

## I. Law enforcement agencies

### **Detention by law enforcement officials**

*Extract from the 2nd General Report [CPT/Inf (92) 3]*

36. The CPT attaches particular importance to three rights for persons detained by the police: the right of the person concerned to have the fact of his detention notified to a third party of his choice (family member, friend, consulate), the right of access to a lawyer, and the right to request a medical examination by a doctor of his choice (in addition to any medical examination carried out by a doctor called by the police authorities).<sup>1</sup> They are, in the CPT's opinion, three fundamental safeguards against the ill-treatment of detained persons which should apply as from the very outset of deprivation of liberty, regardless of how it may be described under the legal system concerned (apprehension, arrest, etc).

37. Persons taken into police custody should be expressly informed without delay of all their rights, including those referred to in paragraph 36. Further, any possibilities offered to the authorities to delay the exercise of one or other of the latter rights in order to protect the interests of justice should be clearly defined and their application strictly limited in time. As regards more particularly the rights of access to a lawyer and to request a medical examination by a doctor other than one called by the police, systems whereby, exceptionally, lawyers and doctors can be chosen from pre-established lists drawn up in agreement with the relevant professional organisations should remove any need to delay the exercise of these rights.

38. Access to a lawyer for persons in police custody should include the right to contact and to be visited by the lawyer (in both cases under conditions guaranteeing the confidentiality of their discussions) as well as, in principle, the right for the person concerned to have the lawyer present during interrogation.

As regards the medical examination of persons in police custody, all such examinations should be conducted out of the hearing, and preferably out of the sight, of police officers. Further, the results of every examination as well as relevant statements by the detainee and the doctor's conclusions should be formally recorded by the doctor and made available to the detainee and his lawyer.

---

<sup>1</sup> This right has subsequently been reformulated as follows: the right of access to a doctor, including the right to be examined, if the person detained so wishes, by a doctor of his own choice (in addition to any medical examination carried out by a doctor called by the police authorities).

---

---

39. Turning to the interrogation process, the CPT considers that clear rules or guidelines should exist on the way in which police interviews are to be conducted. They should address inter alia the following matters: the informing of the detainee of the identity (name and/or number) of those present at the interview; the permissible length of an interview; rest periods between interviews and breaks during an interview; places in which interviews may take place; whether the detainee may be required to stand while being questioned; the interviewing of persons who are under the influence of drugs, alcohol, etc. It should also be required that a record be systematically kept of the time at which interviews start and end, of any request made by a detainee during an interview, and of the persons present during each interview.

The CPT would add that the electronic recording of police interviews is another useful safeguard against the ill-treatment of detainees (as well as having significant advantages for the police).

40. The CPT considers that the fundamental safeguards granted to persons in police custody would be reinforced (and the work of police officers quite possibly facilitated) if a single and comprehensive custody record were to exist for each person detained, on which would be recorded all aspects of his custody and action taken regarding them (when deprived of liberty and reasons for that measure; when told of rights; signs of injury, mental illness, etc; when next of kin/consulate and lawyer contacted and when visited by them; when offered food; when interrogated; when transferred or released, etc.). For various matters (for example, items in the person's possession, the fact of being told of one's rights and of invoking or waiving them), the signature of the detainee should be obtained and, if necessary, the absence of a signature explained. Further, the detainee's lawyer should have access to such a custody record.

41. Further, the existence of an independent mechanism for examining complaints about treatment whilst in police custody is an essential safeguard.

42. Custody by the police is in principle of relatively short duration. Consequently, physical conditions of detention cannot be expected to be as good in police establishments as in other places of detention where persons may be held for lengthy periods. However, certain elementary material requirements should be met.

All police cells should be of a reasonable size for the number of persons they are used to accommodate, and have adequate lighting (i.e. sufficient to read by, sleeping periods excluded) and ventilation; preferably, cells should enjoy natural light. Further, cells should be equipped with a means of rest (eg. a fixed chair or bench), and persons obliged to stay overnight in custody should be provided with a clean mattress and blankets.

