

CPT/Inf (2002) 33

**Report to the Government of
the Principality of Liechtenstein
on the visit to Liechtenstein
carried out by the European Committee
for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman
or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT)
from 31 May to 2 June 1999**

The Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein has requested the publication of this report and of its response. The Government's response is set out in document CPT/Inf (2002) 34.

Strasbourg, 27 November 2002

CONTENTS

Page

Copy of the letter transmitting the report.....	3
I. INTRODUCTION.....	4
A. Dates of the visit, composition of the delegation and establishments visited.....	4
B. Consultations held by the delegation and co-operation encountered.....	4
II. FACTS FOUND DURING THE VISIT AND ACTION PROPOSED	6
A. Torture and other forms of ill-treatment.....	6
B. Police custody	6
1. Preliminary remarks	6
2. Conditions of detention	7
3. Safeguards against the ill-treatment of persons deprived of their liberty	8
C. Vaduz Prison	10
1. Preliminary remarks	10
2. Regime.....	10
3. Health care	11
a. Staff.....	11
b. Medical examination on admission.....	12
c. Prisoners placed in solitary confinement	13
4. Other issues of relevance to the CPT's mandate	13
a. Prison staff	13
b. Complaints and inspection procedures.....	14
c. Contact with the outside world	14
APPENDIX I :	
SUMMARY OF THE CPT'S RECOMMENDATIONS, COMMENTS AND REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION	15
APPENDIX II :	
LIST OF NATIONAL AUTHORITIES AND NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS WITH WHICH THE CPT'S DELEGATION HELD CONSULTATIONS	18

Copy of the letter transmitting the report

Strasbourg, 9 December 1999

Dear Mrs Wildhaber,

In pursuance of Article 10, paragraph 1, of the European Convention for the prevention of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, I have the honour to enclose herewith the report to the Government of Liechtenstein drawn up by the European Committee for the prevention of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment (CPT) after its visit to Liechtenstein from 31 May to 2 June 1999. The report was adopted by the CPT at its fortieth meeting, held from 15 to 18 November 1999.

The various recommendations, comments and requests for information formulated by the CPT are summarised in Appendix I. As regards more particularly the recommendations, having regard to Article 10 of the Convention, the Committee requests the Liechtenstein authorities to provide within six months a report providing a full account of action taken to implement them. The CPT trusts that it will also be possible for the Liechtenstein authorities to provide in the above-mentioned report reactions to the comments formulated by the Committee as well as replies to its requests for information.

The CPT would be grateful if it were possible, in the event of the six-month report being forwarded in German, for it to be accompanied by an English or French translation. It would also be most helpful if the Liechtenstein authorities could provide a copy of the report in a computer-readable form.

I am at your entire disposal if you have any questions concerning either the CPT's report or the future procedure.

Finally, I would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this letter.

Yours sincerely,

Ivan ZAKINE
President of the European Committee for
the prevention of torture and inhuman
or degrading treatment or punishment

Mrs Patricia WILDHABER
Ressort Justiz
Regierungsgebäude
Städtle 49
FL – 9490 VADUZ

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Dates of the visit, composition of the delegation and establishments visited

1. In pursuance of Article 7 of the European Convention for the prevention of torture and inhuman and degrading treatment and punishment (hereafter referred to as "the Convention"), a delegation of the CPT carried out a visit to Liechtenstein from 31 May to 2 June 1999. The visit formed part of the CPT's programme of periodic visits for 1999, and was the second periodic visit to Liechtenstein to be carried out by the Committee¹.

2. The visit was carried out by the following members of the CPT:

- Mr Jón BJARMAN, Head of the Delegation,
- Mr Miklós MAGYAR.

They were assisted by:

- Ms Bettina LUDEWIG (interpreter);
- Ms Sybille von MÜLMANN (interpreter),

and were accompanied by the following members of the CPT's Secretariat :

- Mr Edo KORLJAN
- Mr Dominique BERTRAND.

