



香港眾志
DEMOSISTŌ

Shadow Report on Hong Kong Special Administrative Region

Submitted to the

Human Rights Committee

for consideration in the preparation of the list of issues - Hong Kong -
at the 129th session (29 June 2020 to 24 July 2020) of ICCPR

Submitted by:

Demosistō

June 2020

Introduction	2
1. Major Developments in Hong Kong’s Landscape in May 2020	3
1.1 Introduction of National Security Law	3
1.2 Legislation of “National Anthem Bill”	3
2. Occurrences of Torture Abuse in Correctional Facilities (Articles 7, 10, 22, 26)	4
2.1 Physical Abuse - Targeting Political Detainees (Article 7)	4
2.2 Degrading Treatment towards Remand Persons (Article 10)	4
2.3 Restrictions on Freedom of Association (Article 22)	5
2.4 A Lack of an Independent Complaints Handling System for Correctional Facilities (Article 26)	5
3. Restrictions on Freedom of Expression - Political Censorship (Article 19)	6
4. Restrictions on Freedom of peaceful assembly (Article 21)	7
5. Arbitrary Disqualification of Opposition Candidates (Article 25)	9

Introduction

Demosisto is a pro-democracy youth activist group in Hong Kong. Through street politics, civil society empowerment and international delegations, we advocate democratic reforms, progressive values and self-consciousness of Hongkongers in the city. In our fight for equality, justice and democracy, we aim at turning Hong Kong into a pluralist city. In the past, we have made submissions on issues concerning police brutality, freedoms of assembly, freedoms of speech and prisoners' right in Hong Kong.

As regards the Fourth periodic report of Hong Kong of at the United Nations (UN) Human Rights Committee's 129th session in June 2020, Demosisto in this submission sets out the following list of concerns and recommendations in light of the implementation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights by the Hong Kong government. In some matters, the issues may involve the Beijing authority since China has actively interfered in the local affairs in recent years.

In view of the recent introduction of the national security law, as well as the latest development since the outbreak of the anti-Extradition Bill movements last year, this submission aims to provide more critical updates to the Hong Kong Fourth ICCPR Report, as well as provide more comprehensive information to the Committee when drafting its list of issues relating Hong Kong.

1. Major Developments in Hong Kong's Landscape in May 2020

1.1 Introduction of National Security Law

In May 2020, the National People's Congress (NPC) introduced and adopted a draft decision on "establishing and improving the legal system and enforcement mechanisms for the HKSAR to safeguard national security." The adoption of this decision has empowered the NPC's Standing Committee (NPCSC) to bypass Hong Kong's Legislative Council and directly implant this controversial law in Hong Kong.

The ambiguous yet expansive definition of "national security" has been used as one of the important tools to arrest and silence dissidents. Even pro-government legal scholars have expressed concerns over the grave consequences of the law. For example, the Basic Law Committee member Albert Chen pointed out that the law extends its scope from "the Central government" to "the state power", which will cover the Hong Kong government. As a result, any slogans calling for the city leader to step down can be regarded as "inciting subversion of the state power" and sentenced to life imprisonment, let alone slogans chanting "End the Tyranny" or any critical voices on the Beijing or Hong Kong government.¹ The law will also have ripple effects on expats living and working in the city since the terms of "collusion with foreign forces" is loosely defined and easily abused.

More importantly, the law will allow a new Beijing-led national security agency to officially operate in Hong Kong. With China's poor human rights records, the law is regarded as a new weapon to quell dissidence. In fact, China has a long history of suppressing dissidents with the charges related to "national security". Human rights defenders (e.g. Nobel Peace Prize laureate Liu Xiaobo), citizens reporters (e.g. Tan Zuoren), human rights lawyers (e.g. Wang Quanzhang) and other grassroots or religious organisations have been put behind bars on the charges like "inciting subversion of state power." Hong Kong's civil liberty faces a death blow if the same offence is arbitrarily applied to the city.

1.2 Legislation of "National Anthem Bill"

On June 4 2020, the legislature controlled by pro-government forces has passed another controversial bill - the National Anthem Bill - which criminalizes behaviors misusing the Chinese national anthem, including "publicly and intentionally" altering its lyrics or score, and playing or singing it in a "distorted or disrespectful way."² The law will prohibit all kinds of protecting acts and other derivative work related to the national anthem, which will infringe upon the freedom of expression.