Persons in custody should be allowed to comply with the needs of nature when necessary in clean and decent conditions, and be offered adequate washing facilities. They should be given food at appropriate times, including at least one full meal (i.e. something more substantial than a sandwich) every day.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The CPT also advocates that persons kept in police custody for 24 hours or more should, as far as possible, be offered outdoor exercise every day.

---

43. The issue of what is a reasonable size for a police cell (or any other type of detainee/prisoner accommodation) is a difficult question. Many factors have to be taken into account when making such an assessment. However, CPT delegations felt the need for a rough guideline in this area. The following criterion (seen as a desirable level rather than a minimum standard) is currently being used when assessing police cells intended for single occupancy for stays in excess of a few hours: in the order of 7 square metres, 2 metres or more between walls, 2.5 metres between floor and ceiling.

*Extract from the 6th General Report [CPT/Inf (96) 21]*

14. The CPT welcomes the support for its work expressed in Parliamentary Assembly Recommendation 1257 (1995), on conditions of detention in Council of Europe member States. It was also most pleased to learn from the reply to Recommendation 1257 that the Committee of Ministers has invited the authorities of member States to comply with the guidelines on police custody as laid down in the 2nd General Report of the CPT (cf. CPT/Inf (92) 3, paragraphs 36 to 43).

In this connection, it should be noted that some Parties to the Convention are reluctant to implement fully certain of the CPT's recommendations concerning safeguards against ill-treatment for persons in police custody, and in particular the recommendation that such persons be accorded a right of access to a lawyer as from the very outset of their custody.

15. The CPT wishes to stress that, in its experience, the period immediately following deprivation of liberty is when the risk of intimidation and physical ill-treatment is greatest. Consequently, the possibility for persons taken into police custody to have access to a lawyer during that period is a fundamental safeguard against ill-treatment. The existence of that possibility will have a dissuasive effect upon those minded to ill treat detained persons; further, a lawyer is well placed to take appropriate action if ill-treatment actually occurs.

The CPT recognises that in order to protect the interests of justice, it may exceptionally be necessary to delay for a certain period a detained person's access to a particular lawyer chosen by him. However, this should not result in the right of access to a lawyer being totally denied during the period in question. In such cases, access to another independent lawyer who can be trusted not to jeopardise the legitimate interests of the police investigation should be arranged.

16. The CPT also emphasised in the 2nd General Report the importance of persons taken into police custody being expressly informed without delay of all their rights.

In order to ensure that this is done, the CPT considers that a form setting out those rights in a straightforward manner should be systematically given to persons detained by the police at the very outset of their custody. Further, the persons concerned should be asked to sign a statement attesting that they have been informed of their rights.

The above-mentioned measures would be easy to implement, inexpensive and effective.

---

---

*Extract from the 12th General Report [CPT/Inf (2002) 15]*

33. It is essential to the good functioning of society that the police have the powers to apprehend, temporarily detain and question criminal suspects and other categories of persons. However, these powers inherently bring with them a risk of intimidation and physical ill-treatment. The essence of the CPT's work is to seek ways of reducing that risk to the absolute minimum without unduly impeding the police in the proper exercise of their duties. Encouraging developments in the field of police custody have been noted in a number of countries; however, the CPT's findings also highlight all too often the need for continuing vigilance.

34. The **questioning of criminal suspects** is a specialist task which calls for specific training if it is to be performed in a satisfactory manner. First and foremost, *the precise aim of such questioning* must be made crystal clear: that aim should be to obtain accurate and reliable information in order to discover the truth about matters under investigation, not to obtain a confession from someone already presumed, in the eyes of the interviewing officers, to be guilty. In addition to the provision of appropriate training, ensuring adherence of law enforcement officials to the above-mentioned aim will be greatly facilitated by the drawing up of a code of conduct for the questioning of criminal suspects.

