



人权理事会

第三十九届会议

2018年9月10日至28日

议程项目3

促进和保护所有人权——公民权利、政治权利、
经济、社会及文化权利，包括发展权

任意拘留问题工作组访问斯里兰卡报告

秘书处的说明

任意拘留问题工作组应斯里兰卡政府邀请，于2017年12月4日至15日访问该国。秘书处谨向人权理事会转交关于这次访问的报告，其中载有工作组就以下问题所作观察、提出的结论和建议：与刑事司法系统和《预防恐怖主义法》相关的剥夺自由现象；剥夺儿童的自由以及因残疾和精神健康状况剥夺自由；出于康复目的剥夺自由；基于歧视理由剥夺自由；剥夺寻求庇护者、难民和移民的自由等。



Report of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention on its visit to Sri Lanka* **

I. Introduction

1. At the invitation of the Government, the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention conducted an official visit to Sri Lanka from 4 to 15 December 2017. The Working Group was represented by José Antonio Guevara Bermúdez (Mexico, Chair-Rapporteur), Leigh Toomey (Australia, Vice-Chair) and Elina Steinerte (Latvia, Vice-Chair) and accompanied by staff from the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. The Working Group would like to thank the United Nations country team, the Resident Coordinator and the Human Rights team for supporting the visit. The Working Group was saddened to learn that the Resident Coordinator passed away not long after its visit.
2. The Working Group wishes to reiterate its gratitude to the Government for the invitation and for its cooperation before and during the visit. The Working Group met with the authorities in Colombo, Anuradhapura, Vavuniya, Trincomalee, and Polonnaruwa (see annex I for a list of the ministers and other authorities, with whom the Working Group met). The Group visited over 30 places of deprivation of liberty (see annex II) and was able to confidentially interview over 100 persons deprived of their liberty.
3. The Working Group also recognizes the numerous stakeholders within the country who shared their perspectives, including civil society, lawyers, academics and jurists, as well as individuals who have been or are deprived of their liberty.
4. The Working Group shared its preliminary findings with the Government on 15 December 2017. It intends to continue its constructive dialogue with the Government.

II. Overview of the institutional and legal framework

A. International human rights obligations

5. Sri Lanka is a party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;¹ the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment; the Convention on the Rights of the Child; the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women; the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities; the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance; the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families; the First Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights on an individual complaints procedure; and the Optional Protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict and on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography.
6. On 4 January 2018, the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment entered into force in Sri Lanka. The Working Group commends this important development and encourages the Government to ensure the full independence of the national preventive mechanism and

* Circulated in the language of submission only.

** The annexes are being circulated without editing.

¹ On 19 November 2015, the Government notified the Secretary-General of the termination of all derogations previously notified under the Covenant, pursuant to the lapse of the emergency regulations in August 2011.

sufficient resources to fulfil its mandate, which covers all places of deprivation of liberty in Sri Lanka.

B. National legal framework

7. The Constitution of Sri Lanka was adopted in 1978 and has been amended 19 times. Chapter III of the Constitution, entitled “Fundamental rights”, includes the prohibition of torture (art. 11), the right to equality before the law and equal protection of the law (art. 12), freedom of speech, assembly, association, and movement (art. 14), and freedom of thought conscience and religion (art. 10). Article 13 enshrines the prohibition of arbitrary arrest, detention and punishment, and of retroactive penal legislation. It includes relevant guarantees such as the right to be brought before a judge, the right to a fair trial by a competent court, and the presumption of innocence. Article 17 guarantees the right to seek a remedy before the Supreme Court for the infringement of fundamental rights by executive action. Chapter XVI of the Constitution, entitled “The Superior Courts”, contains article 141, which enshrines the power of the Court of Appeal to issue writs of habeas corpus.

8. The Penal Code of 1883 defines the conduct of individuals and corresponding offences under criminal law and their respective penalties. The Code of Criminal Procedure of 1979 regulates the investigation, trial and punishment of criminal offences, including the conduct of arrest operations, the issuance of warrants and the use of remand, bail and other procedural guarantees.

9. Some of the legislative framework relevant to deprivation of liberty is very outdated, particularly the subordinate regulations and ordinances which date back to the nineteenth century and require revisions to bring them into conformity with the needs of modern Sri Lankan society. The Working Group acknowledges the ongoing process of constitutional reform and notes that further reform of the national legal framework would facilitate its compliance with international obligations with regard to prohibition of the arbitrary deprivation of liberty.

III. Positive measures and initiatives

A. Engagement with international human rights mechanisms

10. The Working Group commends the constructive cooperation of the Government of Sri Lanka with the international community, in particular the United Nations human rights mechanisms. The visit of the Working Group and the recent visits of other special procedures of the Human Rights Council are clear examples of such engagement.

11. The Working Group welcomes information that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, together with the relevant stakeholders, is planning to establish a permanent national mechanism for reporting and follow-up to coordinate the engagement of Sri Lanka with the international human rights mechanisms, including the special procedures and the universal periodic review, which would generate timely reports and follow-up on recommendations.

12. The Working Group also notes the signing on 7 June 2018 by the Government and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) of an Agreement on cooperation and humanitarian activities to benefit persons deprived of their liberty, allowing ICRC access to all detainees and detention centres under the purview of the Government other than Sri Lankan military personnel detained under military law in military establishments.

B. Implementation of Human Rights Council resolution 30/1

13. The Working Group notes the commitments undertaken by Sri Lanka under Human Rights Council resolution 30/1 on promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights. The Working Group welcomes the establishment of the Office of Missing Persons and the appointment of the commissioners in February 2018. Without addressing past

violations, including cases of abductions and enforced disappearances, efforts made by the Government to address instances of arbitrary detention occurring currently will be seriously undermined.

C. National human rights action plan

14. The Working Group welcomes the adoption of the national action plan for the protection and promotion of human rights for the period 2017–2021, which was officially launched by the Government in November 2017. The Working Group was informed that there will be a new coordination mechanism established by the Government, as well as an open platform for stakeholders, including civil society and the Human Rights Commission, to monitor the implementation.

D. Right to Information Act

15. The Right to Information Act of 2017 is a positive step towards the promotion and protection of human rights in Sri Lanka, and can make a significant contribution towards addressing arbitrary deprivation of liberty by allowing access to information which would otherwise be available only to law enforcement agencies.

E. National Human Rights Commission

16. The fact that the Human Rights Commission is able to access a wide variety of places of deprivation of liberty without hindrance from the authorities, including for unannounced visits, is positive. However, the Working Group is seriously concerned that there is no institutionalized practice by the authorities to systematically seek the views of the Commission on draft legislation, despite its clear mandate to review legislation under section 10 of the Human Rights Commission of Sri Lanka Act, No. 21 of 1996.

17. The Human Rights Commission will be designated as the national preventive mechanism, in accordance with the terms of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The Working Group welcomes the fact that the Government sought the views of the Human Rights Commission prior to its designation as the national preventive mechanism. However, the Commission is likely to require further resources, both financial and human, to enable it to discharge its new mandate effectively, as it is already overstretched in its ability to implement its current mandate.