3. The delegation visited Vaduz Police Station and Vaduz Prison.

B. Consultations held by the delegation and co-operation encountered

4. The delegation held consultations with the national authorities and with a representative of the only non-governmental organisation active in areas of concern to the CPT (cf. Appendix II). In addition, numerous meetings were held with local officials in charge of the places visited.

¹ The first periodic visit to Liechtenstein took place in April 1993. The report on that visit has been published as document CPT/Inf (95) 7, and the interim response of the Government as document CPT/Inf (95) 8.

5. The CPT wishes to underline that the degree of co-operation which prevailed during the visit was exemplary, at both national and local level.

The talks with the national authorities, both at the beginning and at the end of the visit, took place in a spirit of close co-operation. In particular, fruitful discussions were held with Mr Heinz FROMMELT, the Minister of Justice. Further, the delegation received a very satisfactory reception at - including rapid access to - both establishments visited.

The CPT also wishes to underline the assistance provided to the delegation by the Deputy Permanent Representative of the Principality of Liechtenstein to the Council of Europe, Mr Patrick RITTER, who acted as the CPT's liaison officer.

6. As regards the substantive content of the CPT's on-going dialogue with the Liechtenstein authorities, the facts found during the 1999 visit show that action has been taken to implement some of the recommendations made by the Committee in its report on the 1993 visit. This is particularly the case as regards the reinforcement of staff at Vaduz Prison and the improvement of possibilities for prisoners to maintain contact with the outside world. However, many of the Committee's other recommendations are yet to be implemented. The CPT trusts that action will be taken to remedy this situation, in the light of this report.

II. FACTS FOUND DURING THE VISIT AND ACTION PROPOSED

A. Torture and other forms of ill-treatment

7. As has been the case during the 1993 visit, the CPT's delegation did not hear any allegations of torture or physical ill-treatment of persons deprived of their liberty in Liechtenstein, and gathered no other evidence of such treatment.

However, the CPT was concerned to learn that prisoners are on occasion held for long periods in solitary confinement in Vaduz Prison. It is widely acknowledged that all forms of isolation without appropriate mental and physical stimulation are likely in the long term to have damaging effects, resulting in changes in social and mental faculties. The observations made in the course of the 1999 visit revealed that the regime applied to prisoners undergoing prolonged periods of non-voluntary solitary confinement in Vaduz Prison did not provide this necessary stimulation. The CPT shall return to this issue later (see paragraphs 22 and 23).

B. Police custody

1. Preliminary remarks

8. The basic rules and practice concerning the detention and treatment of criminal suspects by the police have not changed since the CPT's first visit to Liechtenstein. They were summarised in the report drawn up following that visit (cf. paragraphs 10 to 14 of document CPT/Inf (95) 7). It is recalled that a person suspected of a criminal offence and arrested by the police following the written instruction of an investigating judge must be heard by the latter within 24 hours of being placed under arrest. Criminal suspects arrested by the police without a judge's written order must appear before an investigating judge within 48 hours. Prior to their remand into custody or their release, criminal suspects are held in a cell located within the police station adjacent to Vaduz Prison.

Foreign nationals subject to a removal order can be detained by the police for 96 hours. Their detention may be prolonged by a judge's decision to 30 days. In this case, they are detained at Vaduz Prison.

2. Conditions of detention

9. The CPT wishes to recall the general criteria which guide its activities in this area.

All police cells should be clean, 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 (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 be allowed to comply with the needs of nature when necessary, in clean and decent conditions, and be offered adequate washing facilities. 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 for extended periods (24 hours or more) should be provided with appropriate personal hygiene items and, as far as possible, be offered outdoor exercise every day.

10. As had been the case in 1993, the Vaduz Police Station possessed two cells: a multi-occupancy cell (used primarily for the detention of illegal aliens), and an observation cell which served for inebriated persons or inmates who needed to be placed under surveillance (e.g. because of a risk of suicide). Both cells were empty at the time of the delegation's visit.