35. Over the years, CPT delegations have spoken to a considerable number of detained persons in various countries, who have made credible claims of having been physically ill-treated, or otherwise intimidated or threatened, by police officers trying to obtain confessions in the course of interrogations. It is self-evident that a criminal justice system which places a premium on *confession evidence* creates incentives for officials involved in the investigation of crime - and often under pressure to obtain results - to use physical or psychological coercion. In the context of the prevention of torture and other forms of ill-treatment, it is of fundamental importance to develop methods of crime investigation capable of reducing reliance on confessions, and other evidence and information obtained via interrogations, for the purpose of securing convictions.

36. The **electronic (i.e. audio and/or video) recording of police interviews** represents an important additional safeguard against the ill-treatment of detainees. The CPT is pleased to note that the introduction of such systems is under consideration in an increasing number of countries. Such a facility can provide a complete and authentic record of the interview process, thereby greatly facilitating the investigation of any allegations of ill-treatment. This is in the interest both of persons who have been ill-treated by the police and of police officers confronted with unfounded allegations that they have engaged in physical ill-treatment or psychological pressure. Electronic recording of police interviews also reduces the opportunity for defendants to later falsely deny that they have made certain admissions.

---

37. The CPT has on more than one occasion, in more than one country, discovered **interrogation rooms** of a highly intimidating nature: for example, rooms entirely decorated in black and equipped with spotlights directed at the seat used by the person undergoing interrogation. Facilities of this kind have no place in a police service.

In addition to being adequately lit, heated and ventilated, interview rooms should allow for all participants in the interview process to be seated on chairs of a similar style and standard of comfort. The interviewing officer should not be placed in a dominating (e.g. elevated) or remote position vis-à-vis the suspect. Further, colour schemes should be neutral.

38. In certain countries, the CPT has encountered the practice of **blindfolding** persons in police custody, in particular during periods of questioning. CPT delegations have received various - and often contradictory - explanations from police officers as regards the purpose of this practice. From the information gathered over the years, it is clear to the CPT that in many if not most cases, persons are blindfolded in order to prevent them from being able to identify law enforcement officials who inflict ill-treatment upon them. Even in cases when no physical ill-treatment occurs, to blindfold a person in custody - and in particular someone undergoing questioning - is a form of oppressive conduct, the effect of which on the person concerned will frequently amount to psychological ill-treatment. The CPT recommends that the blindfolding of persons who are in police custody be expressly prohibited.

39. It is not unusual for the CPT to find **suspicious objects** on police premises, such as wooden sticks, broom handles, baseball bats, metal rods, pieces of thick electric cable, imitation firearms or knives. The presence of such objects has on more than one occasion lent credence to allegations received by CPT delegations that the persons held in the establishments concerned have been threatened and/or struck with objects of this kind.

A common explanation received from police officers concerning such objects is that they have been confiscated from suspects and will be used as evidence. The fact that the objects concerned are invariably unlabelled, and frequently are found scattered around the premises (on occasion placed behind curtains or cupboards), can only invite scepticism as regards that explanation. In order to dispel speculation about improper conduct on the part of police officers and to remove potential sources of danger to staff and detained persons alike, items seized for the purpose of being used as evidence should always be properly labelled, recorded and kept in a dedicated property store. All other objects of the kind mentioned above should be removed from police premises.

40. As from the outset of its activities, the CPT has advocated a trinity of rights for persons detained by the police: **the rights of access to a lawyer and to a doctor and the right to have the fact of one's detention notified to a relative or another third party of one's choice**. In many States, steps have been taken to introduce or reinforce these rights, in the light of the CPT's recommendations. More specifically, the right of access to a lawyer during police custody is now widely recognised in countries visited by the CPT; in those few countries where the right does not yet exist, plans are afoot to introduce it.

---

---

41. However, in a number of countries, there is considerable reluctance to comply with the CPT's recommendation that the right of **access to a lawyer**<sup>1</sup> be guaranteed from the very outset of custody. In some countries, persons detained by the police enjoy this right only after a specified period of time spent in custody; in others, the right only becomes effective when the person detained is formally declared a "suspect".