¹ Apple Daily (2020, May 24). Albert Chen: "Carrie Lam step down" can be Incitement of Subversion. Retrieved from <https://hk.appledaily.com/local/20200524/PXTTIZGXXDKP2NAR7OTU36NKUY/>

² Yu, V. (2020, June 4). Hong Kong Legislature Passes Controversial National Anthem Law.

Demosisto recommends that the Beijing government and Hong Kong government:

- withdraw the legislation of the controversial national security law
- ensure that all legislation is in conformity with the guarantees of the freedom of expression, assembly and association enshrined in the Hong Kong Bill of Rights Ordinance (HKBORO), which is the local adaptation of the provisions of the ICCPR in Hong Kong, and in the Article 35 of Basic Law
- respect the people's political rights and civil liberties, and ensure that participation in public affairs should be not restricted or criminalized solely on the basis of unwelcome political beliefs. It is believed that a robust and vibrant civil society is the indispensable part of the “One Country, Two Systems” framework

2. Occurrences of Torture Abuse in Correctional Facilities (Articles 7, 10, 22, 26)

2.1 Physical Abuse - Targeting Political Detainees (Article 7)

As enshrined in Article 7 of ICCPR, "no one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. In particular, no one shall be subjected without his free consent to medical or scientific experimentation." However, since the outbreak of anti-Extradition movement last year, physical abuses targeting political detainees have become one of the most concerning issues in the city. According to various media coverages and human rights reports, arrestees are subject to unreasonable and unlawful treatment by police forces and prison guards during their arrests and detention, including physical abuses, verbal intimidations, and humiliations.

In late-April this year, Demosisto received several requests for assistance from protesters who were previously remanded at Pik Uk Correctional Institution (PUCI), revealing several occurrences of torture abuse. At least 3 victims testified that they were subjected to torture by correctional staff despite facing the danger of returning to the PUCI and suffering retaliation. The three victims were remanded for participating in protest-related activities. During their remand period in PUCI, these protesters were beaten almost every week: some suffered one to two beatings per week while some faced three to five beatings weekly. Correctional staff slapped protesters, jumped up and elbowed them in the spine, and hit their hands and feet with wooden sticks, iron rulers, and police batons etc. Detainees were also forced to count out with phrases “Thank you sir one! Thank you sir two!” upon each stroke of the baton. It was reported that the correctional staff beat the detainees 20 times on each limb in the worst case. (Please refer to the Appendix below for the details of torture abuse.)

2.2 Degrading Treatment towards Remand Persons (Article 10)

As stipulated in Article 10 (3) of ICCPR, “the penitentiary system shall comprise treatment of prisoners the essential aim of which shall be their reformation and social rehabilitation.”

Unfortunately, the 3 victims aforementioned also suffered the degrading treatment which noticeably did not fulfill the purpose of reform nor rehabilitation.

The 3 other incidents included in the Appendix, involving unnecessary and disproportionate use of force, may not have caused serious injuries, but the actions of correctional staff are obviously degrading in nature. Instead of inflicting physical pain, these disrespectful actions are meant to deprive detainees' dignity and make them feel worthless.

2.3 Restrictions on Freedom of Association (Article 22)

In the Third Cycle United Nations Universal Periodic Review for China (which includes Hong Kong), the Hong Kong government has accepted a few recommendations, including the one to “guarantee freedom of speech, assembly and association, including in Hong Kong, and remove restrictions on freedom of information on the internet, in particular for human rights defenders.”

However, the arrests made by Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF) have led to a concern that the freedom of association in Hong Kong has been breached. One of the victims, Tom, was a volunteer in the New Year Rally, on January 1, 2020. The rally was organized by Civil Human Rights Front and had obtained “the Notice of No Objection” from the HKPF. It was an authorized and lawful rally. At the time of arrest, Tom volunteered at a booth that encouraged citizens to organize or join labour unions, as a countermeasure to the pro-China labour unions that dominated the “functional constituency” in the Hong Kong Legislative Council Elections.