F. Fundamental rights procedure

18. According to articles 17 and 126 of the Constitution, any aggrieved party or his or her legal representative may file a petition before the Supreme Court for a remedy with respect to the infringement of fundamental rights through executive or administrative action by the State. The fundamental rights procedure is a potentially important mechanism for the release of individuals who have been arbitrarily deprived of their liberty. However, it is underutilized owing to flaws in the procedure, including a one-month limitation for petitions, the lack of standing of public interest petitions and the fact that the petition must be made to the Supreme Court, which is not easy for people living outside Colombo.

IV. Main findings concerning the right to personal liberty

19. In determining whether the information provided, including from persons interviewed during the visit, raised issues regarding the arbitrary deprivation of liberty, the Working Group considered the five categories of arbitrary deprivation of liberty outlined in paragraph 8 of its methods of work (A/HRC/36/38).

20. The Working Group is mindful of the complex history of Sri Lanka, which has seen the country live under state of emergency legislation for decades. However, it has now returned to peace and, as a democratic country, it must embrace the rule of law. That requires strict adherence to the rule of law by all public officials and full respect for the right to personal liberty, whereby deprivation of liberty may occur only in instances strictly defined in legislation. Throughout its visit, the Working Group observed instances of the authorities using deprivation of liberty as the automatic response to a wide variety of situations in which deprivation of liberty was not absolutely necessary or prescribed by law.

A. Deprivation of liberty in the context of the criminal justice system

1. Pretrial detention

21. In regular criminal matters, suspects are rarely held in police stations beyond a 24-hour period and are normally produced before the courts at the end of this period. At that point, the accused can either be granted bail or remanded in custody. According to information received, the current prison population of Sri Lanka is 20,598, of which 11,009 individuals are held in pretrial detention. Over half the present prison population is awaiting trial, which is exceptionally high. It is common for pretrial detention to continue for 3–4 years and in some instances even longer, up to 10 years, and it is often followed by a lengthy trial. Time spent in pretrial detention is not always taken into account when the final sentence is calculated, and is left to the discretion of the judge. People on remand are held in dire conditions and often choose to plead guilty to expedite the proceedings. In a number of cases, accused persons have spent numerous years in pretrial detention but were subsequently acquitted and released from prison without any acknowledgement of wrongful imprisonment or compensation for the years spent in custody.

22. Such lengthy pretrial detention is in itself incompatible with article 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and may lead to arbitrary deprivation of liberty. The Government must take effective steps to reduce it by: (a) promoting the use of bail and other alternatives to detention; (b) expediting investigations; and (c) expediting court proceedings by ensuring that there are sufficient prosecutors and judges in the country. Time spent in custody during the pretrial stage must always be taken into account when the final custodial sentence is determined and those acquitted and released from pretrial detention must have an automatic right to acknowledgement of wrongful imprisonment and compensation for the years spent in custody.

2. Bail

23. The bail system in Sri Lanka, which could alleviate the extensive resort to pretrial detention by the authorities, is problematic. The Working Group learned of numerous cases in which accused persons were granted bail, but remained in custody because they were unable to afford the bail or provide the requisite sureties. Such situations render the bail system ineffective. The Working Group recalls that whenever possible, non-custodial measures should be used instead of pretrial detention and that those non-custodial measures must be realistic.

3. Undue delays in trials

24. The excessive length of trials in Sri Lanka, sometimes lasting for years or even decades, is of great concern. Such delays are reportedly caused by a number of factors, including the lack of sufficient investigative capacity of the police; insufficient resources in the Office of the Attorney General and the courts, both in infrastructure and personnel, to deal diligently with pending cases; poor case management policies that do not prioritize consecutive court hearings; legal practices allowing for repeated postponement of hearings that take little account of the urgency to end remand; and lack of accountability for long judicial delays. Under international human rights law, detained persons are entitled to stand trial within a reasonable time or to release. Persons who are not released pending trial must be tried as expeditiously as possible.

4. Confessions obtained by torture and ill-treatment

25. Numerous alarming allegations were received concerning the use of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment by the police, including the Criminal Investigation Department and the Terrorist Investigation Division, in order to obtain confessions from detainees, either to facilitate the investigation or, in certain instances, to be used as evidence in court. The Working Group recalls that prohibition of torture and ill-treatment is absolute and that breach of that prohibition may also lead to a breach of the prohibition of arbitrary deprivation of liberty. Any confession should be made before a judge, who must ensure in all cases that the Government has met its obligation in demonstrating that it was given without coercion. That safeguard must be understood in terms of the absence of any direct or indirect physical or undue psychological pressure from the investigating authorities on the accused, with a view to obtaining a confession of guilt. The judges should consider inadmissible as evidence any statements or confessions found to have been obtained through torture or ill-treatment and should order immediate investigations into such allegations.²

5. Right to challenge the legality of detention

26. The right to challenge the legality of detention is not effectively guaranteed in Sri Lanka. The lack of legal assistance guaranteed for all detainees from the moment of arrest, the unjustified delay in criminal proceedings and judicial remedies for the protection of fundamental rights, the excessive use of pretrial detention, the lack of effective access to bail or other alternatives to detention and the practice by the police of obtaining statements without the presence of a lawyer and through coercion, are some of the abuses that could be prevented if effective control of the legality of detention ordered by the judiciary was in place.

27. Persons deprived of their liberty must be informed, in a language and format that the detainee understands, of the right to legal representation, the reasons justifying the deprivation of liberty, possible judicial avenues to challenge the arbitrariness and lawfulness of the deprivation of liberty and the right to bring proceedings before a court and to obtain without delay appropriate and accessible remedies.³ The review by a court of the legality of deprivation of liberty must be carried out on a regular, periodic basis and must involve a substantive, individualized assessment of whether the deprivation of liberty is necessary, reasonable and proportionate in the circumstances of each case.

6. The right to legal assistance

28. The right to legal assistance is far from guaranteed in different contexts of deprivation of liberty, including in the criminal justice system. Persons arrested or detained by the police are not systematically informed of their right to legal assistance, which affects their access to counsel. Furthermore, while lawyers seem to have access to their clients at certain stages of their detention, the right of the detainee to legal assistance is not sufficiently protected by law. In practice, most detainees only have access to legal representation at the time of their court appearance.

29. The right to legal assistance should be guaranteed by law so that it applies from the moment of arrest and before an accused person makes a statement to the police.⁴ The Government must abide by its international human rights obligations with regard to the right of every person to legal assistance. The Government should ensure that the police, the courts, and public officials at the local level are aware of the importance and availability of legal aid services in order to communicate this information to the relevant stakeholders.

