments of one of the key UN human rights bodies – the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention. . . . Genser not only presents an analysis of the legal significance of its jurisprudence over the past twenty seven years, but then reveals to his reader what it really means to submit a case for a decision, to fight for the unjustly imprisoned, and to succeed in securing their freedom. . . . It's easy to criticize "the UN" and its member states for its inconsistent defense of human rights in its politicized forums; but the real achievements of the UN human rights system lie in the norms it has adopted and the independent mechanisms like the Working Group that fight independently to uphold these standards in real world situations, for real people. Genser opens our eyes to what's needed to make a good case – and how to fight for individual freedom, successfully.

Felice D. Gaer Director, Jacob Blaustein Institute for Human Rights Vice-Chairperson, UN Committee against Torture

Having spent over a decade in solitary confinement as a political prisoner, I have come to appreciate with great intensity that the subtle aspects of freedom - to read, to walk about, and to sleep – are actions that can easily be taken for granted. The persistent denial of access to family, to information and to human interaction induces a profound loneliness in the prisoner, coupled with the dreadful feeling as though your life's contributions are slowly being excised from public consciousness. This is why, when a sympathetic prison guard tapped on my cell gate one morning and whispered to me with hushed excitement that "the UN just called for your release!," I felt a renewed sense of hope that the wheels of justice were still churning. I learned a short time later that my international lawyer Jared Genser, the book's author, had just made public Opinion No. 22/2015. In a detailed decision, the Working Group unanimously agreed I was being held in violation of international law and it urged my immediate release ... for the United Nations to have spoken out in this unequivocal way had struck an irrecoverable blow to the former prime minister's efforts to try to justify my detention. . . . Jared Genser is a pioneer in the area of human rights law and a courageous and indefatigable representative of political prisoners around the world. This book represents his singular expertise in this area and should be required reading for all who seek a deeper understanding of the Working Group's activities and inner mechanisms.

Dato' Seri Anwar Ibrahim

President of the People's Justice Party and Member of Parliament (2018–Present) Deputy Prime Minister of Malaysia (1993–1998)

There are those for whom words have meaning and those who issue hollow promises. This is as true of people as it is of states. . . . It is precisely to ensure that these words were not empty that France, with Robert Badinter and Louis Joinet, has played a leading role in the establishment of an original mechanism to ensure concretely the proper application of the intentions proclaimed by these nations. . . . It is in this spirit that Jared Genser has produced this exceptional work, so rigorous in both legal and methodological terms. This book will surely become an indispensable tool for all those who believe that human rights are nothing if they are not concretely applied to individual situations. . . . Thanks to the author for allowing us to better defend those persecuted around the world by so usefully assisting their advocates, without whom the universality of fundamental rights would be a vain hope.

The Honorable François Zimeray Ambassador of France for Human Rights (2008–2013) Lawyer

As someone engaged in the defense of political prisoners over the years, I regard *The United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention* as a tour de force and seminal scholarly work, which makes an enormous contribution to understanding the phenomenon of arbitrary detention in our world today. In particular, it is also a comprehensive and practical guide for freeing the arbitrarily detained, infused with the author's experiences as an international lawyer in this



complex, interdisciplinary, and specialist field, where his exceptional work is widely known and respected for its unique and effective contributions.

The Honorable Irwin Cotler, P.C., O.C. Chairman, Raoul Wallenberg Centre for Human Rights Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada (2003–2006)

Up until the Working Group adopted Opinion No. 2/2003 on my case, I had been detained with total impunity and incommunicado by China for more than fourteen months. Within a day of this decision being made public, I was finally given access to my local lawyer and my hope was restored, learning the world had not forgotten my plight. Despite still having faced a potential death sentence on spurious charges of endangering national security, this invaluable opinion from the United Nations combined with the relentless advocacy of this book's author Jared Genser resulted in my early release, enabling me to dedicate the balance of my life pursuing freedom, democracy, and human rights for the Chinese people.

Yang Jianli President, Initiatives for China



# The UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention

COMMENTARY AND GUIDE TO PRACTICE

Jared Genser

Perseus Strategies and Georgetown University Law Center





# **CAMBRIDGE**UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314-321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi - 110025, India

79 Anson Road, #06-04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107034457

doi: 10.1017/9781139540711

© Jared Genser 2020

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2020

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

NAMES: Genser, Jared, author.

TITLE: The UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention: commentary and guide to practice / Jared Genser.

DESCRIPTION: New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019.

IDENTIFIERS: LCCN 2019014858 | ISBN 9781107034457 (hardback)

SUBJECTS: LCSH: United Nations. Working Group on Arbitrary Detention. | Detention of persons—Government policy. | Due process of law. | Human rights—International cooperation. | BISAC: LAW / International.

CLASSIFICATION: LCC K3241 .G46 2019 | DDC 345/.0527–dc23

LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2019014858

ISBN 978-1-107-03445-7 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.



## Contents

List of Figures	page xv
About the Author	xvi
Foreword Archbishop Desmond M. Tutu	xix
Acknowledgments	XX
List of Abbreviations	xxiii
PART I BACKGROUND	1
Introduction	3
I What Is Detention?	3
II What Makes a Deprivation of Liberty Arbitrary?	4
III The Case of Ayub Masih v. Pakistan	7
IV Lessons from Ayub Masih's Case	Ç
V Background on UN Human Rights System	10
Overview of the Working Group	12
I Consists of Independent Experts	13
II Flexible Standing and Rules of Evidence	15
III Engages in an Adversarial Process	16
IV Uses All Available Law and Principles	16
V Issues Legal Opinions	19
VI Updates Its Working Methods and Procedures	21
2 Deliberations of the Working Group	23
I Deliberation No. 1 on House Arrest	2.4
II Deliberation No. 2 on Admissibility of Communications, National	
Legislation, and Documents of a Declaratory Nature	26
III Deliberation No. 3 on Deprivation of Liberty Subsequent to a	
Conviction, Quality of Information on Which Decisions are	
Based, 90-Day Deadline for Replies, and "Urgent Action"	20
IV Deliberation No. 4 on Rehabilitation through Labour	31
V Deliberation No. 5 on the Situation Regarding Immigrants and	
Asylum-Seekers and Revision	34
VI Deliberation No. 6 on Legal Analysis of Allegations against the	
International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia	37
VII Deliberation No. 7 on Issues Relating to Psychiatric Detention	40