The CPT has repeatedly stressed that, in its experience, the period immediately following deprivation of liberty is when the risk of intimidation and physical ill-treatment is greatest. Consequently, the possibility for persons taken into police custody to have access to a lawyer during that period is a fundamental safeguard against ill-treatment. The existence of that possibility will have a dissuasive effect upon those minded to ill treat detained persons; further, a lawyer is well placed to take appropriate action if ill-treatment actually occurs. The CPT recognises that in order to protect the legitimate interests of the police investigation, it may exceptionally be necessary to delay for a certain period a detained person's access to a lawyer of his choice. However, this should not result in the right of access to a lawyer being totally denied during the period in question. In such cases, access to another independent lawyer should be arranged.

The right of access to a lawyer must include the right to talk to him in private. The person concerned should also, in principle, be entitled to have a lawyer present during any interrogation conducted by the police. Naturally, this should not prevent the police from questioning a detained person on urgent matters, even in the absence of a lawyer (who may not be immediately available), nor rule out the replacement of a lawyer who impedes the proper conduct of an interrogation.

The CPT has also emphasised that the right of access to a lawyer should be enjoyed not only by criminal suspects but also by anyone who is under a legal obligation to attend - and stay at - a police establishment, e.g. as a "witness".

Further, for the right of access to a lawyer to be fully effective in practice, appropriate provision should be made for persons who are not in a position to pay for a lawyer.

42. Persons in police custody should have a formally recognised right of **access to a doctor**. In other words, a doctor should always be called without delay if a person requests a medical examination; police officers should not seek to filter such requests. Further, the right of access to a doctor should include the right of a person in custody to be examined, if the person concerned so wishes, by a doctor of his/her own choice (in addition to any medical examination carried out by a doctor called by the police).

---

<sup>1</sup> The CPT has subsequently published a more detailed section on "access to a lawyer as a means of preventing ill-treatment"; see paragraphs 18-25 of the 21st General Report (CPT/Inf (2011) 28).

---

All medical examinations of persons in police custody must be conducted out of the hearing of law enforcement officials and, unless the doctor concerned requests otherwise in a particular case, out of the sight of such officials.

It is also important that persons who are released from police custody without being brought before a judge have the right to directly request a medical examination/certificate from a recognised forensic doctor.

43. A detained person's **right to have the fact of his/her detention notified to a third party** should in principle be guaranteed from the very outset of police custody. Of course, the CPT recognises that the exercise of this right might have to be made subject to certain exceptions, in order to protect the legitimate interests of the police investigation. However, such exceptions should be clearly defined and strictly limited in time, and resort to them should be accompanied by appropriate safeguards (e.g. any delay in notification of custody to be recorded in writing with the reasons therefor, and to require the approval of a senior police officer unconnected with the case or a prosecutor).

44. Rights for persons deprived of their liberty will be of little value if the persons concerned are unaware of their existence. Consequently, it is imperative that persons taken into police custody are **expressly informed of their rights** without delay and in a language which they understand. In order to ensure that this is done, a form setting out those rights in a straightforward manner should be systematically given to persons detained by the police at the very outset of their custody. Further, the persons concerned should be asked to sign a statement attesting that they have been informed of their rights.

45. The CPT has stressed on several occasions **the role of judicial and prosecuting authorities** as regards combatting ill-treatment by the police.

For example, all persons detained by the police whom it is proposed to remand to prison should be physically brought before the judge who must decide that issue ; there are still certain countries visited by the CPT where this does not occur. Bringing the person before the judge will provide a timely opportunity for a criminal suspect who has been ill-treated to lodge a complaint. Further, even in the absence of an express complaint, the judge will be able to take action in good time if there are other indications of ill-treatment (e.g. visible injuries; a person's general appearance or demeanour).

Naturally, the judge must take appropriate steps when there are indications that ill-treatment by the police may have occurred. In this regard, whenever criminal suspects brought before a judge at the end of police custody allege ill-treatment, the judge should record the allegations in writing, order immediately a forensic medical examination and take the necessary steps to ensure that the allegations are properly investigated. Such an approach should be followed whether or not the person concerned bears visible external injuries. Further, even in the absence of an express allegation of ill-treatment, the judge should request a forensic medical examination whenever there are other grounds to believe that a person brought before him could have been the victim of ill-treatment.