2.4 A Lack of an Independent Complaints Handling System for Correctional Facilities (Article 26)

Hong Kong's Correctional Services Department has been one of the top ten most-complained about departments, according to the Ombudsman's report in 2018.³ In an interview by a media, HK01, with 50 former young prisoners, young inmates are subject to inhuman treatment and tortures, including forced urine drinking and eating excrement, physical abuses, verbal intimidation and solitary confinement.⁴ For those detained for participating in human rights, labour unions and political activities, especially the protesters during the anti-Extradition movement, they also fall victims to more discrimination and degrading treatment by correctional officers.⁵

³ Ombudsman (2018). Annual Report. Retrieved from <https://ofomb.ombudsman.hk/doc/yr30/index.html>

⁴ HK01 (2017, August 7). An exclusive interview with 50 former young prisoners. Retrieved from <https://www.hk01.com/%E7%A4%BE%E6%9C%83%E6%96%B0%E8%81%9E/110179/%E8%99%90%E5%9B%9A-01%E5%B0%88%E8%A8%AA50%E5%90%8D%E5%B0%91%E5%B9%B4%E7%8A%AF-%E6%8F%AD%E6%87%B2%E6%95%99%E8%BF%AB%E9%A3%B2%E5%B0%BF%E9%A3%9F%E5%B1%8E-%E6%91%91%E7%A0%B4%E8%80%B3%E8%86%9C%E6%90%8D%E8%81%BD%E8%A6%BA>

⁵ Please refer to the attached Special Procedures Report by Demosisto to the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights.

The existing complaint handling mechanism of the Correctional Services Department is under heavy criticism for its effectiveness. Solely in 2018, the department filed 340 cases of complaints, with only 23.8% (81 cases) of them being investigated, while 0.6% (2 cases) were substantiated. The mechanism also lacks transparency since it has never publicized its Complaints Handling Manual. According to Demosisto's report, detainees are warned not to file complaints to lawmakers or lawyers; otherwise, they will be retaliated.

There is no government action signalling the improvement of the complaint handling mechanism or providing equal and effective protection for political detainees or detainees in general so far.

Demosisto recommends that Hong Kong government:

- ensure that the use of force and the practice adopted by law enforcement agencies are aligned with international law and standards, including ICCPR, “Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment” and “the UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners.”
- ensure that the Correctional Services Department must uphold its neutrality and prisoners will not be singled out for abuse due to their political opinions
- respect the freedom of association enshrined in the Article 18 of HKBORO which corresponds to the Article 22 of ICCPR
- take necessary measures to establish an independent complaints handling system for persons deprived of liberty (including prisoners and remand persons) to conduct independent and effective investigations into the complaints about the torture abuse or other abuse of power by the correctional staff and to formulate legally binding decisions to hold the perpetrators

3. Restrictions on Freedom of Expression - Political Censorship (Article 19)

Since the outbreak of the anti-extradition bill movements in 2019, Beijing has started to tighten its grip on Hong Kong. Pro-democracy voices face repercussions from the regime. The political censorship is exemplified by various incidents. For example, the pro-democracy messaging boards, also called Lennon Walls, were torn down by the government. The Home Affairs Department also blatantly pledged to bar any local projects that involve the terms "Lennon".⁶ Besides, 30 years after it was founded, a satirical show “Headliner” was suspended after it mocked the police officers wore more protective gears than medical staff

⁶ Apple Daily (2020, March 21). Home Affairs Department Bars Projects with Lennons. Retrieved from <https://hk.appledaily.com/local/20200321/WFFVVMY36Z72Y2MBCHKLZOAW4KE/>

amid the outbreak of COVID-19.⁷ The show has long been criticized by Beijing loyalists 30 years since it was found. Both cases demonstrate that the government is undermining the people's rights to express their political beliefs with constraints.

Furthermore, political censorship has become a severe problem in recent year. For example, Cathay Pacific Airways warned their employees' social media usage out of work hours. The company vowed to adopt a “zero tolerance approach” and fire those who take part in pro-democracy protests and assemblies. Pro-democracy companies, which pledge to provide services to democracy supporters in the city, face discriminative scrutiny by the government. In 2020, a job-matching company called “The Coming Dawn HK” (“晨光萬事屋” in Chinese) was under political screening by the Companies Registry that challenged its definitions of “comrades”, “the fail of tyranny” and pro-democracy “yellow economic circle” mention in its interviews and social media.