vii



viii	Contents
VIII Deliberation No. 8 on Deprivation of Liberty Linked to/Resulting	
from the Use of the Internet	42
IX Deliberation No. 9 Concerning the Definition and Scope of	
Arbitrary Deprivation of Liberty under Customary International Law	w 43
X Drug Policies and Arbitrary Detention	47
PART II INDIVIDUAL CASE PROCEDURE	49
3 Process for Taking a Case to the Working Group	51
I General Overview	51
A Summary of Process	51
B Important Implications of Submitting a Case	52
C Identifying Detainees for Submission	54
D Adverse State(s) and Detentions by Non-State Actors	55
E Approach to Evidence	57
F Languages	59
G Categories of Cases	59
H Working Group's Basic Principles and Guidelines, Prior Opinio	
and Annual Reports	60
I Working Group Country Mission Reports	61
J Applicable Law	63
K States of Emergency	68
II Submitting a Case	69
A Authorization for Submission	69
B Timing of Submission	70
C Contents of Submission	71
III Conveying the Case to the Government	77
A "Urgent Action"	78
B Regular Procedure	80
IV Receiving and Replying to a Response from the Government	81
V Consideration of the Case	87
A Background on Individual Case Consideration in Methods of W	
B Process for Reaching Opinions	88
C Timeframe for the Issuances of Opinions	89
VI Finalizing of the Opinion and Communication to	
the Government and Petitioner	91
VII Structure of Opinions	92
A Opinion Number and Date Adopted	92
B Preliminary Information	93
C Information from Source and Government	93
D Discussion and Disposition	94
E Recommendations to Government	95
F Referrals to Other Relevant UN Special Procedures	96
G Follow-Up Procedure	97
VIII Appeals of Opinions	100
IX Follow-Up on Opinions	101
X Reprisals	102



Conte	ents	ix
PART	III CASE JURISPRUDENCE	105
4 Cat	tegory I - No Legal Basis for Detention	109
I	No Penalty without Law	109
	A Arrested without Warrant and Held without Charge	113
	B Arrested and Detained by Government Agency without Legal Authority	114
	C Charges Changed without Explanation	114
	D Detained under Vague Law	114
	E Detained after Release Order	114
	F Detained beyond Expiration of Sentence	115
	G Detained for Extra-Legal "Rehabilitation"	116
	H Detained on General Charges of Threat to National Security	116
	I Detained under Law Not Authorizing Detention	117
	J Detained across an Extradition When Maximum Sentence Exceeded	117
	K Detained after Incomplete Extradition Request	117
	L Detained after Illegal Border Crossing after Order for Repatriation	117
	M Detained Post-Acquittal on Unspecified New Charges	118
	N Detained in Psychiatric Hospital without Due Process	118
	O Detained for Conscientious Objection When Detention Not Valid Penalty	119
	P Detained in Violation of Parliamentary Immunity Q Detained by Non-State Actor Attributed to State	119
II	Ex Post Facto Laws	120
	Ne Bis In Idem or Double Jeopardy	12C 122
	Detention after Amnesty	122
	Extraordinary Rendition	124
r Cat	tegory II – Violation of Fundamental Rights and Freedoms	127
	Freedom of Religion	
1	A Freedom of Religion, Belief, Conscience, and Thought	133
	B Manifestation of Religion or Belief	134
	C Permissible Limitations	137
	D Targeting of Religious Groups	139 143
П	Association	147
	A Scope of the Right	148
	B Permissible Limitations and Derogations	150
III	Assembly	159
	A Scope of the Right	159
	B Limits to the Right	162
IV	Opinion and Expression	168
	A Freedom of Opinion	170
	B Scope of Freedom of Expression	173
	C Permissible Limitations and Derogations	178
V	Participation in Public Affairs/Government	208
	A Scope of the Right	208
	B Interpretation of Participation in Government Affairs	211
	C Permissible Limitations	215
	D Overlap with Article 19 Freedom of Expression	217
	Freedom of Movement	219
1/11	Minority Cultures to Enjoy Culture	221