---

---

The diligent examination by judicial and other relevant authorities of all complaints of ill-treatment by law enforcement officials and, where appropriate, the imposition of a suitable penalty will have a strong deterrent effect. Conversely, if those authorities do not take effective action upon complaints referred to them, law enforcement officials minded to ill-treat persons in their custody will quickly come to believe that they can do so with impunity.

46. **Additional questioning by the police of persons remanded to prison** may on occasion be necessary. The CPT is of the opinion that from the standpoint of the prevention of ill-treatment, it would be far preferable for such questioning to take place within the prison establishment concerned rather than on police premises. The return of remand prisoners to police custody for further questioning should only be sought and authorised when it is absolutely unavoidable. It is also axiomatic that in those exceptional circumstances where a remand prisoner is returned to the custody of the police, he/she should enjoy the three rights referred to in paragraphs 40 to 43.

47. Police custody is (or at least should be) of relatively short duration. Nevertheless, **conditions of detention in police cells** must meet certain *basic requirements*.

All police cells should be clean and of a reasonable size<sup>1</sup> for the number of persons they are used to accommodate, and have adequate lighting (i.e. sufficient to read by, sleeping periods excluded) ; preferably cells should enjoy natural light. Further, cells should be equipped with a means of rest (e.g. a fixed chair or bench), and persons obliged to stay overnight in custody should be provided with a clean mattress and clean blankets. Persons in police custody should have access to a proper toilet facility under decent conditions, and be offered adequate means to wash themselves. They should have ready access to drinking water and be given food at appropriate times , including at least one full meal (i.e. something more substantial than a sandwich) every day. Persons held in police custody for 24 hours or more should, as far as possible , be offered outdoor exercise every day.

Many police detention facilities visited by CPT delegations do not comply with these minimal standards. This is particularly detrimental for persons who subsequently appear before a judicial authority ; all too frequently persons are brought before a judge after spending one or more days in substandard and filthy cells, without having been offered appropriate rest and food and an opportunity to wash.

48. The duty of care which is owed by the police to persons in their custody includes the responsibility to ensure their *safety and physical integrity*. It follows that the proper monitoring of custody areas is an integral component of the duty of care assumed by the police. Appropriate steps must be taken to ensure that persons in police custody are always in a position to readily enter into contact with custodial staff.

---

<sup>1</sup> As regards the size of police cells, see also paragraph 43 of the 2nd General Report (CPT/Inf(92)3).

---



On a number of occasions CPT delegations have found that police cells were far removed from the offices or desks where police officers are normally present, and were also devoid of any means (e.g. a call system) enabling detained persons to attract the attention of a police officer. Under such conditions, there is considerable risk that incidents of various kinds (violence among detainees; suicide attempts; fires etc.) will not be responded to in good time.

49. The CPT has also expressed misgivings as regards the practice observed in certain countries of each operational department (narcotics, organised crime, anti-terrorism) in a police establishment having its own detention facility staffed by officers from that department. The Committee considers that such an approach should be discarded in favour of a *central detention facility*, staffed by a distinct corps of officers specifically trained for such a custodial function. This would almost certainly prove beneficial from the standpoint of the prevention of ill-treatment. Further, relieving individual operational departments of custodial duties might well prove advantageous from the management and logistical perspectives.

50. Finally, the **inspection of police establishments by an independent authority** can make an important contribution towards the prevention of ill-treatment of persons held by the police and, more generally, help to ensure satisfactory conditions of detention. To be fully effective, visits by such an authority should be both regular and unannounced, and the authority concerned should be empowered to interview detained persons in private. Further, it should examine all issues related to the treatment of persons in custody: the recording of detention; information provided to detained persons on their rights and the actual exercise of those rights (in particular the three rights referred to in paragraphs 40 to 43); compliance with rules governing the questioning of criminal suspects; and material conditions of detention.

The findings of the above-mentioned authority should be forwarded not only to the police but also to another authority which is independent of the police.

---