Demosisto recommends that Hong Kong government:

- stop all forms of political censorship and take necessary measures to protect Hong Kong citizens’ right to exercise free speech in line with the Article 19 of ICCPR

4. Restrictions on Freedom of peaceful assembly (Article 21)

The right of peaceful assembly shall be recognized. No restrictions may be placed on the exercise of this right other than those imposed in conformity with the law and which are necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security or public safety, public order (ordre public), the protection of public health or morals or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.

Under the current Public Order Ordinance (Cap. 245), the Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF) is given the wide discretionary powers to impose conditions on demonstrations before it issues a “Notice of No Objection) and to decide whether a demonstration or assembly is “legally” held. However, the procedure and application of “Notice of No Objection” has increasingly been abused to eliminate the number of mass demonstrations. During the Hong Kong movements in 2019, the HKPF has refused to issue any “Notice of No Objection” to the Civil Human Rights Front (CHRF) coalition, the organizer of the million-person rally, for nearly five months.⁸ Without the “Notice of No Objection”, CHRF cannot publicly call upon the public to demonstrate against the government's misconduct.

⁷ Grundy, T. (2020, May 19). Hong Kong public broadcaster suspends satirical show hours after gov't demands apology for 'insulting' police. Hong Kong Free Press. Retrieved from <https://hongkongfp.com/2020/05/19/hong-kong-public-broadcaster-axes-satirical-show-hours-after-govt-demands-apology-for-insulting-police/>

⁸ Apple Daily (2019, December 5). First Permission after Four-month Refusal. Retrieved from <https://hk.appledaily.com/local/20191205/F5PZWAJ3RCNSPERXZLOBUFCP4Y/>

Besides, the procedure is also used to legitimize the excessive use of police forces during protest crackdowns since all forms of protests are regarded as “unlawful” if organizers fail to obtain “Notice of No Objection”. Protesters are thus considered as participating in “unlawful assemblies”. In 2020, 15 high-profile pro-democracy figures were arrested for allegedly “organising and participating in unlawful assemblies” as the police refused to issue the permission to organizers.⁹ Hence, the process of issuing "Notice of No Objection" per se can be employed and abused as a way to clamp down upon the right of peaceful assembly.

HKPF has also extended its power to issue “the Notice of Objection” to ban all politically sensitive assemblies. When President Xi Jinping visited Hong Kong in 2017, the police department issued its first objection after the transfer of sovereignty over Hong Kong to ban an assembly mourning the fall of Hong Kong.¹⁰ “The Notice of Objection” was also used to ban the annual candlelight vigil in 2020, the first time in 31 years after the Tiananmen Square Massacre.¹¹

Despite the attainment of “the notice of no objection”, the assembly could be forcefully suspended or stopped by the HKPF. On 1 January, 2020, the march that day received “the Notice of No Objection” and was joined with over a million of Hongkongers. Yet, HKPF suddenly called off the march three hour after its start and unreasonably demanded millions of demonstrators to evacuate the area in 30 minutes.¹² Later on, when large crowds continued to march or were on their way to leave, police declared that they were taking part in an illegal assembly, with about 400 of them finally detained.¹³

Apart from the “Public Order Ordinance”, the government also suppresses protests in the name of implementing social distancing measures for containing COVID-19, as numerous media reports suggested. The four-people gathering ban (which was later extended to eight-people gathering ban) is one of the typical examples. On the Mother's day in 2020, a family of three were charged and fined by police officers for violating the 8-people gathering ban

⁹ Wong, R. (2020, April 18). 15 Hong Kong pro-democracy figures arrested in latest police round up. Hong Kong Free Press. Retrieved from <https://hongkongfp.com/2020/04/18/8-hong-kong-pro-democracy-figures-arrested-in-latest-police-round-up-party-says/>