² See, for example, Committee against Torture general comment No. 2 (2007) on the implementation of article 2, para. 6; Human Rights Committee general comment No. 32 (2007) on the right to equality before courts and tribunals and to a fair trial, para. 41; United Nations Basic Principles and Guidelines on Remedies and Procedures on the Right of Anyone Deprived of Their Liberty to Bring Proceedings Before a Court, guideline 12; and A/HRC/25/60.

³ See United Nations Basic Principles and Guidelines, principles 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8.

⁴ *Ibid.*, principle 9 and guideline 8.

Access to legal aid services, particularly for those in a situation of vulnerability and marginalization, should be increased.

7. Presidential pardons and abolition of the death penalty

30. The Working Group notes that the exercise of presidential pardons for convicted prisoners should be regulated by clear guidelines to avoid arbitrary application and ensure that there is a means for release on compassionate grounds. Sri Lanka should abolish the death penalty, establish a formal moratorium on all pending executions, commute all death sentences to prison sentences, and pardon long-term prisoners.

B. Deprivation of liberty in the context of the Prevention of Terrorism Act

31. The Prevention of Terrorism Act, Law No. 48 of 1979, is still operational in Sri Lanka but the Working Group was informed by the authorities that no more arrests are carried out under the provisions of the Act. While there have been a number of arrests since 2015, those numbers seem to have diminished. The National Human Rights Commission should be notified of all arrests under the Prevention of Terrorism Act.

32. The numerous severe restrictions to fair trial guarantees entailed by the application of the Prevention of Terrorism Act are of great concern. For instance, under part II of the Act, a suspect does not have the right to legal assistance until the court proceedings commence. In practice, this means that any statements, including confessions, which normally form an essential part of prosecution under the Act, are given in the absence of lawyers. The Working Group recorded numerous instances in which those convicted under the Act had allegedly been subjected to harassment, intimidation, threats and even ill-treatment and torture to extract confessions. Numerous instances were reported of confessions written in Sinhala signed by suspects who did not understand the language. The Working Group was informed that this practice was ceasing and that Tamil suspects are instead forced to write and sign their own confessions in Tamil to avoid any accusations regarding their inability to speak Sinhala.

33. The absence of a lawyer at the time of statements being recorded by the police under the Prevention of Terrorism Act is a crucial factor, which contributes to the risk of confessions extracted under ill-treatment and torture. The Working Group strongly urges the Government to review this practice to guarantee all suspects, irrespective of the charges, immediate access to a lawyer, free of charge. In addition, any confessions should only be recorded in front of a judge.

34. Furthermore, the so-called “voir dire” inquiry may be used to determine whether a confession has been made voluntarily or not. In accordance with this procedure, the suspect has to prove that a confession presented to the court has been extracted under duress. Initially, it falls upon the prosecution to show that the statement has been freely given, the standard of proof being that of the balance of probabilities. It then falls upon the suspect to prove beyond reasonable doubt that the confession has been extracted under duress. However, given the exceptionally lengthy pretrial periods which normally precede the trial stage and the lack of access to a thorough medical assessment in the initial stages of custody, it is nearly impossible for the suspects to reach this high standard of proof. The Working Group wishes to recall that the breach of the absolute prohibition of torture and ill-treatment can lead to the breach of the prohibition of arbitrary detention.

35. Equally, people investigated under the Prevention of Terrorism Act face significant challenges in accessing bail, which is only possible with the agreement of the Attorney General, whose consent is given extremely rarely. That has led to the de facto exclusion of suspects under the Prevention of Terrorism Act from the ordinary bail regime, which means that once a person has been arrested under the provisions of the Act, she or he must remain in pretrial detention until the completion of proceedings. However, pretrial detention under the Act is even longer than under regular criminal proceedings. This exceedingly long period is usually between 10 and 15 years and is sometimes even longer, with the longest period reported to the Working Group being 22 years. Moreover, some individuals have

been acquitted and released after an exceptionally long pretrial period, but without any acknowledgement of wrongful imprisonment or compensation.

36. Any period of pretrial detention, including for the most serious offences and terrorism-related crimes, must remain exceptional and must never be of excessive length.⁵

37. According to the information received at the time of the visit, there were 69 suspects who had been remanded in custody and charged under the Prevention of Terrorism Act, of whom 59 were of Tamil origin. There were a further 17 suspects who had been remanded in custody under the Act but had yet to be charged.

38. The Working Group was informed of cases which had been recently transferred from the High Courts in Vavuniya and Trincomalee (with court proceedings in Tamil), to Anuradhapura (with proceedings in Sinhala). In the High Court of Anuradhapura, there was only one Tamil translator for all court proceedings, which was causing delays. Equally, there were significant delays in relation to the translation of court documents. At the time of the visit, in the High Court of Anuradhapura, in addition to the cases that had been transferred, there were 17 suspects under the Prevention of Terrorism Act, of whom 15 were of Tamil origin. The language barrier that Tamil suspects face in the courts is a serious impediment to the full implementation of their fair trial rights and seriously undermines the credibility of the proceedings.

39. Furthermore, the Working Group was informed that there were no Tamil-speaking judges in the Supreme Court in Colombo at the time of the visit. The Government must undertake reforms in the delivery of justice to ensure that everyone is treated equally before the courts in Sri Lanka.

40. The Working Group urges the Government to repeal the Prevention of Terrorism Act without delay. The regime put in place under the Act falls significantly short of international standards in relation to the right to a fair trial and is of such gravity as to give deprivation of liberty under the Act an arbitrary character. The replacement of the Act with new counter-terrorism legislation which complies with international human rights standards and best practices is one of the short-term goals of the Government, as stipulated in the national action plan, and should be implemented immediately.⁶

C. Deprivation of liberty of children

41. The Working Group is deeply concerned that over 14,000 girls and boys under the age of 18 are deprived of their liberty in 371 childcare institutions across Sri Lanka. Only 33 of those institutions are operated by the Government. Sri Lanka's legal framework regarding children falls short of international best practice in several areas. They include the failure to: (a) stipulate a uniform definition of a child and an internationally acceptable minimum age of criminal responsibility; (b) ensure that the best interests of the child is the primary focus and that the deprivation of a child's liberty is a matter of last resort and for the shortest possible period; (c) prioritize the diversion of children away from the criminal justice system, and (d) distinguish between the responses applicable to children in conflict with the law and children in need of care and protection.

1. Children in conflict with the law⁷

42. According to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, to which Sri Lanka has been a party since 12 July 1991, a person is considered a child until he or she reaches the age of 18. This definition has not been incorporated into Sri Lankan legislation in a uniform manner. The Working Group acknowledges that on 21 May 2018, the parliament passed

⁵ Ibid., guideline 18.

⁶ See also statement by the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism on his visit to Sri Lanka, July 2017, available from www.ohchr.org/en/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=21884&LangID=E.

⁷ Convention on the Rights of the Child, art. 37, and United Nations Basic Principles and Guidelines, principle 18 and guideline 18.