X		•	Contents
	VIII	Equal Protection	223
	IX	Right to Seek Asylum	226
6	Cate	gory III – Violation of Rights of Due Process	229
	I	Arrest without a Warrant	229
		A Applicable Law and Standards	230
		B Cases of Arrest without a Warrant	<sup>2</sup> 34
		C Analysis of Arrest without a Warrant	<del>24</del> 3
	II	Incommunicado Detention	244
		A Applicable Laws and Standards	248
		B Cases of Incommunicado Detention	253
		C Analysis of Incommunicado Detention	271
	III	Denial of Right to Trial or Release within Reasonable Time,	
		Including the Right to Habeas Corpus	271
		A Right to Prompt Appearance before a Judge	273
		B General Rule against Pretrial Detention	275
		C Right to Trial or Release within a Reasonable Time	281
	13.7	D Counting of Time in Pretrial Detention toward Final Sentence	282
	1 V	Denial of Right to Competent Independent and Impartial Tribunal	283 283
		A Denial of Right to Competent, Independent, and Impartial Tribunal B Denial of Right to Presumption of Innocence	-
		C Denial of Right to Present a Defense	297 303
		D Denial of Right to Present and Cross-Examine Witnesses	3 <sup>0</sup> 3
		E Denial of Right to Public Hearing	3 <u>2</u> 0
		F Evidentiary Challenges: Improper Evidence and Absence of Evidence	330
		G Denial to Right of Appeal	343
	V	Military Tribunals	351
		A Applicable Laws and Standards	357
		B Cases of Military Tribunals	362
		C Analysis of Trials by Military Tribunal	374
	VI	Administrative Detentions	374
		A Debtor's Prison	374
		B Psychiatric, Disability, and Drug User Detentions	376
		C Other Administrative Offenses	380
	VII	Mass Detentions	383
		A Inferring Broader Violations from Individual Cases and Context	384
		B Inferring Broader Violations from Repetition of Fact Patterns	386
	X 7777	C Examining Situations of Large Cohort of Detainees Together	388
		Extraditions	388
		Disproportionate or Excessive Sentencing	393
		Juvenile Justice	394
	ΛI	Unusual Case: Julian Assange v. Sweden and the United Kingdom	396
		A Timeline of the Case  B Assange's Complaint to the WCAD	397
		B Assange's Complaint to the WGAD C Government Responses to Assange's Petition	398
		D WGAD Opinion	403 405
		E Unusual Approach to WGAD Opinion	405 406
		F Rejection of Appeal	400



C	Contents		xi
7	Cate	egory IV – Violation of Rights of Asylum Seekers	410
,		Applicable Law and Standards	410
		Limitations and Exclusions	411
		Extension of Protections to Other Class of Migrants, Including	411
	111	Stateless People	412
	IV/	Detention Not Justified By Inability of State to Carry out Deportation	413
		Detention of Foreigners Pending Removal on National Security Grounds	414
		Detention Cannot Be Used by States as a Deterrent	414
		State Justifications for the Detention of Refugees, Asylum Seekers, and	415
	V 11	Migrants	416
	VIII	State Failures to Provide Opportunity for Judicial or Administrative Review	
		State Failure to Honor Valid Refugee or Lawful Immigration Status	417
		Detentions of Migrants by States in Prisons or by Police	419
		Detentions of Migrants by States in Private Detention Facilities	420
		Detentions of Children	421
		Status of Refugees and Asylum Seekers Who Return Home	421 422
		Refugees and Asylum Seekers Who Threaten National Security or	4
	211 1	Commit Serious Crimes	422
	XV	State Diversion of Asylum Seekers to Third Countries	423
		Same 2 : Volvior 01: 20 / ann decides to 1 mild decides	<del>T-</del> )
8	Cate	egory V – Discrimination on Protected Grounds	··· 425
		Birth	426
		National, Ethnic, or Social Origin	-
		Language	427
		Religion	431
		Economic Condition	431
		Political Opinion	434
		Other Opinion	434
		Gender	437 438
		Sexual Orientation	438
		Disability	
		Other Status	439
	2 11	A Citizenship	440
		B Family Status	440
		C Human Rights Defenders	440
		D Whistleblowers	441 442
			7-7-
9	Dete	ention Not Arbitrary	443
_		Government's Response Successfully Rebuts Source's Claims or	112
		Corroborated by the Record	442
	П	Government Has Complied with International Law	443
		Exception to Prohibition against Detention Applies	444 445
		Narrow Exception Allowing Preventative Detention When Danger to	443
	1 4	Community	115
	V	WGAD Asked to Substitute Itself for Domestic Fact Finder	445 447
		Failure by Source to Properly Argue a Case	<del>44</del> 7 <del>44</del> 7
		Failure by Source to Properly August a Case Failure by Source to Reply to Government's Response	448
		Source Contradicts Itself in Reply to Government's Response	448