¹⁰ HK01(2019, July 25). Police Bans Yuen Long Demonstration. Retrieved from <https://www.hk01.com/%E7%A4%BE%E6%9C%83%E6%96%B0%E8%81%9E/356256/%E5%85%89%E5%BE%A9%E5%85%83%E6%9C%97-%E8%AD%A6%E6%96%B9%E7%99%BC%E9%81%8A%E8%A1%8C%E7%A6%81%E4%BB%A4-%E7%94%B3%E8%AB%8B%E4%BA%BA%E6%98%8E%E4%B8%8A%E8%A8%B4-%E6%9C%83%E5%A0%85%E6%8C%81%E8%87%AA%E5%B7%B1%E4%B8%80%E5%80%8B%E4%BA%BA%E8%A1%8C>

¹¹ Khan, N.(2020, June 1). Hong Kong Police Ban Tiananmen Massacre Vigil. The Wall Street Journal. Retrieved from <https://www.wsj.com/articles/hong-kong-police-ban-tiananmen-massacre-vigil-11591002907>

¹² Apple Daily (2020, January 1). Millions of Demonstrators Forced to Evacuate in 30 Minutes. Retrieved from <https://hk.appledaily.com/local/20200101/K3QBYYUIVTDMD4BXPWG2PGKWAM/>

¹³ Yu, V. (2020, January 1). Hundreds arrested at huge New Year’s Day rally in Hong Kong. The Guardian. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/jan/01/new-years-day-rally-hong-kong>

when they went shopping at a mall.¹⁴ When district councillors, such as Lester Shum and Andrew Chiu, arrived to mediate the situation, the police threatened to arrest the elected representatives for breaching the gathering ban as well.¹⁵ These abuses of the infection-control measures violate the purpose of the restrictions and trample upon the freedoms of peaceful assembly.

Demosisto recommends that the Hong Kong government:

- abolish provisions in Part III of Public Order Ordinance which fail to meet international human rights law and standards on the right to peaceful assembly
- ensure that the Hong Kong Police Force's handling of assemblies and protests is in conformity with principles of necessity and proportionality and take the necessary steps in line with Article 21 of ICCPR to guarantee the right of peaceful assembly

5. Arbitrary Disqualification of Opposition Candidates (Article 25)

Article 25 of ICCPR protects the people's rights "to take part in the conduct of public affairs, directly or through freely chosen representatives" and "to vote and to be elected at genuine periodic elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret ballot, guaranteeing the free expression of the will of the electors". However, the Hong Kong government's political screening has severely undermined those rights in recent years.

In 2016, the NPCSC issued a loosely defined interpretation of Basic Law Article 104 which stated oaths must be taken "sincerely." NPCSC's re-interpretation of the provision provided the legal basis for disqualifying six elected pro-democracy legislators in 2016 and 2017 who staged protests in their oath-taking sessions. One of the legislators was removed from his seat just because he added to his oath, "I will protect the justice system in Hong Kong, fight for true democracy, and serve Hong Kong for its sustainable development."¹⁶

Apart from elected representatives, candidates in local elections are also qualified with the claim that their individual's or their affiliated parties' views did not "uphold the Basic Law".

¹⁴ BBC (2020, May 11). Protests Reemerged Amid Coronavirus. Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.com/zhongwen/trad/chinese-news-52613665>

¹⁵ HK01 (2020, May 11). Police Slammed for Abusing Gathering Bans. Retrieved from <https://www.hk01.com/%E6%94%BF%E6%83%85/471456/%E6%AF%8D%E8%A6%AA%E7%AF%80%E5%92%8C%E4%BD%A0sing-%E5%B2%91%E6%95%96%E6%9A%89%E6%89%B9%E8%AD%A6%E6%96%B9%E6%BF%AB%E7%94%A8%E9%99%90%E8%81%9A%E4%BB%A4-%E5%9C%A8%E5%95%86%E5%A0%B4%E5%85%A7%E6%9B%BE%E8%A2%AB%E8%AD%A6%E5%91%8A>

¹⁶ Hong Kong Watch (2018). 'Political screening in Hong Kong' The disqualification of candidates and lawmakers ahead of the March by-elections. Retrieved from https://static1.squarespace.com/static/58ecfa82e3df284d3a13dd41/t/5aa12c7e24a694618514dffa/1520512150845/DQ+report_PROOF5.pdf