Act No. 10 of 2018 to amend chapter 19 of the Penal Code, which increased the minimum age of criminal liability from 8 to 12 years of age. The Working Group encourages a further increase to a minimum of 14 years, in line with the Convention on the Rights of the Child.⁸ While the legal framework in Sri Lanka does not provide for the deprivation of liberty of children who have been in conflict with the law, in practice such children are being detained in several different types of facilities known as “certified schools”, “detention homes”, “remand homes” or “approved homes”. The distinction between the types of services offered by these facilities, their criteria for intake and the period of admission is not clear. Some children are placed in these facilities while criminal cases against them are being heard in the courts. Other children are residing in these facilities for their own protection, including girls under 18 years of age who have been involved in underage relationships. In all cases, the placement is ordered by the courts.

43. Although placement of children in these facilities is considered an alternative to imprisonment, it appears to be used by the courts as the primary option, rather than the last resort. The placements involve significant periods of deprivation of liberty, including for up to three years in certified schools. In some cases, children continue to be held in these institutions after they have reached the age of 18. Children between the ages of 16 and 18 are also treated in the same way as adults under Sri Lankan law and in some cases detained in prisons with adult offenders.

2. Children in need of care and protection

44. Children in need of care and protection, such as orphaned, abused, abandoned and destitute children, are placed in institutions known as “receiving homes”, “national training and counselling centres”, “approved schools” or “voluntary children’s institutions” throughout Sri Lanka. Some facilities are State-funded, although most are privately managed by non-governmental groups. At present, placements are made under the Children and Young Persons Ordinance 1939 and its amendments. Despite the fact that this ordinance is only applicable to children aged 12 and above, children as young as 8 are being admitted to remand and care homes.

45. The Working Group was informed that such placements, which can occur without the consent of the child, are decided on by the Provincial Commissioner or on a referral by the courts. The legal basis for many placements is unclear and appears to be based on an overly broad discretion exercised by the Provincial Commissioner and the courts to detain children. The Working Group observed registries recording the placement of children that stated that the children had been detained because they had “escaped from their homes” or for their own “safety”, including situations in which parents felt that they could not exercise sufficient control over their children. The authorities administering homes for children appear to defer to court orders, rather than prioritizing the best interests of the child.

46. During the placement, the children undertake counselling and other activities designed to prepare them for life outside the institution, such as handicrafts, but only some attend school and have the opportunity to learn alongside other children in a formal educational setting. At present, children in need of care are held with children in conflict with the law, contrary to international standards that require their strict separation. Steps are being taken to amend the law through the children (judicial protection) bill, so that children in need of care are placed in separate homes to children in conflict with the law. Some children detained in care homes have reportedly been beaten and sexually abused, particularly in understaffed and underresourced centres, where staff have not received appropriate training or clear guidelines on appropriate disciplinary methods for children under their care. It is not clear whether the children, as survivors of abuse, are receiving any psychiatric assessment or counselling and appropriate medical care. Care homes are not the only setting in which children are deprived of their liberty for their protection. The Working Group observed the case of a 7-year-old child who was detained overnight in a police station in protective custody owing to a lack of care at home. The Working Group recalls

⁸ See Committee on the Rights of the Child, general comment No. 10 (2007) on children’s rights in juvenile justice, para. 33.

that protective custody must be supervised by a judicial authority and must only be used as a last resort and when the victims themselves desire it (see E/CN.4/2002/77, para. 46).

47. The Working Group welcomes the steps taken by the Government to address these issues, including the establishment of two dedicated juvenile courts in Jaffna and Colombo, the addition of child desks in police stations and a Child Unit in the Attorney General's Department, and development by the Department of Probation and Child Care Services of an alternative care policy that emphasizes community-based rehabilitation of children. The Working Group also acknowledges that the remand and care homes are providing a much-needed service for children who have no other support or have been subject to abuse in their family homes and pregnant girls. Nevertheless, the deprivation of liberty of children in these institutions must be subject to a clearly defined legal basis, regularly reviewed by an independent judicial authority and only undertaken as a last resort and for the shortest time possible.

D. Deprivation of liberty on the grounds of disability or mental health condition⁹

48. The Working Group learned that placement of individuals in hospitals and treatment facilities on the basis of a psychosocial disability or a mental health condition, such as schizophrenia, bipolar disorder and depression, is increasingly common in post-conflict Sri Lanka. That poses serious risks for persons with psychosocial disabilities, who are particularly at risk of being deprived of their liberty for long periods without the ability to seek a review of the reasonableness, proportionality and necessity of the detention. Around 8,000 persons are admitted to the National Institute of Mental Health (Angoda) each year for treatment. They can come to the facility on their own or can be brought by their family members, the police or prison authorities.

49. The Working Group received no clear explanation of the process of admitting individuals to psychiatric or similar institutions, but it appears that persons with psychosocial disabilities or a mental health condition are typically involuntarily detained either after referral by a court order in a criminal matter, or if they are believed to have a "serious psychosocial disability that requires treatment". The Working Group was informed that in criminal matters, the individual is kept under review by a visiting magistrate who can order their discharge. For individuals admitted for treatment, the process is significantly longer, with some persons remaining institutionalized for decades and even the rest of their lives. Older persons, persons with physical disabilities or those with co-occurring drug addiction are particularly at risk of indefinite detention in such facilities.

50. Once a decision is made by a treating psychiatrist to admit a person to the acute or intermediate care wards, that individual cannot challenge the decision before a judicial authority, which is a matter of serious concern. The Working Group urges the Government to ensure that the right to challenge the legality of detention before a court applies to everyone equally, including those with psychosocial disabilities. There appears to be no criteria for admission, including safeguards to prevent the arbitrary deprivation of liberty. It appears that the legal basis upon which the admission of the individuals takes place are the Mental Disease Ordinance 1873 and the Mental Disease Act 1956. Moreover, admission to treatment facilities is not limited to those with a psychosocial disability, but includes persons with intellectual disabilities and persons who could be discharged but have no family members that can be traced or are willing to assist them to live in the community. Such a situation does not correspond to the internationally accepted human rights standards and the Government must ensure community-based support is provided to such individuals. While the Working Group welcomes the commitment of the National Institute of Mental Health to prioritizing community-based support, wherever possible, this appears to be a very limited practice. The Government must urgently review and amend this legislation and policies in order to implement its obligations under the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

⁹ See United Nations Basic Principles and Guidelines, principle 20 and guideline 20.

E. Deprivation of liberty for rehabilitation purposes

1. Rehabilitation of ex-combatants

51. At the time of the visit, eight men had been deprived of their liberty at Poonthottam Rehabilitation Centre in Vavuniya, which was administered by the Ministry for Prison Reforms, Rehabilitation, Resettlement and Hindu Affairs and was the only rehabilitation centre for ex-combatants that remained operational in Sri Lanka. The eight men were originally arrested and charged under the Prevention of Terrorism Act, with various allegations made against them of having assisted or been involved in activities of the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam. They were held for substantial periods of time (ranging from 10 to 22 years) in pretrial detention at New Magazine prison before being transferred to Poonthottam for up to two years of rehabilitation. The Working Group was informed that their agreement to undergo rehabilitation at Poonthottam was only secured by the prospect of spending one to two years in rehabilitation rather than many years awaiting trial.