IX Case Does Not Fall within WGAD's Categories of Arbitrary Deprivation of Liberty X Detainee Released, Case Filed, but Detention Not Arbitrary X IC Case Pending, Issuance of Opinion Deferred XII Case Referred to Other UN Special Procedure 451 XII Case Referred to Other UN Special Procedure 452 XII Case Referred to Other UN Special Procedure 453 XII Case Referred to Other UN Special Procedure 454 A Background 457 I Introduction A Background B The Facts of Mohamed Nasheed's Case 458 II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention A The Lead Up to the Petition and Its Submission 459 B Category II: Arbitrary Detention C Category III: Arbitrary Detention D Category III: Arbitrary Detention E Category V: Arbitrary Detention F Category V: Arbitrary Detention B Argument Response to the Petition A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission 472 A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission 473 B Arguments Regarding Category I Violations A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission 474 D Arguments Regarding Category II Wiolations 475 F Additional Updates Provided by the Government 476 IV Reply to the Government's Response A Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II Violations C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II Violations C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II Violations C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II Violations D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II Violations C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II Wiolations D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II Wiolations UThe WGAD's Opinion A The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V I Introduction A Background B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer	xii	Contents
Deprivation of Liberty X Detainee Released, Case Filed, but Detention Not Arbitrary X I Case Pending, Issuance of Opinion Deferred 451 XII Case Referred to Other UN Special Procedure 454 FART IV ADDITIONAL CASE STUDIES 455  10 Mohamed Nasheed v. The Maldives	IX Case Does Not Fall within WGAD's Categories of Arbitrary	
X Detainee Released, Case Filed, but Detention Not Arbitrary XI Case Pending, Issuance of Opinion Deferred XII Case Referred to Other UN Special Procedure 454  FART IV ADDITIONAL CASE STUDIES 455  10 Mohamed Nasheed v. The Maldives 457  I Introduction 457  A Background 457  B The Facts of Mohamed Nasheed's Case 458  II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention 459  A The Lead Up to the Petition and Its Submission 459  B Category II: Arbitrary Detention 460  C Category II: Arbitrary Detention 461  D Category III: Arbitrary Detention 462  E Category V. Arbitrary Detention 472  III Government Response to the Petition 473  A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission 474  B Arguments Regarding Procedure 473  C Arguments Regarding Category I Violations 474  D Arguments Regarding Category II Violations 474  E Arguments Regarding Category II Wiolations 474  F Additional Updates Provided by the Government 477  IV Reply to the Government's Response A Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II Violations 476  A The Category II Violations 477  B Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II Violations 477  E Arguments Regarding Category II Wiolations 477  F Additional Updates Provided by the Government 477  IV Reply to the Government's Response A Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II Violations 480  C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II Wiolations 480  C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II Wiolations 480  C The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V violations 481  A The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V in Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V in Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V in Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V in Maldives' Deten		448
XI Case Pending, Issuance of Opinion Deferred XII Case Referred to Other UN Special Procedure 454  PART IV ADDITIONAL CASE STUDIES  1 Introduction A Background B The Facts of Mohamed Nasheed's Case II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention A The Lead Up to the Petition and Its Submission B Category I: Arbitrary Detention C Category II: Arbitrary Detention D Category III: Arbitrary Detention E Category V: Arbitrary Detention F Category V: Arbitrary Detention C Category II: Arbitrary Detention F Category V: Arbitrary Detention A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission F Category V: Arbitrary Detention A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A Treply to the Government Regarding Category II Violations A Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding Procedure A Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding Procedure B Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II Violations C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II Violations V The WGAD's Opinion A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid B The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III VI Resolution  1 "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases v. Turkey under Category III VI Resolution  1 "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases v. Turkey 490 I Introduction A Background B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases 491 II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention 493 A The Lead Up to the Petition 494 A The Lead Up to the Petition 495		
XII Case Referred to Other UN Special Procedure  A DADITIONAL CASE STUDIES  10 Mohamed Nasheed v. The Maldives		
PART IV ADDITIONAL CASE STUDIES  10 Mohamed Nasheed v. The Maldives	•	
Io Mohamed Nasheed v. The Maldives		
I Introduction A Background B The Facts of Mohamed Nasheed's Case II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention A The Lead Up to the Petition and Its Submission B Category II: Arbitrary Detention C Category III: Arbitrary Detention D Category III: Arbitrary Detention E Category V: Arbitrary Detention E Category V: Arbitrary Detention F Category V: Arbitrary Detention E Category V: Arbitrary Detention F Category V: Violations F Category V: Violati	PART IV ADDITIONAL CASE STUDIES	455
A Background B The Facts of Mohamed Nasheed's Case II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention A The Lead Up to the Petition and Its Submission B Category II: Arbitrary Detention C Category II: Arbitrary Detention D Category III: Arbitrary Detention E Category V: Arbitrary Detention E Category V: Arbitrary Detention E Category V: Arbitrary Detention F Category II: Arb	10 Mohamed Nasheed v. The Maldives	457
B The Facts of Mohamed Nasheed's Case II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention A The Lead Up to the Petition and Its Submission B Category I: Arbitrary Detention C Category II: Arbitrary Detention D Category III: Arbitrary Detention E Category V: Arbitrary Detention D Category W: Arbitrary Detention E Category V: Arbitrary Detention Hill Government Response to the Petition A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A Addressing Category II and V Violations A The Government's Response and Its Submission A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Regarding Procedure A Backgory II II Violations A The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V D Th	I Introduction	457
II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention A The Lead Up to the Petition and Its Submission B Category I: Arbitrary Detention C Category II: Arbitrary Detention D Category III: Arbitrary Detention E Category V: Arbitrary Detention A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A Regarding Procedure A Tree C Arguments Regarding Category I Violations A Regarding Category II wiolations A Addressing the Response (2007) Ill and V Violations A Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding Procedure A Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category I Violations C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II and V Violations D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category III Violations A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid B The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V D Th		457
A The Lead Up to the Petition and Its Submission B Category II: Arbitrary Detention C Category III: Arbitrary Detention D Category III: Arbitrary Detention E Category V: Arbitrary Detention E Category V: Arbitrary Detention The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A Treaments Regarding Procedure A Treaments Regarding Category I Violations A Treaments Regarding Category II and V Violations A Addressing Regarding Category III and V Violations A Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding Procedure A Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding Procedure A Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category I Violations C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category I Violations D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II violations D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II Violations D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II Violations D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II Violations D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II Violations A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid B The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V A The Solution A Background B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention A The Lead Up to the Petition		45 <sup>8</sup>
B Category II: Arbitrary Detention C Category III: Arbitrary Detention D Category III: Arbitrary Detention E Category III: Arbitrary Detention E Category V: Arbitrary Detention F Category V: Arbitrary Detention The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A Treatment Regarding Procedure C Arguments Regarding Category I Violations D Arguments Regarding Category II and V Violations F Additional Updates Provided by the Government F Additional Updates Provided by the Merits of the Category II and V Violations F Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category III Violations F A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid F The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid F The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V F The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III F The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III F The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III F The Government Cases V. Turkey	y .	459
C Category II: Arbitrary Detention D Category III: Arbitrary Detention E Category V: Arbitrary Detention E Category V: Arbitrary Detention E Category V: Arbitrary Detention A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission B Arguments Regarding Procedure C Arguments Regarding Procedure C Arguments Regarding Category I Violations D Arguments Regarding Category III and V Violations E Arguments Regarding Category III Violations F Additional Updates Provided by the Government IV Reply to the Government's Response A Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding Procedure B Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category I Violations C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II and V Violations D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category III Violations 480 The WGAD's Opinion A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid B The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category I C The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V D The Government Cases V. Turkey  1	•	
D Category III: Arbitrary Detention E Category V: Arbitrary Detention E Category V: Arbitrary Detention E Category V: Arbitrary Detention A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission B Arguments Regarding Procedure A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission B Arguments Regarding Procedure C Arguments Regarding Category I Violations D Arguments Regarding Category II and V Violations E Arguments Regarding Category III Violations F Additional Updates Provided by the Government IV Reply to the Government's Response A Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding Procedure B Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category I Violations C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II and V Violations D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category III Violations 480 V The WGAD's Opinion A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid B The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category I C The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III	9.	
E Category V: Arbitrary Detention  III Government Response to the Petition  A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission  B Arguments Regarding Procedure  C Arguments Regarding Category I Violations  D Arguments Regarding Category II and V Violations  E Arguments Regarding Category III Violations  F Additional Updates Provided by the Government  IV Reply to the Government's Response  A Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding Procedure  B Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category I Violations  C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II and V Violations  C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II Violations  V The WGAD's Opinion  A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid  B The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V  D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V  I The WGAD's Opinion  A The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V  I The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V  I The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V  I The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V  I The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V  A Background  A Background  B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases  II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention  A The Lead Up to the Petition  Have the Petition of Petition  A The Lead Up to the Petition	y .	· ·
III Government Response to the Petition A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission B Arguments Regarding Procedure C Arguments Regarding Category I Violations D Arguments Regarding Category III and V Violations E Arguments Regarding Category III violations F Additional Updates Provided by the Government IV Reply to the Government's Response A Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding Procedure B Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category I Violations C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II and V Violations D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category III Violations V The WGAD's Opinion A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid B The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III WI Resolution  10 The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III when the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III when the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III when the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III when the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III when the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III when the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III when the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III when the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III when the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III when the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III when the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III when the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III when the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III when the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was		463