11. Material conditions of detention in the multi-occupancy cell were in principle quite satisfactory (good lighting, ventilation, sanitary annex etc). However, the official occupancy rate (15 detainees) remained too high for a 28 m² cell. Consequently, **the CPT must reiterate the recommendation made after the 1993 visit that the maximum capacity be reduced to 8 persons** (a measure which will involve removing seven beds). **In those rare cases when more than 8 persons are detained at any one time by the police, additional accommodation should be brought into service.**

12. Material conditions of detention in the observation cell were also on the whole satisfactory. However, **it would be desirable for persons placed in the cell to have ready access to running water for drinking and washing purposes** (the flow of which might be controlled from outside the cell, to avoid any risk of flooding). Further, the delegation noted that there was no special register recording the use of that cell. **The CPT recommends that such a register be established.**

3. Safeguards against the ill-treatment of persons deprived of their liberty

13. In the report drawn up after the 1993 visit, the CPT made a number of recommendations designed to reinforce formal safeguards against the ill-treatment of persons deprived of their liberty, and more specifically the following rights:

- the right of those concerned to inform a close relative or another third party of their choice of their situation;
- the right of access to a lawyer;
- the right of access to a doctor.

The CPT considers that these three rights are fundamental safeguards against the ill-treatment of persons deprived of their liberty, which should apply from the very outset of custody (that is, as soon as those concerned are obliged to remain with the police).

The information gathered in the course of the 1999 visit indicates that the Committee's recommendations are yet to be implemented.

In this connection, the CPT wishes to stress that the current favourable situation as regards the treatment of persons deprived of their liberty (cf. paragraph 7) is not a justification for failing to reinforce formal safeguards. No State is free from the risk of instances of ill-treatment.

14. The right of persons detained by the police to inform a relative or a third party of their choice of their situation is still not guaranteed in Liechtenstein. **The CPT recommends that such a right be formally recognised, as from the very outset of a person's custody (that is, from the moment when he is obliged to remain with the police). Further, any possibility exceptionally to delay the exercise of this right, in order to protect the interests of justice, should be clearly circumscribed in law and made subject to appropriate safeguards (e.g. any delay to be recorded in writing with the reasons therefor and to require the approval of a judicial authority).**

15. As regards the right of access to a lawyer, it remains the case that this right is guaranteed only from the moment when a person detained acquires the status of a "Beschuldigter" (cf. paragraphs 24-27 of the 1993 visit report). Further, even a "Beschuldigter"'s right of access to a lawyer can in certain cases be substantially restricted, by having meetings between him and the lawyer supervised. This is not a satisfactory state of affairs.

The CPT wishes to stress that, in its experience, it is during the period immediately following the deprivation of liberty that the risk of intimidation is greatest. Consequently, the possibility for persons taken into custody by the police 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 on those minded to ill-treat detained persons; moreover, 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 investigation should be arranged.

To maintain its effectiveness as a safeguard against ill-treatment, the right of access to a lawyer must include the right to talk to him in private. The detained person should also be entitled to have a lawyer present during any questioning conducted by the police (whether this be during or after the initial period of custody). Naturally, the fact that a detained person has stated that he wishes to have access to a lawyer should not prevent the police from beginning to question him on urgent matters before the lawyer arrives.

In the light of these considerations, **the CPT recommends that steps be taken to ensure that all persons detained by the police have as from the very outset of their deprivation of liberty a right of access to a lawyer, as defined above. Such a right should be enjoyed by all persons deprived of their liberty, including those detained under Aliens legislation.**

16. As regards access to a doctor, the CPT notes that provisions have not yet been adopted in order to make clear that persons detained by the police are entitled to have access to a doctor of their choice (in addition to an examination by a doctor called by the police). **The CPT invites the Liechtenstein authorities to adopt such provisions.**

17. In the report on its 1993 visit, the CPT recommended that a form setting out their rights be given automatically to persons detained by the police, at the outset of their custody. It also recommended that this form be made available in different languages and that the detainee should sign a statement attesting that he has been informed of his rights in a language which he understands.

The authorities replied that "an information leaflet setting out the rights of detained persons has been considered and that it would be probably translated into a half of a dozen frequently used languages. The same goes for an information leaflet giving explications on the procedural rights in Liechtenstein and containing useful information for the detainees" (cf. CPT/Inf (95) 8, page 5).