52. The Working Group regards the ongoing deprivation of liberty of those men and others who have been or will be sent to Poonthottam for rehabilitation in future under these circumstances, as arbitrary. The deprivation of liberty at Poonthottam lacks a legal basis and, in the case of the current eight detainees, was the result of numerous grave violations of the right to a fair trial, including a lack of effective legal assistance, the inability to access the evidence against them and undue delay in being tried. Testimony and reports received from individuals who have been released from Poonthottam indicate that, along with their family members, they continue to be subject to harassment and surveillance by the authorities. According to the testimony received, the certificate issued at the completion of vocational training at the facility does not prevent released persons from being rearrested on the same grounds at any time. The Working Group learned of one case where a person was released from a rehabilitation centre, only to be rearrested and transferred to another rehabilitation centre, effectively creating a revolving door of repeated deprivation of liberty. Given the serious issues surrounding the arbitrary deprivation of liberty, the Working Group strongly urges the Government to close down the Poonthottam Rehabilitation Centre, unconditionally release those who remain in the centre and provide them with the appropriate compensation and other reparations.

2. Rehabilitation programmes for drug users

53. According to the information received from the Government, in 2016 there were 79,578 persons in Sri Lanka arrested for drug related offences. Sixty per cent of those individuals were arrested in relation to cannabis, while 35 per cent were arrested in relation to heroin. Of those arrests 66.9 per cent related to the crime of drug possession and 33.1 per cent related to the consumption of drugs. In the same year, the total number of prison admissions was 24,060, of which 10,535 persons had allegedly committed offences related to drugs. The Working Group notes that almost 50 per cent of the persons deprived of their liberty in the criminal justice system have allegedly committed non-violent crimes related to drugs, which is a very high percentage.

54. In 2016, 2,355 persons were treated for drug abuse. Both the Government and non-governmental organizations provide residential care, treatment and rehabilitation services for those dependent on drugs. Admissions to such treatment and rehabilitation centres can be either voluntary or compulsory. In relation to compulsory rehabilitation, the Bureau of the Commissioner General of Rehabilitation of the Ministry for Prison Reforms, Rehabilitation, Resettlement and Hindu Affairs, informed the Working Group that some rehabilitation camps for former Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam cadres have been turned into rehabilitation camps for “drug addicts”. The aim of the programmes in such rehabilitation camps is the rehabilitation of “addicts” through psychological and medical therapy, with the secondary aim being that of the reduction in the overcrowding in prisons.

55. During its visits to the Kandakadu and Senapura treatment and rehabilitation centres, the Working Group was informed that the rehabilitation programme consisted of two six-month periods, the first six months being spent in Kandakadu for counselling and the second six months in Senapura for vocational training. All who enter this programme do so

pursuant to a court order. However, the Working Group observed numerous irregularities in the way court orders had been obtained. It is very common for family members to request the courts to make such orders, or for those arrested for possession of drugs to be placed under a detention order in the rehabilitation camps without any medical assessment of whether the individuals in question are in fact addicted to drugs and therefore require rehabilitation. In fact, the only medical assessment carried out in relation to those arrested takes place after the judge has made the decision to refer the individual to the rehabilitation camps and only certifies whether the person is fit, physically and mentally, to be sent to such a camp. Moreover, following the arrest and court order, it is common for those arrested to be sent to remand prisons for periods of two to three weeks before they are transferred to rehabilitation camps. During that period, and even when they have been transferred to a rehabilitation camp, addicts receive no medical treatment and must therefore go without treatment or relief for withdrawal symptoms.

56. The compulsory rehabilitation programme subjects detainees to long hours of physically strenuous exercise, there is no individualized assessment conducted to determine the most appropriate treatment programme and the overall delivery of the programme is not carried out by specifically trained medical professionals. Security in the two camps is provided by the army and the programmes are overseen by counsellors who, from a medical standpoint, have received limited training on the management of drug dependence. The Working Group is of the view that the military authorities should not be involved in administering rehabilitation programmes and any such programmes must be in the hands of professionally trained medical personnel.

57. Although the two rehabilitation centres benefit from more relaxed rules than a regular prison, they are nevertheless akin to prisons in their organizational structure: barbed wire fences surround the centre, heavily armed army personnel in military uniforms patrol the boundaries, there are fixed schedules for activities, there is no possibility to freely move in and out of the centres, there are obligatory uniforms for detainees and rules for family visits. The Working Group was also concerned about the remote location of these centres, which has negative repercussions for family visits.

58. The detainees have no legal representation, impairing their ability to contest their confinement in rehabilitation centres or to obtain release at the end of the programme. In addition, the time that the detainees spend during the second rehabilitation phase in Senapura is not precisely set. While the authorities stated that this should be six months, the Working Group came across cases in which the rehabilitation period had been considerably extended.

59. The Working Group wishes to emphasize that the absolute prohibition of arbitrary deprivation of liberty and the safeguards against it apply to everyone, including those arrested, detained or charged for drug-related offences and those undergoing compulsory rehabilitation programmes for drug addicts.

3. Rehabilitation of women and other vulnerable persons¹⁰

60. At the time of the visit, 175 women were deprived of their liberty at the Methsevana State House of Detention in Gangodawila, which is maintained by the Social Services Department of the Western Provincial Council and is the only State-run women's home in Sri Lanka. An estimated 90 per cent of the women detained there have a psychosocial disability and the facility is unable to provide the support they require. The women are very poor and come to Methsevana with a low level of education. They are sent to the facility for rehabilitation and to undertake various vocational training activities.

61. It is of serious concern that women and children are deprived of their liberty at Methsevana without due process and satisfactory judicial review. Most women placed at Methsevana have been found to have committed acts of vagrancy under the Vagrants Ordinance 1841 and detained pursuant to the House of Detention Ordinance 1907. The Working Group was informed that if a woman pleads guilty to acts of vagrancy, she can be

¹⁰ See United Nations Basic Principles and Guidelines, principle 19 and guideline 19.

released upon payment of a fine of 100 rupees. However, most women who are found to have engaged in acts of vagrancy cannot afford to make such a payment and would probably be detained again when found by the police to be loitering or committing other acts that fall under the Vagrants Ordinance. Women who are unable to pay the fine or do not wish to plead guilty are placed in Methsevana by an order of a magistrates' court. According to the testimony received, most women cannot afford a lawyer and have no access to legal assistance before or during their court hearing.

62. Once placed under a court order, the women are not taken back before the court for periodic review. Most are "no date" detainees, who have not been given a release date and are effectively detained indefinitely. Some women have been deprived of their liberty at Methsevana for years, including one woman who has been held in the facility since 1975. The Working Group was informed that either the Minister or a court can order release, but that there are limited prospects for doing so, particularly for women who have no family. In fact, it appears that one of the few ways that a woman can be released is if a husband is found for her through the placement of an advertisement in the newspapers, a practice which the Working Group finds unacceptable. Women interviewed confirmed that staff at the facility do make an effort to find employment for them so that they could have a source of income, allowing them to reside in the community.

63. Women residing at Methsevana are not permitted to leave and the facility is more like a prison than a suitable environment for vocational training. Women are often brought to Methsevana in a prison van, uniformed police officers guard the facility, residential areas are secured by locks and bars, and a seclusion cell is used to temporarily house women who have been involved in violent behaviour. The personnel resources at Methsevana are not sufficient to ensure that the women are safely detained and a further 15–20 staff members are needed. The conditions do not meet international standards for places of detention, particularly the women's living areas, and the buildings are not maintained or suitable for persons who require medical care. Children residing with their mothers at Methsevana are only permitted to do so until they reach the age of 3, at which point the child is either adopted with the mother's consent or transferred by court order to a childcare home. There are no personnel specialized in psychosocial disabilities at Methsevana. The Working Group considers the removal of children from their mothers at such a young age to be contrary to the best interests of the child and calls upon the Government to introduce legislation outlawing the practice.

64. The Working Group urges the Government to take immediate action to address these issues. The Vagrants Ordinance 1841 and the House of Detention Ordinance 1907 are outdated and are overly broad in their application to individuals deemed to be "idle and disorderly", including "prostitutes".

F. Deprivation of liberty on discriminatory grounds

65. The Working Group learned of several situations in which people were being deprived of their liberty, or were at high risk of being detained, on discriminatory grounds, contrary to Sri Lanka's obligations under articles 2 and 26 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights to ensure the equal protection of the law without distinction of any kind.

66. Poverty appears to be a major determinant of whether a person will be taken into custody throughout Sri Lanka and how long he or she will be deprived of liberty. Testimonies from many people in detention indicated that those who could afford quality legal representation were likely to receive a better outcome in their cases, including individuals charged under the Prevention of Terrorism Act or for criminal offences and those detained at drug rehabilitation centres and childcare institutions. The Working Group also received reports that between 25 and 30 beggars, homeless and street people are reportedly being detained at Ridiyagama Detention Centre in Ambalantota each month. The Centre, which is maintained by the Social Affairs Division of the Southern Provincial Council, also houses anybody sent by court order who is defined as a vagrant under the Vagrants Ordinance. That includes female prostitutes, elderly people and individuals who

have psychosocial impairments or alcohol addiction. The Working Group was informed that a similar detention centre is located at Weerawila.

67. The Working Group also received accounts of Tamils who had been arrested and detained in 2015, 2016 and 2017 upon returning to Sri Lanka after seeking asylum in another country or working abroad. The Working Group also received testimony that in some cases, the returnees were beaten and kept under surveillance once released, and charged with offences relating to illegal departure from Sri Lanka. Similarly, civil society organizations, journalists, lawyers, activists and human rights defenders who attempt to protect the rights of Tamils are reportedly subject to threats and harassment for their work.

68. The Working Group considers that any form of discrimination that results in the deprivation of liberty is clearly arbitrary and urges the Government to find affordable alternatives to detention for the most vulnerable members of society, including social services. The Working Group also urges the Government to investigate allegations of discrimination against Tamils in the criminal justice system, holding those responsible for human rights violations accountable for their actions.

G. Deprivation of liberty of asylum seekers, refugees, stateless persons and migrants

69. Sri Lanka is not a party to the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees or its 1967 Protocol, nor to the 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, nor the 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness. However, arrangements are in place with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in the form of a memorandum of understanding to ensure that those arriving in Sri Lanka as asylum seekers are given international protection. UNHCR registers such individuals, provides them with the requisite documents until they are able to either live freely in the community or until resettlement arrangements can be made in a third country. While this is a positive step undertaken by the current Government, the ad hoc nature of the arrangement is of concern.

70. Detention in the context of migration proceedings must be an exceptional measure that is only resorted to in instances clearly identified in law, following an assessment of the necessity to detain in each individual case. Moreover, due consideration of alternatives to detention must be carried out so as to ensure that detention is resorted to only exceptionally. When detained, migrants must be held in appropriate facilities which respect their inherent dignity.¹¹

71. The Working Group observed the dire conditions in the Mirihana immigration detention facility, which is overcrowded, with poor shower and bathroom facilities and no recreational activities for those held there. As a former police station, the facility is entirely inappropriate for holding people for prolonged periods. However, some individuals have been held there for significant periods of time, including one person who has been there since 2010. The Working Group appreciates the difficulties the Sri Lankan authorities face in establishing the true nationality of this individual, but recalls that immigration detention must be a measure of last resort and can never be indefinite. If the nationality of that individual cannot be established, he must be released.

V. Implementation of opinions adopted by the Working Group

72. Since its establishment, the Working Group has adopted 11 opinions involving Sri Lanka (see annex III). The Working Group invites the Government to submit updated information, including on whether the subjects of these opinions whose deprivation of liberty has been found to be arbitrary, have been released and reparations made to them, or

¹¹ See Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, revised deliberation No. 5 on deprivation of liberty of migrants, paras. 12, 14, 16, and 17.

whether any other action has been taken to implement the recommendations of the Working Group.

VI. Conclusions

73. The Working Group appreciates the willingness of the Government to submit itself to scrutiny through the visit, and considers that the findings in the present report offer an opportunity to support the Government in addressing situations of arbitrary deprivation of liberty.

74. The Working Group was informed of many positive changes that were being made across Sri Lanka in relation to the deprivation of liberty.

75. The Working Group identified systemic problems within the criminal justice system which placed defendants at a high risk of arbitrary detention.

76. The Working Group found that while the number of arrests and detention under the Prevention of Terrorism Act appears to have fallen, the Act contains numerous severe restrictions on the right to a fair trial.

77. The Working Group is deeply concerned that over 14,000 girls and boys under the age of 18 are deprived of their liberty in 371 childcare institutions across Sri Lanka.

78. The Working Group learned that the placement of individuals in hospitals and treatment facilities on the basis of a psychosocial disability or a mental health condition, such as schizophrenia, bipolar disorder or depression, is increasingly common in post-conflict Sri Lanka.

79. The Working Group identified systemic problems with deprivation of liberty for rehabilitation purposes, including with regard to the rehabilitation of ex-combatants, drug users, women and other vulnerable persons.

80. The Working Group learned of several situations in which people were being deprived of their liberty, or were at high risk of being detained, on discriminatory grounds.

81. The Working Group observed the ad hoc nature of the arrangements regarding asylum seekers in Sri Lanka and the dire conditions in the Mirihana immigration detention facility.

VII. Recommendations

82. The Working Group recommends that the Government of Sri Lanka undertake the following measures in relation to the national human rights framework:

(a) Continue efforts to establish a permanent government body to coordinate engagement with international human rights mechanisms, while involving from the outset all the relevant stakeholders, including the Human Rights Commission and civil society actors;

(b) Enable the Office of Missing Persons to commence its operations immediately, with the full involvement and participation of victims and civil society organizations;

(c) Establish, without delay, a truth and reconciliation commission, a reparations programme and a special accountability mechanism, as outlined in Human Rights Council resolution 30/1, with the full involvement and participation of all relevant stakeholders;

(d) Embark upon implementation of the objectives set out in the national action plan for the promotion and protection of human rights for the period 2017–2021 with the full involvement of the Human Rights Commission and civil society;

(e) Institutionalize the practice of seeking the advice of the Human Rights Commission on draft legislation, giving it an opportunity to provide comments and engage in constructive dialogue with it concerning its recommendations;

(f) Ensure that adequate additional resources, in terms of both personnel and funding, are allocated to the Human Rights Commission so as to enable it to discharge its functions as the national preventive mechanism effectively and independently;

(g) Review the legal framework applicable to the fundamental rights procedure in order to widen the scope of its application and undertake concrete steps to make this procedure further accessible throughout the country.

83. The Working Group recommends that the Government of Sri Lanka undertake the following measures in relation to criminal justice:

(a) Adopt measures to address lengthy pretrial detention, such as:

(i) Promoting the use of bail (set at realistic levels) and alternatives to detention;

(ii) Expediting investigations;

(iii) Expediting court proceedings by ensuring that there are sufficient prosecutors and judges in the country. Ensure that time spent in pretrial custody is taken into account when the final custodial sentence is determined;

(b) Ensure that decisions on whether to grant bail are individualized and that no group of suspects, such as those held under the Prevention of Terrorism Act, is submitted to a blanket exclusion from bail. Ensure that decisions on whether to grant bail are not dependent upon the consent of the Attorney General;

(c) Undertake training for the police in investigative skills, dedicate personnel and infrastructure resources to the Attorney General's Office and the courts, review case management policies and issue practice directions in the courts to put an end to repeated postponements of hearings;

(d) Fully honour the obligations of the State under the Convention against Torture, including with regard to those held under the Prevention of Terrorism Act, and ensure that all confessions obtained under duress are deemed inadmissible as evidence in court, that any confessions are made before a judge who needs to ascertain that they were made freely and without coercion, and ensure that the burden of proof rests with the Government in this regard. Ensure that past and present allegations of torture and ill-treatment are investigated and that those responsible are prosecuted and punished;

(e) Ensure that persons in detention are informed of their rights, including their right to challenge the legality of their detention, and that regular, periodic reviews are individualized and involve an assessment of whether detention is necessary, reasonable and proportionate;

(f) Ensure that the right to legal assistance is guaranteed by law from the moment of arrest and before an accused person makes a statement to the police or is subjected to interrogation;

(g) Ensure that those acquitted, including of charges under the Prevention of Terrorism Act, receive a public acknowledgement of wrongful imprisonment and adequate reparations, including compensation and/or guarantees of non-repetition;

(h) Enact legislative criteria for presidential pardons, parole and early release. Abolish the death penalty and establish a formal moratorium on all pending executions.

84. The Working Group recommends that the Government of Sri Lanka undertake the following measures in relation to the Prevention of Terrorism Act:

(a) Conduct an urgent nationwide audit to determine the exact numbers of those held under the Prevention of Terrorism Act, how long they have been deprived of liberty, their status (remand or convicted), and their location. Ensure that those held under the Act are either tried or released;

(b) Ensure that the National Human Rights Commission is notified of any arrest carried out under the Prevention of Terrorism Act;

(c) Repeal the Prevention of Terrorism Act without delay. Further to the national action plan for the protection and promotion of human rights for the period 2017–2021, ensure that any new legislation complies with international human rights standards and best practice, and guarantees all suspects immediate access to legal assistance free of charge and provisions for applying for bail that are not subject to the veto of the Attorney General;

(d) Ensure that the Prevention of Terrorism Act is amended through a consultative process, including with victims' rights' groups, civil society and human rights lawyers, and that relevant experts assist in drafting the new legislation;

(e) Ensure that those suspected of criminal activity, including involvement in terrorism, are heard in a language they understand, or provided with appropriate translation in areas around the country.

85. The Working Group recommends that the Government of Sri Lanka undertake the following measures in relation to children:

(a) Ensure that the definition of a child under the Convention on the Rights of the Child is incorporated across Sri Lankan legislation (for example, the Criminal Code, the Criminal Procedure Code etc.) and that ministries issue information about this change to relevant locations where children are deprived of their liberty;

(b) Ensure a further increase of the minimum age of criminal responsibility to at least 14, in line with the Convention on the Rights of the Child;

(c) Enact the children (judicial protection) bill to ensure that there are two types of facilities for children: those for children in contact with the law and those for children in need of care, so that children in those two categories are not placed in the same facility;

(d) Ensure that new legislation defines the legal basis on which the detention of a child can be ordered (for example, a child aged between 14 and 18 on remand or convicted of a crime, with both categories to be separated, or a child under 18 with no family), that detention can only be by court order and must be reviewed periodically, and that a person can no longer remain in such facilities after the age of 18. Ensure that the detention of children is the last resort and in the best interest of the child, with community-based placement and/or care prioritized;

(e) Introduce a code of conduct and legislative oversight of privately run children's homes, with mandatory reporting and inspection requirements, education and counselling requirements and training requirements, and clear child protection policies for staff with regard to appropriate disciplinary methods, in line with the national child protection policy;

(f) Ensure that the National Child Protection Authority receives the necessary staffing and financial resources to regularly monitor all centres where children are deprived of their liberty, including those operated by non-government entities, and that reintegration plans are put in place for children after they leave those centres;

(g) Ensure that the courts take a proactive role in considering the necessity of detaining children and seek alternatives whenever possible. Ensure that a child protection policy and guidelines are in place for every institution at which children are deprived of their liberty, in line with the national child protection policy.

86. The Working Group recommends that the Government of Sri Lanka undertake the following measures in relation to disability or mental health condition:

(a) Enact legislation to ensure that the admission of persons to mental health facilities in criminal matters is in accordance with criminal procedure and is kept under review by a court which can order discharge in appropriate cases;

(b) Review and amend the Mental Disease Ordinance 1873 and the Mental Disease Act 1956 to clarify how and under what circumstances individuals are admitted to and remain in the custody of mental health facilities;

(c) Ensure that personal and financial resources are allocated to allow for community-based support to individuals whenever possible, including persons with intellectual disabilities, so that they can live in the community as an alternative to detention in mental health facilities.

87. The Working Group recommends that the Government of Sri Lanka undertake the following measures in relation to the rehabilitation of ex-combatants:

(a) Release the eight detainees at the Poonthottam Rehabilitation Centre immediately and unconditionally, and close the Centre as soon as possible, as it lacks a legal basis and, in the case of the current eight detainees, was the result of grave violations of the right to a fair trial;

(b) Ensure that those who are currently detained and have previously been detained at the centre receive public acknowledgement of wrongful imprisonment and compensation and/or guarantees of non-repetition, including the immediate cessation of harassment and surveillance by the authorities of the detainees and their families.

88. The Working Group recommends that the Government of Sri Lanka undertake the following measures in relation to rehabilitation programmes for drug users:

(a) Ensure that the consumption of drugs is decriminalized in Sri Lanka, in order to avoid arbitrary detention;

(b) Eradicate, in law and in practice, the involuntary confinement of those who use or are suspected of using or possessing drugs for personal consumption;

(c) Ensure that the prohibition of arbitrary arrest and the right to a fair trial are protected in accordance with international norms, including in respect of persons who are arrested, detained or charged for drug-related offences other than for use or possession for consumption.

89. The Working Group recommends that the Government of Sri Lanka undertake the following measures in relation to the rehabilitation of women:

(a) Urgently repeal the Vagrants Ordinance 1841 and the House of Detention Ordinance 1907. Acts of vagrancy are strongly associated with poverty, which is a social problem best addressed through the provision of community support services that allow impoverished women to live in dignity and self-sufficiency;

(b) Enact legislation and allocate sufficient funds to ensure that the Methsevana State House of Detention can serve as an open house, providing care and formal education and/or vocational training to women who have no family support structure, rather than as a place of detention, and preferably in more modern premises;

(c) Introduce legislation to outlaw the removal of young children from their mothers at Methsevana State House of Detention, as being contrary to the best interests of the child;

(d) Ensure that the 2014 cabinet decision which seeks to ensure that individuals with psychosocial disabilities can be provided with support at the National Institute of Mental Health is implemented, while encouraging the prioritization of community-based support wherever possible. Ensure that sufficient resources are put in place at Angoda to give effect to that decision.

90. The Working Group recommends that the Government of Sri Lanka undertake the following measures in relation to discrimination:

(a) Put an end to the detention of homeless and street people and those defined as vagrants under the Vagrants Ordinance (such as female prostitutes, elderly people and individuals with psychosocial impairments or alcohol addiction) at the detention centres in Ambalantota and Weerawila;

(b) Investigate allegations concerning Tamils who have been arrested and detained when returning to Sri Lanka after seeking asylum in another country or working abroad and punish those responsible for any torture or ill-treatment. If such individuals are still in detention, immediately and unconditionally release them, and ensure that they receive public acknowledgement of wrongful imprisonment and compensation and/or guarantees of non-repetition. Cease intimidation, harassment and threats to civil society organizations, journalists, lawyers, activists and human rights defenders who attempt to protect the rights of Tamils;

(c) Find affordable alternatives to detention for the most vulnerable members of society, including social services to alleviate poverty.

91. The Working Group recommends that the Government of Sri Lanka undertake the following measures in relation to asylum seekers, refugees, stateless persons and migrants:

(a) Ratify the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol and develop a national legal framework in relation to asylum seekers and refugees that reflects international standards;

(b) Enact legislation that would specify that any detention in the course of migration proceedings must be exceptional, ordered by a judicial authority only in cases when specifically prescribed by law and assessed as necessary and proportionate in individual cases;

(c) Ensure that a dedicated process is put in place which allows for the identification of stateless persons;

(d) Ensure that alternatives to detention in the context of migration, which are accessible and realistic, are deployed;

(e) Cease holding migrants in Mirihana immigration detention facility immediately as it is entirely inappropriate for such purposes.

Annex I

Meetings with authorities

During the visit, the Working Group met with the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Prison Reforms, Rehabilitation, Resettlement and Hindu Affairs, the Commissioner General of Prisons and the Commissioner General for Rehabilitation, the Minister of Law and Order and Southern Development, the Inspector General of Police, the Criminal Investigation Department, the Terrorist Investigation Division, the Special Task Force and the Organised Crime Division, the Minister of Women and Child Affairs, the Minister of Health, Nutrition and Indigenous Medicine, the Deputy Minister of National Policy and Economic Affairs, the Secretary to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Secretary to the Ministry of Defence, the Chief of Defence Staff, the Commanders of the Army, Navy and Air Force and the Chief of the State Intelligence Service the Controller General of Immigration and Emigration, the Chief Justice, the Attorney General, representatives of the Bar Association, the Human Rights Commission, the Legal Aid Commission, the National Police Commission, as well as various authorities in Anuradhapura, Vavuniya, Trincomalee, and Polonnaruwa.

Annex II

Detention facilities visited

The Working Group visited over 30 places of deprivation of liberty, including police stations; remand, long-term and open prisons; immigration detention facilities and entry ports; army and navy camps; homes for children, women and the elderly; institutions for persons with psychosocial disabilities; rehabilitation centres for ex-combatants and centres for treatment of drug dependency.

Colombo

Welikada Prison

Welikada Prison Women's Ward

New Magazine Remand Prison

Police Criminal Investigations Department

Terrorist Investigation Division

Kollipitiya Police Station

Slave Island Police Station

Panagoda Army Base – Security Forces Headquarters (West)

Mulleriyawa Mental Hospital – National Institute of Mental Health (Angoda)

Mirihana Migration Centre

Methsevana State House

The Balika Home (Girls Home)

The Senior Citizen's Home

The infants home

Ghampa / Negombo

Negombo Remand Prison

Criminal Investigation Department holding facilities at international airport

Terrorist Investigation Division holding facilities at international airport

Narcotics holding facilities at international airport

Negombo removal facilities at international airport

Remand Home for Juveniles (Ranmuthugala)

Certified School for Juveniles (Ranmuthugala)

Anuradhapura

Anuradhapura prison and remand prison

Anuradhapura work camp and open prison camp

Anuradhapura police station

Nochchiyagama Police station

Yehali Counselling Center

Vavuniya

Poonthottam Rehabilitation Centre

Vavuniya Army Head Quarters (former Josef Camp)

Trincomalee

Trincomalee Naval Base

Trincomalee Harbour Police

St Joseph Home for Elders

Polonnaruwa

Kandakadu Treatment and Rehabilitation Centre

Senapura Rehabilitation Camp

Kurunegala

Meath Nivasa Old Peoples' home

Annex III

Opinions adopted concerning Sri Lanka

Opinion No. 48/2013: Varnakulasingham Arulanandam

Opinion No. 9/2013: Santhathevan Ganesharatnam

Opinion No. 50/2012: Uthayakumar Palani

Opinion No. 38/2012: Gunasundaram Jayasundaram

Opinion No. 26/2012: Pathmanathan Balasingam and Vijiyanthan Seevaratnam

Opinion No. 49/2011: Jegasothy Thamothersampillai and Sutharsini Thamothersampillai

Opinion No. 30/2008: Gunasundaram Jayasundaram

Opinion No. 8/2005: Maxilan Anthonypillai Robert et al

Opinion No. 24/2001: Edward Anton Amaradas et al

Opinion No. 21/2001: Chinniah Atputharajah et al

Opinion No. 1/1996: S. Sellathurai et al