A The Lead Up to the Response and Its Submission  B Arguments Regarding Procedure  C Arguments Regarding Category I Violations  Arguments Regarding Category II and V Violations  E Arguments Regarding Category III violations  F Additional Updates Provided by the Government  IV Reply to the Government's Response  A Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding Procedure  B Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category I Violations  C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II and V Violations  D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category III Violations  D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category III Violations  V The WGAD's Opinion  A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid  B The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V  D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V  D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V  Introduction  A Background  B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases  490  I Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention  A The Lead Up to the Petition  493  A The Lead Up to the Petition	9 , ,	
B Arguments Regarding Procedure C Arguments Regarding Category I Violations D Arguments Regarding Category II and V Violations E Arguments Regarding Category III Violations F Additional Updates Provided by the Government IV Reply to the Government's Response A Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding Procedure B Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category I Violations C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II and V Violations D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category III violations V The WGAD's Opinion 484 A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid B The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category I C The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V I Resolution 486 VI Resolution 487 VI Resolution 487 VI Resolution 488 VI Resolution 489 A Background B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases 491 II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention 493 A The Lead Up to the Petition 493		
C Arguments Regarding Category I Violations D Arguments Regarding Category II and V Violations E Arguments Regarding Category III Violations F Additional Updates Provided by the Government F Additional Updates Provided by the Government IV Reply to the Government's Response A Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding Procedure B Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category I Violations C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category III and V Violations D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category III Violations V The WGAD's Opinion A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid B The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category I C The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III and V A Resolution  1 "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases v. Turkey I Introduction A Background B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases III Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention A The Lead Up to the Petition  474 474 477 474 477 474 477 474 477 474 477 477 477 478 479 479 479 479 480 481 485 480 480 481 485 486 487 486 48	1 1	
D Arguments Regarding Category II and V Violations E Arguments Regarding Category III Violations F Additional Updates Provided by the Government IV Reply to the Government's Response A Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding Procedure B Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category I Violations C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II and V Violations D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category III Violations V The WGAD's Opinion A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid B The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category I C The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V I Resolution  1 "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases v. Turkey I Introduction A Background B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention A The Lead Up to the Petition  474 477 477 478 477 478 477 478 477 478 477 478 479 479 479 479 480 480 481 485 486 487 486 487 486 487 486 487 486 487		
E Arguments Regarding Category III Violations F Additional Updates Provided by the Government 477 IV Reply to the Government's Response A Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding Procedure B Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category I Violations C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II and V Violations D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category III Violations V The WGAD's Opinion A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid B The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category I and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III VI Resolution 486 VI Resolution 487 VI Resolution 488 VI Resolution 489 VI Resolution 490 A Background B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases 491 II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention 493 A The Lead Up to the Petition 494	9 9 9 .	
F Additional Updates Provided by the Government  IV Reply to the Government's Response A Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding Procedure B Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category I Violations C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II and V Violations D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category III Violations V The WGAD's Opinion A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid B The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category I C The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III VI Resolution  1 "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases v. Turkey I Introduction A Background B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention A The Lead Up to the Petition  477  478  479  470  470  470  470  471  475  475  475  476  477  477  477  477	9 9 9 .	
IV Reply to the Government's Response A Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding Procedure B Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category I Violations C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II and V Violations D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category III Violations 480 V The WGAD's Opinion A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid B The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category I C The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III VI Resolution 486 U Resolution 487 I "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases v. Turkey I Introduction A Background B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases 491 II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention 493 A The Lead Up to the Petition 493	9 9 9 .	
A Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding Procedure B Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category I Violations C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II and V Violations D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category III Violations V The WGAD's Opinion A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid B The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category I C The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III VI Resolution  10 Waldressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category III of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid 485 485 486 487 488 489 489 480 480 480 481 481 482 483 484 485 486 487 486 487 487 488 488 488 488 489 488 489 488 489 488 489 489	·	
B Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category I Violations C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II and V Violations D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category III Violations V The WGAD's Opinion A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid B The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category I C The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III VI Resolution  10 The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III VI Resolution  11 "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases v. Turkey  I Introduction A Background B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases  490 II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention 493 A The Lead Up to the Petition 493	1 /	
Category I Violations C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II and V Violations D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category III Violations V The WGAD's Opinion A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid B The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category I C The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III VI Resolution 486 VI Resolution 487  11 "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases v. Turkey I Introduction A Background B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases 490 II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention 493 A The Lead Up to the Petition 493		4/9
C Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category II and V Violations  D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category III Violations  V The WGAD's Opinion  A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid  B The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category I  C The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V  D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III  VI Resolution  486  VI Resolution  487  11 "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases v. Turkey  I Introduction  A Background  B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases  490  II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention  493  A The Lead Up to the Petition  490		480
Category II and V Violations  D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category III Violations  V The WGAD's Opinion  A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid B The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category I  C The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V  D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III  VI Resolution  1 "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases v. Turkey  I Introduction  A Background B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases  490  I Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention 491  A The Lead Up to the Petition 493	· .	1
D Addressing the Response's Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Category III Violations  V The WGAD's Opinion  A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid B The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category I  C The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V  D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III  VI Resolution  1 "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases v. Turkey  I Introduction  A Background B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases  490  II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention  493  A The Lead Up to the Petition  494  495		480
Category III Violations  V The WGAD's Opinion  A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid  B The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was  Arbitrary under Category I  C The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary  under Category II and V  D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary  under Category III  VI Resolution  486  VI Resolution  487  11 "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases v. Turkey  I Introduction  A Background  B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases  II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention  A The Lead Up to the Petition  493  A The Lead Up to the Petition  494	· .	•
V The WGAD's Opinion  A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid  B The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was  Arbitrary under Category I  C The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary  under Category II and V  D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary  under Category III  VI Resolution  486  VI Resolution  487  11 "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases v. Turkey  I Introduction  A Background  B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases  II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention  A The Lead Up to the Petition  488  489  481		481
B The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category I C The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III 486 VI Resolution 487  11 "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases v. Turkey I Introduction A Background B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases 490 II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention A The Lead Up to the Petition 493 A The Lead Up to the Petition 494		•
Arbitrary under Category I C The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III 486 VI Resolution 487  11 "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases v. Turkey I Introduction A Background B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases 490 II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention A The Lead Up to the Petition 493 A The Lead Up to the Petition 494	A The Government of the Maldives' Procedural Arguments Were Invalid	485
C The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category II and V 486  D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III 486  VI Resolution 487  11 "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases v. Turkey 490  I Introduction 490  A Background 490  B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases 491  II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention 493  A The Lead Up to the Petition 493	B The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was	
under Category II and V D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III 486 VI Resolution 487  11 "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases v. Turkey 490 I Introduction A Background B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases 491 II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention A The Lead Up to the Petition 493 A The Lead Up to the Petition 494		
D The Government of the Maldives' Detention of Nasheed was Arbitrary under Category III 486 VI Resolution 487  11 "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases v. Turkey 490 I Introduction 490 A Background 490 B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases 491 II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention 493 A The Lead Up to the Petition 493		
under Category III 486 VI Resolution 487  11 "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases v. Turkey 490 I Introduction 490 A Background 490 B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases 491 II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention 493 A The Lead Up to the Petition 493		
VI Resolution 487  11 "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases v. Turkey 490  I Introduction 490  A Background 490  B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases 491  II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention 493  A The Lead Up to the Petition 493		
11 "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases v. Turkey		-
I Introduction 490 A Background 490 B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases 491 II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention 493 A The Lead Up to the Petition 493	VI Resolution	487
I Introduction 490 A Background 490 B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases 491 II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention 493 A The Lead Up to the Petition 493	11 "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases v. Turkey	490
A Background B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases 490 II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention A The Lead Up to the Petition 493 494		• •
B The Facts of the "Balyoz" or Sledgehammer Cases  II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention  A The Lead Up to the Petition  493  494  495		
II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention A The Lead Up to the Petition 493 493	9	
A The Lead Up to the Petition 493		
D. C. L. C. C. H. L. D. C.		