For example, Demosisto's secretary-general Joshua Wong was barred from running the District Council election in 2019 since the electoral officer did not believe Wong would exclude the option of Hong Kong independence if Hong Kong will be, in the unforeseeable future, granted self-determination to decide upon its future. The government's move appears to discriminate against particular political views.¹⁷

Demosisto recommends that the Hong Kong government:

- abolish all forms of arbitrary disqualifications of election candidates and elected representatives based on political affiliations
- respect the people's political rights and civil liberties, and ensure that participation in public affairs should be not restricted solely on the basis of unwelcome political beliefs

¹⁷ Cheng, K. (2019, October 29). Hong Kong activist Joshua Wong slams election officer for 'twisting and misunderstanding' his political views with election ban. Hong Kong Free Press. Retrieved from <https://hongkongfp.com/2019/10/29/hong-kong-activist-joshua-wong-slams-election-officer-twisting-misunderstanding-political-views-election-ban/>

Appendix: Forms of Torture

<u>Type 1- 【Physical Abuse - Targeting Political Detainees】</u>	12
<u>Incident 1: ‘Glory to Hong Kong’ Incident</u>	12
<u>Incident 2: Discriminatory Treatment due to Political Prejudices</u>	13
<u>Type 2 - 【Harassment & Intimidation】</u>	13
<u>Incident 3: A Sequel to the ‘Glory to Hong Kong’ Incident</u>	13
<u>Type 3 - 【Degrading Treatment - Far from the Purpose of Reform or Rehabilitation】</u>	14
<u>Incident 4: Reciting Information without Making Mistakes</u>	14
<u>Incident 5: Unnecessary and Disproportionate Use of Force</u>	14
<u>Incident 6: Pointless Practice in Pursuit of Absolute Obedience</u>	15

Type 1- 【Physical Abuse - Targeting Political Detainees】

Incident 1: ‘Glory to Hong Kong’ Incident

On 7 February, around 8:30pm at night, 6 political detainees sang ‘Glory to Hong Kong’, a song widely adopted as the anthem of the protests at a normal volume in the educational area of Pik Uk Correctional Institution (‘PUCI’) while other detainees were singing other pop songs more loudly. The 6 detainees then returned to their own activities, such as reading, writing letters and having some small talks.

Two days later, on 9 February 2020, between 1pm and 2pm, Assistant Officer I (Staff identification number: AO1-700) Huen Ngar Tat (禰雅達) entered the Dayroom where inmates were partaking in recreational activities and ordered all ‘rioters’ to assemble in front of him. A total of 8 detainees stood up. Huen then forced the detainees to transit from the Dayroom 4A to the rear staircases - a place without CCTV monitoring - with the posture of crouching down (**Please see the picture at the end of this document**).

Huen asked who had joined the chorus and the reason of singing ‘Glory to Hong Kong’. He also pointed out that ‘rioters’ defied the government, and the superiors (of PUCI) loathed it.

6 of them admitted singing the song. Shortly after, Huen started castigating the 6 detainees from left to right. He first slapped two of the detainees. He ordered the remaining detainees to slap themselves, hard enough to make a loud sound, since he ‘is feeling tired’. The whole process lasted approximately 15 minutes. The sayings below have strongly shown that the Superintendent has acquiesced Huen’s action:

- I. "I could hear you guys singing even when I was in Day Orderly Officer's office!"
- II. "How should I explain to the Day Orderly Officers and the Chief Officer?"
- III. (After he slapped the detainees and threatened them) 'Now I am done (slapping you), and I can explain to the Chief Officer. Any dissatisfaction?'

Incident 2: Discriminatory Treatment due to Political Prejudices

Another victim, Tom, recalled the moment when correctional staff first learned that he was a detainee for political reasons on the first day of remand. Without a further word, the correctional staff slapped him twice in the face, before screaming: ‘You attack the police, and my wife is a cop! Do you want to hurt my wife?’. He then said ‘What you are eating right now is provided by the government, so I can prevent you from eating your meals!’.

Jackson also had similar experience: the day he was remanded he was shouted at by correctional staff. ‘Do you want to blow up cops? Yes or no? Do you want to hit us? I was a former policeman too; you want to hit me?! My wife is a cop, you want to hit her?’