However, the CPT's delegation which carried out the second periodic visit to Liechtenstein was unable to find such a leaflet. Furthermore, it received complaints from prisoners at Vaduz Prison that they had not been provided with information about their rights whilst in police custody, not even verbally. Consequently, **the CPT recommends that a form setting out those rights in a straightforward manner be systematically given to persons detained by the police, at the very outset of their custody. The form should be available in an appropriate range of languages.**

C. Vaduz Prison

1. Preliminary remarks

18. The general description of Vaduz Prison provided in the report on the CPT's 1993 visit remains valid. The establishment is located in a modern building which offers excellent material conditions of detention for up to 24 prisoners (16 individual and 4 double cells). At the time of the 1999 visit the establishment was accommodating nine prisoners, eight on remand and one serving a short sentence (Vaduz Prison is used to accommodate prisoners sentenced for up to two years)².

19. The establishment's inmate population included a number of foreign nationals, several of whom complained that they were not given sufficient information about the grounds for their detention or the progress of their case. In this connection, the CPT notes that despite the recommendations made in the report on the 1993 visit and the measures announced in the Liechtenstein authorities' response, the prison rules had not yet been updated and were still available only in German. **The CPT recommends that steps be taken to remedy this situation without further delay.**

2. Regime

20. The lack of activities for prisoners held in Vaduz Prison was severely criticised by the CPT in the 1993 visit report. The CPT's delegation which carried out the 1999 visit found that there had been some improvement as regards work opportunities. In particular, a number of prisoners were offered a remunerated job (assembling parts for electric guitars). However, educational and sports activities remained underdeveloped. As regards the latter, although the establishment possessed an indoor exercise bicycle, it was inconveniently placed in a room where prisoners were working. Further, the delegation found no trace of the table tennis board which, according to the response of the Liechtenstein authorities, had been placed in the exercise yard. It should also be noted that none of the prisoners were engaged in vocational training or rehabilitation activities.

To sum up, there was a pervasive air of boredom in the establishment, prisoners spending most of their time playing cards in the small common room, reading books (unfortunately, available almost exclusively in German) and watching TV.

21. The CPT recognises that it is not easy to develop a satisfactory programme of activities in a small establishment which has a fairly rapid turnover of prisoners. Nevertheless, the Committee is convinced that more could be done in this area. Increasing the number of books in foreign languages and providing a small room designated for sports activities (e.g. weight training) are examples of steps which might be taken. **The CPT recommends that the Liechtenstein authorities persevere in their efforts to develop the programmes of activities available to prisoners, in the light of the above remarks.**

² At the time of the visit, 14 prisoners were serving longer sentences imposed by Liechtenstein courts in Austrian prisons, in accordance with a bilateral agreement.

22. During the first visit to Liechtenstein in 1993, the CPT was informed that an investigating judge is authorised to place restrictions on remand prisoners in order to reduce the risk of interference with the investigation; these included prohibition of contact with other prisoners and the limitation/prohibition of contacts (correspondence and visits) with the outside world. In practice, prisoners subject to restrictions remained confined to their cells, apart from the daily outdoor exercise taken alone in the roof area set aside for them, and enjoyed few visiting rights. The CPT recommended that the Liechtenstein authorities ensure that arrangements for the detention of prisoners placed in solitary confinement for criminal investigation purposes or for any other reason be adjusted so as to provide such prisoners with purposeful activities and appropriate human contact.

23. During the 1999 visit, the CPT's delegation met a detainee who had been subject to restrictions from August 1997 until February 1998. He had not been allowed visits (except from his lawyer), and had had no work opportunities or any form of association with other inmates. The detainee in question had not even been allowed to open his cell window. The above is all the more of concern given that according to information provided to the delegation, the legislation in force allows such a regime to be applied for no more than three months.

The CPT would like to receive the comments of the Liechtenstein authorities on the above-mentioned case. It would also like to receive statistics concerning cases in which restrictions have been applied to remand prisoners during 1998 and 1999, including the length of time of their application. The CPT would also like to be informed of the possibilities open to remand prisoners to contest restrictions applied to them.