Con	tents	X111
II	I Government Response to the Petition	498
	A Serious Procedural Irregularities in Government's Response	498
	B Arguments Regarding Procedure	499
	C Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Due Process Violations	500
	D New References to Article 9 of the ICCPR	501
IV	Reply to the Government's Response	502
	A Addressing the Serious Procedural Irregularities in the Government's	)
	Response	502
	<ul><li>B Addressing the Responses' Arguments Regarding Procedure</li><li>C Addressing the Responses' Arguments Regarding the Merits of the Due</li></ul>	503
	Process Violations	505
V	The WGAD's Opinion	507
	A The Government of Turkey's Procedural Arguments Were Invalid B The Government of Turkey Violated the Due Process Rights Guaranteed by the ICCPR and Held the Petitioners in Violation of Its International	508
<b>x</b> 7	Obligations	508
V	I Resolution	510
12 A	ung San Suu Kyi v. Myanmar	F12
	I Introduction	512
	A Background	512
	B The Facts of Aung San Suu Kyi's Case	513
ī	I Petitions to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention and Its Opinions	516
1	y	519
	A Opinion No. 8/1992	519
	B Opinion No. 2/2002	520
	C Opinion No. 9/2004	521
	D Opinion No. 2/2007	522
	E Opinion No. 46/2008 F Opinion No. 12/2010	523
ш	ı	5 <del>2</del> 4
11.	Campaign to Secure Aung San Suu Kyi's Freedom	525
	A International Engagement	526
	B Bilateral Pressure	527
п	C Media and Opinion Editorials	528
11	7 Conclusion	529
13 N	lukhtar Ablyazov v. France	531
	I Introduction	531
	A Background	531
	B Facts of the Case	531
I	I Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention	534
	A Procedural Note Regarding Treatment of Extradition under ICCPR	535
	B Category I Arbitrary Detention	536
	C Category III Violations	537
II	I Government Responses to the Petition	543
	A Serious Procedural Irregularities	543
	B Response from the Government of France	544
	C Responses from the Governments of Ukraine and Kazakhstan	545
Ι	Replies to the Governments' Responses	545
	A Reply to the Government of France	545
	B Replies to the Governments of Ukraine and Kazakhstan	545