Type 2 - [Harassment & Intimidation]

Incident 3: A Sequel to the ‘Glory to Hong Kong’ Incident

After the aforementioned ‘Glory to Hong Kong’ incident, Jackson (and other detainees involved) suffered from further intimidation by the correctional staff. Including:

- Verbal ‘warnings’ of how the staff could find ways to ‘mess with’ their families. Huen explicitly said he had been a police officer before and had ‘friends’ in a lot of Districts. If the staff did not ‘mess with’ them inside PUCI, they had ways to do things to their families outside.
- Threats not to provide meals for political prisoners.
- Threats to lock them in solitary confinement cells (usually for continuous 7 days) if they filed any complaints.
- Threats of retaliation if they complained to the lawmakers or District Councillors that came to visit. The Assistant Officer, Huen Ngar Tat, said, ‘They can’t help you. “Hammer hits a nail and the nail hits back at the piece of wood”. It’s a chain of reaction and you are the ones that have to stay (at PUCI).’ That implies that the prisoners will be the ones who suffer in the end even if they tell the lawmakers the truth.

Type 3 - 【Degrading Treatment - Far from the Purpose of Reform or Rehabilitation】

The incidents below may not have caused serious injuries, but the actions of correctional staff are obviously degrading in nature. Their use of force was unnecessary and disproportionate. Instead of inflicting physical pain, these disrespectful actions are meant to deprive detainees' dignity and make them feel worthless.

Incident 4: Reciting Information without Making Mistakes

All persons in custody, when arriving at PUCI, would first enter the holding room known as a 'fingerprint room' (「指模房」 in Chinese). Correctional staff would then assign them their inmate numbers, inquire them about their background, and demand that they perform a series of actions, including greeting the guard, and reciting their name and inmate number (also as known as a process called 「報牌仔」 in Chinese). If correctional staff were dissatisfied with how the inmates performed the actions, they would be abusive and rude.

Ivan experienced their abusiveness first-hand. When Ivan was remanded to PUCI in November 2019, he did not meet the correctional staff's requirements pertaining to the greeting actions mentioned above. Purely and simply because of his failure to perform the actions in a flawless manner, he was then slapped so hard by a member of staff that he fell to the ground, upon which he was stood up again so that he could be slapped further.

Incident 5: Unnecessary and Disproportionate Use of Force

Ivan recalled another incident which happened during a night close to the end of 2019. One evening, Ivan greeted a correctional staff with "Hello", instead of "Good evening sir", and so was warned to 'watch your step'. On the following day, the staff called Ivan out and took him to an area - a narrow corridor - which was not covered by the facility's CCTV cameras.

The correctional officer proceeded to grab Ivan's head, and slammed it into the concrete wall four or five times, while hitting and slapping Ivan on the face in between each slam together with verbal insults on his family. After the incident, Ivan suffered from continuous headaches and an impaired sense of balance for two days.

After this incident, Ivan exhibited some common symptoms of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), including heightened anxiety and hyperarousal. ‘Every time I saw that particular officer, I would tense up, because I was afraid I would be beaten by him again. I felt extremely anxious whenever he passed by’, Ivan said. He passed his days in PUCI with stress and fear.

Remarks:

However, in view of the “white terror” created by the government over the past year, most Hong Kong protesters also place no confidence in professionals who work within the system, be they clinical psychologists at education institutions or social workers at social welfare organizations, for fear that those professionals might disclose their information to police and throw them in jail. Therefore, it is difficult to officially diagnose whether protesters were traumatised by the incidents in PUCI.

Incident 6: Pointless Practice in Pursuit of Absolute Obedience

When detainees newly arrive at PUCI, they are demanded to recite 250 characters of ‘YTR/YDR codes of behaviour for children’ with the posture of crouching down. If they make a single mistake in their recitation, they have to write out the entire text for thirty times. Ivan, Jackson, and Tom had all experienced this. Moreover, they had to alternate between three different coloured pens for each character while writing out the text: writing the first character in red, the second in blue, and the third in black.

Besides, if detainees do not fold their blankets to a certain standard, they will be forced to hold up their blankets in a stress position for a total of eight hours (except the meal-time); they cannot move until it is time to return to their cells for the night.

The rear staircases, a place without CCTV monitoring, in the 'Glory to Hong Kong' incident.