Further, the Committee recommends that arrangements in Vaduz Prison for remand prisoners subject to restrictions be immediately adapted, in order to provide them with purposeful activities and guarantee them appropriate human contact.

3. Health care

a. Staff

24. The Vaduz Prison medical service was headed by the "Landesphysikus", a general practitioner working for the Government, who was assisted by another general practitioner working part-time. They covered together all the consultations held in the prison medical service. Both doctors also took turns being on call round the clock and stood in for each other during holidays; they were backed up by the Casualty Department of Vaduz Hospital. Where necessary, specialist outpatient consultations were held in Vaduz Hospital; for example, 37 transfers to Vaduz Hospital for medical care took place between 1 January 1998 and 1 June 1999. The delegation noted that the prison social service included 3 psychologists, and it was stated that a psychiatrist went to the prison to hold consultations on request. For the purposes of ordinary hospital care, there was an agreement whereby prisoners could be transferred to a prison hospital in Austria (Feldkirch, 15 km from Vaduz); in the event of emergency hospitalisation, Vaduz Hospital had a secure cell where a prisoner could be held for a short time until his state of health permitted transfer to the prison hospital.

25. However, as had been the case in 1993, the prison was not visited on a regular basis by nursing staff; nursing care could be provided there at the request of one of the doctors working in the prison medical service. The doctor to whom the delegation spoke considered that there was no need for daily visits by a nurse, given in particular the small number of inmates in Vaduz Prison.

Nevertheless, the Committee remains of the view that regular visits by a nurse to the prison would be highly desirable. The duties of a nurse could include inter alia noting prisoners' requests for medical consultations, ensuring the supply and distribution of medicines prescribed, and keeping the medical records, tasks which are at present performed by prison staff. The nurse could in addition be entrusted with an initial medical screening of newly-arrived prisoners (cf. paragraph 26), as well as with supervising conditions of hygiene (cleanliness of clothing and bedding; access to running water; sanitary installations).

The CPT therefore recommends the Liechtenstein authorities to reconsider the possibility of organising regular visits by a nurse to Vaduz Prison.

b. Medical examination on admission

26. Section 9 of the Prison Act and Article 4.1 of the Ordinance concerning the Act (LGB1.1985 No. 38) stipulate that all prisoners must receive a medical examination within 24 hours of arrival. The general practitioner working part-time in the establishment informed the delegation that the "Landesphysikus" held a weekly consultation (on Fridays) in the Vaduz Prison medical service; however, when notified, the duty doctor visited the medical service within 48 hours of the arrival of each new prisoner.

The delegation decided to conduct itself a systematic check of the medical files of the nine prisoners present; it transpired that only 3 prisoners had been examined within 48 hours of entering the prison, while the others had had a medical consultation after a period ranging from 9 days to almost 7 months. The delegation also noted that the summary of the initial medical examination and the medical monitoring notes set out in the prisoners' medical files were scant.

The CPT recommends that the Liechtenstein authorities ensure that all detainees entering Vaduz Prison are examined by a doctor, or by a fully qualified nurse reporting to a doctor, within 24 hours of arrival.

c. Prisoners placed in solitary confinement

27. Reference has already been made (cf. paragraphs 7 and 22) to the fact that remand prisoners subject to restrictions could be held for prolonged periods in conditions akin to solitary confinement. In this connection, the CPT wishes to stress that whenever a prisoner placed under such conditions (for whatever cause: in the interest of a criminal investigation, at the prisoner's own request, disciplinary reasons, the danger he presents, disruptive behaviour) asks for a doctor - or a prison officer asks for one on his behalf - the doctor should be called without delay with a view to carrying out a medical examination of the prisoner. The results of the medical examination, including an account of the prisoner's physical and mental condition as well as, if need be, the foreseeable consequences of continued isolation, should be set out in a written statement to be forwarded to the competent authorities.

Consequently, **the CPT recommends that the Liechtenstein authorities take steps to ensure that the relevant regulations and practice are consistent with the points made in this paragraph.**

4. Other issues of relevance to the CPT's mandate

a. Prison staff

28. At the time of the 1993 visit, only two staff worked in Vaduz Prison and no staff member was present at night. From 7 p.m. to 7 a.m. the following day, a police patrol from the adjacent building would intervene in case of emergency. The Committee recommended that a high priority be given to reinforcing the staff at Vaduz Prison.

The Liechtenstein authorities have taken positive measures in response to this recommendation: at the time of the 1999 visit, the establishment was staffed by five prison officers and eight part-time reserve police officers, and there was a staff member present 24 hours, seven days per week. The CPT is also pleased to note that all the prison officers currently employed at Vaduz Prison have undergone 2½ years training in Switzerland, including instruction in first aid.

29. However, the present staff complement at Vaduz Prison does not include a female prison officer, despite the fact that the establishment does on occasion accommodate female prisoners. **The CPT invites the Liechtenstein authorities to explore the possibility of engaging one or more female members of staff.**

b. Complaints and inspection procedures

30. As indicated in its first report, the CPT considers that effective complaints and inspection procedures are fundamental safeguards against ill-treatment. Prisoners should have avenues of complaint open to them both within and outside the prison system, and have confidential access to an appropriate authority. The CPT attaches particular importance to prison establishments being visited by an independent body empowered to hear complaints of prisoners (and, if necessary, take appropriate action) and to inspect the premises.

31. In the course of the 1993 visit, it was noted that the existing procedures regarding complaints by prisoners were outdated and that new legislation was to be prepared on this subject. Further, in their response to the CPT's report, the authorities confirmed that legislation should soon be adopted. However, according to the information gathered during the 1999 visit, this new legislation has still not been passed. **The CPT would like to receive the comments of the Liechtenstein authorities on this subject.**

32. As regards the inspection of Vaduz Prison, the Code of Criminal Procedure stipulates that the President of the Landgericht or a judge designated by him shall make an unannounced visit to the establishment at least once every three months, with a view to inspecting the premises, interviewing the prisoners and rectifying deficiencies observed. However, the delegation received information to the effect that such a visit had not taken place for two years. **The CPT recommends that the Liechtenstein authorities take appropriate steps to ensure that the establishment is regularly visited by a judge, as provided by the legislation in force.**

33. The delegation was also informed of the activities of the Working Group "Assistance to Detainees and Probation". This group (composed of the Public Prosecutor, the Chief of Staff of the National Police, an investigating magistrate, the Landesphysikus, a Social Services representative and a representative of the NGO Justitia et Pax) is required to submit an Annual Report. **The CPT would like to receive a copy of the last annual report.**

c. Contact with the outside world

34. It is very important for prisoners to be able to maintain reasonably good contact with the outside world. Above all, prisoners must be given the means of safeguarding their relationships with their families and close friends, and especially with their spouses or partners and their children. The maintenance of such relationships is of crucial importance for all those concerned, particularly in the context of prisoners' social rehabilitation.

35. In this area, the CPT recommended in the report on the 1993 visit that the visiting entitlement for prisoners be increased to at least one hour per week, and that the arrangements governing prisoners' access to the telephone be relaxed.

The CPT is pleased to note that these recommendations have been implemented by the Liechtenstein authorities.

APPENDIX I

SUMMARY OF THE CPT'S RECOMMENDATIONS, COMMENTS AND REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

A. Police custody

1. Conditions of detention

recommendations

- the maximum capacity of the multi-occupancy cell at Vaduz Police Station to be reduced to 8 persons. In those rare cases when more than 8 persons are detained at any one time by the police, additional accommodation should be brought into service (paragraph 11);
- a register recording the use of the observation cell at Vaduz Police Station to be established (paragraph 12).

comments

- it would be desirable for persons placed in the observation cell to have ready access to running water for drinking and washing purposes (paragraph 12).

2. Safeguards against the ill-treatment of persons deprived of their liberty

recommendations

- the right of persons detained by the police to inform a relative or a third party of their choice of their situation to be formally recognised, as from the very outset of a person's custody (that is, from the moment when he is obliged to remain with the police). Any possibility exceptionally to delay the exercise of this right, in order to protect the interests of justice, should be clearly circumscribed in law and made subject to appropriate safeguards (e.g. any delay to be recorded in writing with the reasons therefor and to require the approval of a judicial authority) (paragraph 14);
- steps to be taken to ensure that all persons detained by the police have as from the very outset of their deprivation of liberty a right of access to a lawyer, as defined in paragraph 15. Such a right should be enjoyed by all persons deprived of their liberty, including those detained under Aliens legislation (paragraph 15);
- a form setting out in a straightforward manner the rights of persons detained by the police to be systematically given to such persons at the very outset of their custody. The form should be available in an appropriate range of languages (paragraph 17).

comments

- the Liechtenstein authorities are invited to adopt provisions guaranteeing the right of persons detained by the police to have access to a doctor of their choice (in addition to an examination by a doctor called by the police) (paragraph 16).

B. Vaduz Prison

1. Preliminary remarks

recommendations

- steps to be taken to update the prison rules and translate them into relevant foreign languages (paragraph 19).

2. Regime

recommendations

- the Liechtenstein authorities to persevere in their efforts to develop the programmes of activities available to prisoners at Vaduz Prison, in the light of the remarks made in paragraphs 20 and 21 (paragraph 21);
- arrangements in Vaduz Prison for remand prisoners subject to restrictions to be immediately adapted, in order to provide them with purposeful activities and guarantee them appropriate human contact (paragraph 23).

requests for information

- the comments of the Liechtenstein authorities on the case referred to in paragraph 23 (paragraph 23);
- statistics concerning cases in which restrictions have been applied to remand prisoners during 1998 and 1999, including the length of time of their application (paragraph 23);
- the possibilities open to remand prisoners to contest restrictions applied to them (paragraph 23).

3. Health care

recommendations

- reconsider the possibility of organising regular visits by a nurse to Vaduz Prison (paragraph 25);
- ensure that all detainees entering Vaduz Prison are examined by a doctor, or by a fully-qualified nurse reporting to a doctor, within 24 hours of arrival (paragraph 26);
- steps to be taken to ensure that the relevant regulations and practice concerning access to a doctor for prisoners placed in solitary confinement are consistent with the points made in paragraph 27 (paragraph 27).

4. Other issues of relevance to the CPT's mandate

recommendations

- appropriate steps to be taken to ensure that Vaduz Prison is regularly visited by a judge, as provided by the legislation in force (paragraph 32).

comments

- the Liechtenstein authorities are invited to explore the possibility of engaging one or more female members of staff at Vaduz Prison (paragraph 29).

requests for information

- the comments of the Liechtenstein authorities concerning the adoption of new legislation regarding complaints by prisoners (paragraph 31);
- a copy of the last annual report prepared by the Working Group "Assistance to Detainees and Probation" (paragraph 33).

APPENDIX II

LIST OF NATIONAL AUTHORITIES AND NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS WITH WHICH THE CPT'S DELEGATION HELD CONSULTATIONS

A. National authorities

- Mr Heinz FROMMELT Minister of Justice
- Mr Norbert MARXER Head, Legal Service of the Government,
Ministry of Justice
- Ms Marion FRICK-TABARELLI Deputy Head, Legal Service of the Government,
Ministry of Justice
- Ms Patricia WILDHABER Legal Adviser to the Minister, Ministry of Justice
- Ms Alma WILLI Public Prosecutor
- Mr Arnold LATERNER Investigating Magistrate
- Mr Reto BRUNHART Chief of the National Police
- Mr Uwe LANGENBAHN Chief of Staff, National Police
- Mr Daniel SOCHIN Governor, Vaduz Prison
- Ms Bettina EBERLE-FROMMELT Office for Social Services
- Ms Lora VIDIC Psychiatrist, Office for Social Services
- Mr Marco OSPELT Deputy of the Landesphysikus
- Mr Horst SCHÄDLER Head, Immigration Office
- Ms Gertrude GRABMAYER Immigration Office
- Mr Patrick RITTER Deputy Permanent Representative of the Principality
of Liechtenstein to the Council of Europe

B. Non-governmental organisations

- Justitia et Pax