xiv	Content
V The WGAD's Opinion	546
A Ablyazov's Detention Was Not without Legal Basis	546
B Ablyazov's Detention Was Found Narrowly to Be Arbitrary under	71
Category III	546
VI Resolution	54 <sup>8</sup>
14 Yang Jianli v. China	549
I Introduction	549
A Background	549
B The Facts of the Case	549
II Petition to Working Group on Arbitrary Detention	550
A The Lead Up to the Petition	550
B Request for Urgent Action	55
C Submission of Petition: Category III Arbitrary Detention	55
III Government Response to the Petition and Reply to Response	552
IV The WGAD's Opinion	554
A Preliminary Observations on the Government's Response and	
Approach to the Evidence	554
B Legal Analysis	554
V Resolution	555
Table of Authorities	559
Appendices: Required Legal Materials	58
Appendix 1 Methods of Work of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention	58:
Appendix 2 Model Questionnaire to be Completed by Persons Alleging Arbitrat	ry
Arrest or Detention	59
Appendix 3 UN Basic Principles and Guidelines on Remedies and Procedures	on
the Right of Anyone Deprived of Their Liberty to Bring Proceeding	s
before a Court	595
Index	625



## Figures

1	List of UN special procedures	раде 11
2	Overview of regular procedure	51
3	Average number of detainees submitted per case	55
4	Cover page of a WGAD petition	72
5	Government response rate to urgent action appeals	79
6	Government response rate to regular communications	81
7	Response rate for Governments with most cases	82
8	Impact of Government response on outcome	87
9	Average days from communication to opinion	89
10	Another view of efficiency of Working Group processing cases	90
11	Average days to reach opinion for top countries	90
12	Number of issued opinions, by year	91
13	Outcome of Working Group cases	91
14	Working Group reporting of releases of detainees that were	
	subjects of its opinions	99
15	Appeals of Working Group opinions	100
16	Top twenty-five countries comprise majority of cases	105
17	Top ten countries with cases brought to Working Group in last decade	106
18	Distribution of cases by region	106
19	Basis of finding of arbitrary detention, one or multiple categories of cases	107
20	Basis of finding of arbitrary detention, across case categories	107
21	Basis of finding of arbitrary detention where opinion based on one category	108





## About the Author

Jared Genser is Managing Director of Perseus Strategies, a public interest law firm. He also founded Freedom Now, an independent nongovernmental organization, and has been referred to by the *New York Times* as "The Extractor" for his work freeing political prisoners around the world. Although past success is no guarantee of future performance, over the course of his career Genser has taken more than forty-five cases to the UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention and never lost. Those cases have been brought against many governments, including those of Bolivia, China, Cuba, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Myanmar, Nicaragua, North Korea, Pakistan, Russian Federation, South Sudan, Sudan, Malaysia, Maldives, Turkey, and Viet Nam. The cases were filed on behalf of a total of 309 detainees, of whom 300 have had their cases resolved.

Before founding Perseus Strategies, Genser was a partner in the government affairs practice of the global law firm DLA Piper LLP and a management consultant with McKinsey & Company. He has taught semester-long seminars about the UN Security Council at Georgetown University Law Center and the University of Michigan and University of Pennsylvania law schools. He was an associate of the Carr Center for Human Rights Policy at Harvard University from 2014 to 2016, a visiting fellow with the National Endowment for Democracy from 2006 to 2007, and earlier in his career was named by the National Law Journal as one of "40 Under 40: Washington's Rising Stars."

Genser's pro bono clients have included former Czech Republic President Václav Havel and Nobel Peace Prize Laureates Liu Xiaobo, Aung San Suu Kyi, Desmond M. Tutu, and Elie Wiesel. He holds a BS from Cornell University, an MPP from Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government, where he was an Alumni Public Service Fellow, and a JD cum laude from the University of Michigan Law School.

He is coeditor of *The UN Security Council in the Age of Human Rights* (Cambridge University Press, 2016) and *The Responsibility to Protect: The Promise of Stopping Mass Atrocities in Our Time* (2011).

Genser is the recipient of the American Bar Association's International Human Rights Award, Liberty in North Korea's Freedom Fighter Award, and the Charles Bronfman Prize. He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and Fellow of the Royal Society of the Arts. In addition to being qualified to practice law in Maryland and the District of Columbia in the United States, he is also a Solicitor of England and Wales.

xvii





### Foreword

Dear Friends,

Since the beginning of recorded history, people in positions of political and economic power have wielded detention and imprisonment as weapons – often arbitrarily and brutally – to reduce the influence of those who disagree with them. Depending on prevailing environmental circumstances, these "dissenters" are sometimes labeled political detainees, political prisoners, or prisoners of war.

Power can prove more fleeting than we think. As the Reverend Martin Luther King observed, "The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends towards justice." Yet powerful people keep committing the same mistakes. They keep locking up those who hold different views to their own, hoping that the prison bars will make their problems go away, and proving over and over the truth of Spanish philosopher George Santayana's point: "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

Two of the people widely regarded as among the brightest lights of the twentieth century, Winston Churchill and Nelson Mandela, have in common that their journeys to the helm of their countries were defined by their confinements in South Africa. Churchill was not held for long, but his derring-do escape from a prisoner-of-war camp during the second Anglo–Boer War was regarded as heroic and a turning point in his career. Mandela, on the other hand, absorbed the pressures of his twenty-seven-year incarceration in apartheid prisons to emerge fully formed, a giant sparkling diamond of humanity – virtually without flaws.

Suffering embitters some people, while ennobling others. But this does not detract from the fact that, whatever the eventual outcome, society must hold those who abuse power to account.

I am not a pacifist; nor do I believe that in situations of wrongfulness claiming neutral ground is morally defensible. I have long said that if you are neutral in situations of injustice then you have chosen the side of the oppressor.

To its enormous credit, since its establishment in 1991, the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention has been a candle in the darkness, relentlessly shining a bright light on the grave injustice of the arbitrary deprivation of liberty around the world. It has issued more than 1,000 legal opinions regarding the detentions of more than 5,000 people. In many cases these opinions, when combined with effective advocacy, have proved key factors in helping secure freedom for the arbitrarily detained. The group has also conducted more than fifty field visits to nations around the world to better understand the situation of deprivations of liberty and the underlying reasons for arbitrary detentions.

xix



xx Foreword

This book is both the first comprehensive review of the Working Group's jurisprudence and activities and a practical guide designed to assist advocates for the arbitrarily detained to be more effective in their efforts. I am especially pleased to recommend it to you because I worked with its author, the tenacious human rights lawyer Jared Genser, on political prisoner cases for more than a dozen years.

If you are reading this foreword, it probably means that you can put the information in the book to good use – in your own way – to contribute to securing the release from prison of someone who has been arbitrarily deprived of their liberty. The greatest fear of any political prisoner is that they will be forgotten. By taking up this cause you can ensure the world will remember.

God bless you.

Archbishop Emeritus Desmond M. Tutu Cape Town, South Africa

+ Aldmin

January 2019



## Acknowledgments

The research and writing of this book took three years and an enormous amount of effort. That is because it is much more than a treatise about the jurisprudence of the UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention. It was also written to serve as a guide to how to most effectively address the phenomenon of arbitrary detention in our world today, grounded in my personal experiences helping the courageous detainees who I have had the privilege to represent. Although the Working Group remains a little-known quasi-judicial body overseen by the United Nations Human Rights Council, its opinions, country missions, and broader efforts serve an invaluable function in assisting advocates for the arbitrarily detained in securing their ultimate release and helping governments improve their adherence to their obligations under international law. The Working Group's volunteer expert members and professional staff deserve enormous credit for performing small miracles every day, despite the small budget, that often help save people's lives.

This book would not have been possible without the superb research, drafting, and editorial assistance that I have received from numerous staff, interns, externs, and part-time consultants to my public interest law firm Perseus Strategies, including Emad Ansari, Elise Baranouski, Maraya Best, Sara Birkenthal, Mary Brooks, Michael Cullen, Phoebe Dantoin, Sara Deibler, Skylar Gleason, Csaba Gondola, Anli Jiao, William Juhn, Claire Lynch, Ashley McLaughlin-Leen, Luladay Mengistie, Juan Miramontes, Laura Notess, George O'Connor, Charles Orta, Samuel Ritholtz, Nicole Santiago, Brian Tronic, and Daniel Wassim. And I have also been truly blessed to have extraordinary mentors who inspired and challenged me over the course of my career, including Jerome A. Cohen, Irwin Cotler, Lawrence Levinson, Kathleen Kennedy Townsend, and Desmond M. Tutu, among others.

I would like to dedicate this book to the clients and their families that I have been honored to represent, going back to my time as a law student. Their resilience in the face of adversity, their suffering, and their willingness to put their lives in my hands have been both a sacred trust and enormous responsibility.

I would also like to dedicate this book to my parents, Lyne Taylor Genser and Sander Genser, who inspired my commitment to public service. And I would also like to dedicate it to my children, Alexandra and Zachary, who bring such joy and inspiration to my life. It is for them that I have sought as best I could to leave the world a little better off than how I found it. I also want to extend my profound thanks to my wife, Elaine, whose unyielding love and support truly make everything possible.

And, finally, I would like to thank my editor, John Berger at Cambridge University Press, for his patience and support for this important project.

xxi





## **Abbreviations**

ACHPR African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights

ACHR American Convention on Human Rights

AKP Justice and Development Party ("Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi,"

Turkev)

BHRC Bar Human Rights Committee of England and Wales

CAT Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading

Treatment or Punishment

CERD Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination

CRC Convention on the Rights of the Child
CSRT Combatant Status Review Tribunal
DEA Drug Enforcement Administration
DPRK Democratic People's Republic of Korea
ECHR European Convention on Human Rights

ECOSOC Economic and Social Council ECtHR European Court of Human Rights

ETA Basque Homeland and Liberty ("Euskadi Ta Askatasuna,"

Spain/France)

EU European Union

FIDH International Federation for Human Rights

HR Committee UN Human Rights Committee HRC UN Human Rights Council

IACHR Inter-American Commission on Human Rights

ICC International Criminal Court

ICCPR International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

ICJ International Court of Justice

ICRC International Committee of the Red Cross

ICTY International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia

ILO International Labor Organization

KEGOC Kazakhstan Electricity Grid Operating Company

LTTE Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam
MDP Maldivian Democratic Party
MNDF Maldives National Defence Force
NGO Non-Governmental Organization
NLD National League for Democracy
OAS Organization of American States

xxiii



xxiv List of Abbreviations

OHCHR UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights

PJAK Kurdish Free Life Party ("Partiya Jiyana Azad a Kurdistanê," Iran)

TICC "Títulos de Interés y Capital Cubiertos," Venezuela

TÜBITAK Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey ("Türkiye

Bilimsel ve Teknolojik Āraştırma Kurumu," Turkey)

UAE United Arab Emirates

UDHR Universal Declaration of Human Rights

UN United Nations

UNCHR UN Commission on Human Rights

UNGA UN General Assembly

UNHCR UN High Commissioner for Refugees

UNOG UN Office at Geneva UPR Universal Periodic Review

VCCR Vienna Convention on Consular Relations WGAD UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention