

**Report by
Center for Defending Freedom of Journalists (CDFJ)
As part of Jordan's periodic review submitted to the Committee
against Torture**

Jordan's third Shadow Report submitted to the committee against torture

Shadow Report 2015

The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan's third periodic report

Submitted to the committee against torture according to the convention's article 19

November 2015

This is a Shadow Report presented by Center for Defending Freedom of Journalists (CDFJ) as part of the Committee Against Torture's periodic review.

Center for Defending Freedom of Journalists CDFJ
Queen Rania Street
Amman - Jordan
Tel. +962 5160820
Fax. +962 5602785
Email: info@cdfj.org; nidal@cdfj.org
Website: www.cdfj.org

The Center for Defending Freedom of Journalists was established in Jordan in 1998. It is a non-governmental organization operating in Jordan and specializing in defending the freedom of the media. The CDFJ provides for capacity building for workers in the media field in Jordan and the Arab world. It also offer legal aid services to media practitioners when they face lawsuits and litigation procedures related to their professional work. These services are provided through MELAD, the Media Legal Aid Unit, which encompasses lawyers and legal advisors. Moreover, the CDFJ monitors and documents violations of media freedoms and human rights committed against media practitioners in Jordan through a unit called "Ain". Since 2002, the CDFJ has issued an annual report on Media Freedom Status in Jordan, and violations committed against it. In 2012, the CDFJ established the network of Media Freedom Defenders in the Arab world "SANAD", as well as an

affiliated program to monitor and document violations of media freedoms in the Arab world. It has already issued three annual reports covering the region in 2012, 2013, and 2014. It is currently preparing to launch its fourth report covering 2015.

We are committed to the efforts of putting an end to practices that stand in contradiction with national and international human rights standards. This includes torture and other forms of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. This report aims at continuing endeavors towards achieving this goal, namely by highlighting the continued use of torture and other forms of mistreatment in Jordan, in order to raise the level of the Jordanian Government's accountability towards fulfilling its international commitments.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The CDFJ welcomes this opportunity to provide information to the United Nations' Committee Against Torture (CAT) before it engages in constructive dialogue with the Jordanian Government in order to strengthen the enforcement of the UN Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, which Jordan had ratified.
- 1.2 This report focuses on the list of issues identified by the CAT. This list does not necessarily encompass all the issues identified by the CAT, but, rather, only those which are related to journalists' documented cases in this report and whose cases are compatible with the following items and references in list of issues:
 - 1.2.1 **Item (3) of Article (2):** Regarding Article 2 of the Convention and in view of the CAT's closing remarks and the Human Rights Committee's comments related to Paragraph 9, which requests information on Jordan's steps to ensure that all detainees attain, in law and in practice, basic guarantees from the moment of their detention, as well as measures adopted to carry out effective monitoring of the implementation of these guarantees.
 - A. Advising the detainees of their rights at the time of detention, inclusive of informing them of charges against them.
 - B. Immediately hiring an independent lawyer and conducting an independent medical examination.
 - C. Duly notifying the detainee's family.
 - D. Speedy appearance of the defendant before a judge.

E. Providing "lawyers' rooms" at detention centers to allow for confidential consultations between lawyers and their clients.

1.2.2 **Item (14) of Article (2):** The results of investigations and legal pursuits in relation to the case of excessive use of force by PSD officers on 15 July 2011 during a demonstration staged in Al-Nakheel Square in Amman.

1.3 This report seeks to assist the UN CAT and the Jordanian Government to engage in an open and productive dialogue with the aim of improving the member country's commitment to the letter and spirit of the Convention.

1.4 We point out that the cases presented in the report represent, in the opinion of the CDFJ, degrading treatment and an attack on the right to not be subjected to torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. They involve violations of the provisions of Articles 7, 9, and 19 of the Convention on Civil and Political Rights, which guarantees freedom of opinion and the media. They also involve violations of Articles 1, 2, and 16 of the UN Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. Both these conventions were published in the Official Gazette in Jordan. Additionally, physical and verbal attacks constitute a crime according to the Jordanian Penal Code.

2. Overview

Jordan is a signatory state to leading UN conventions that prohibit torture and other cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment or punishment. These conventions include the Convention on Civil and Political Rights, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and the Geneva Conventions related to the additional first and second protocols, in addition to the 1998 Rome Statute that established the International Criminal Court. Jordan has published the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Convention against Torture in the Official Gazette, rendering them part of the Jordanian legal system. In recent years, Jordan went through legislative amendments, but they were not in line with international standards for human rights. Laws continue to indicate that major flaws still exist.

2.1 Criminalizing Torture

- 2.1.1 Jordanian legislation imposes restrictions on the freedom of expression and the media. Numerous laws include restrictive articles, from penalties that deny freedom to harsh fines.
- 2.1.2 For example, the Jordanian Penal Code includes several legal texts that restrict the freedom of media and publication, making journalists vulnerable to legal pursuit in the event that they criticize the king or a foreign country or if they call for core change in the political system and structure. They could be accused of charges like lese-majesty or harming relations with a foreign country or calling for undermining the ruling regime. The Jordanian Penal Code was used in more than one incident to accuse journalists of the aforementioned crimes, after they published news materials dealing with these issues. Media outlets continue to be put on trial in line with the Penal Code, which includes penalties that deny freedom in media cases. The Ministry of Justice formed a committee to amend the law, and it has concluded a preliminary draft, but this draft did not include amendments to or cancellations of any articles or the controversial items in the law, particularly those affecting the media and allowing for referring journalists to the State Security Court. Additionally, the Penal Code classifies crimes related to freedom of opinion, expression and the media as crimes committed against the state's internal and external security.
- 2.1.3 After the Anti-Terrorism Law was amended in 2014, the charge of "harming relations with a foreign country" falls now under the specialization of the State Security Court. Under Article 18 of the Penal Code, this crime is punishable by five years of imprisonment, while under the Anti-Terrorism Law, the penalty increases to 15 years if convicted with temporary hard labor. Human Rights Watch has criticized the amendments to the Law, and considered them as a threat to freedoms and rights and an extensive expansion of what constitutes terrorist action.
- 2.1.4 Since 2001, the CDFJ has been issuing an annual report on the violations committed against media practitioners in Jordan. The annual report presents and highlights the cases that constitute degrading treatment and an attack on the right not to be subjected to torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. It also highlights violations of the provisions of Articles 7, 9, and 19 of the Convention on Civil and Political Rights, which guarantees freedom of opinion and the media, and violations of Articles 1, 2, and 16 of the UN Convention against

Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. Both these conventions were published in the Official Gazette in Jordan. Additionally, physical and verbal attacks constitute a crime according to the Jordanian Penal Code.

2.1.5 Pardon laws allow perpetrators of acts of torture to evade trial, which constitutes a violation of the provisions of the Convention against Torture. A pardon must not include serious violations of human rights, such as torture. Moreover, laws related to dropping lawsuits or punishment do not comply with the state's duties as outlined in the Convention. There must be a provision that clearly and candidly states that crimes of torture cannot be dropped and that perpetrators of such crimes must be tried.

2.1.6 Additionally, there is no effective mechanism to ensure that perpetrators of acts of torture are held accountable, are punished, and are brought to justice. This does not comply with the commitments of the member states as stated in Article 4(1) of the Convention regarding criminalizing torture and punishing the perpetrators.

2.2 Prohibiting the causes of torture

2.2.1 In addition to the provision stated in Article 61 of the Penal Code, no person shall be relieved of criminal responsibility in the case of committing the crime of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment in accordance with an order issued by a high-ranking employee or a public authority, be it military or civilian.

2.2.2. The International Human Rights Law has confirmed that some absolute rights may not be suspended under any circumstance. These rights include the right not to be subjected to torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment.

2.3 Legal Guarantees for Detainees

2.3.1 Conference rooms for lawyers

2.3.1.1 The conference rooms available for lawyers at reform and rehabilitation centers do not ensure confidentiality of communications between the lawyer and the client.

2.3.1.2 The rooms were designed for the simultaneous use of up to 20 lawyers. This raises the issue of the legal deliberations being held in close proximity among the detainees and the lack of regard for privacy.

2.3.2 The right to a lawyer

2.3.2.1 Article 13 sets forth the legal guarantees for detainees' protection against the unlawful use of solitary confinement, such as the right to call a lawyer and the notification of relatives of the location of detention. The law does not distinguish among those detained without charges, those awaiting trial, and those serving prison sentences after their conviction. Nevertheless, the police does not inform detainees of their right to have a lawyer at the time of their arrest and before beginning the interrogation process. Therefore, it is necessary amend the relevant laws, such as the Law on the Principles of Criminal Trials and the Law on Reform and Rehabilitation Centers, in order to ensure the detainee's right to hire a lawyer upon his arrest, as well as to have the right to have a lawyer present at all proceedings.

2.3.3 The right to contact relatives and to receive medical examination

2.3.3.1 The Law on Criminal Proceedings or other relevant laws do not commit detaining authorities to the provision of medical examinations in police centers for detainees after following their arrest. Similarly, there is no commitment to inform relatives of the detainee's arrest or detention.

2.3.3.2 A case in point in this regard is when journalist and writer Jamal Ayoub was prohibited on 23/4/2015 from using the telephone to contact his relatives to inform them of his detention at the Al-Hussein Security Center.

2.4 Escaping punishment and lack of transparency and accountability for torture

2.4.1 Member states are explicitly prohibited from accepting any evidence that is based on statements proven to have been made under torture in any legal proceedings. This is in line with Article 15 of the Convention. When the court excludes evidence found to

have been obtained as a result of torture or other forms of mistreatment, then the prosecutor general must undertake an immediate investigation in the torture and pursue the perpetrator as per the law. However, it is disappointing that the prosecution general does not adhere to this measure, and no police officer involved in torture or mistreatment has thus far been brought to justice. As a general rule, judges are never notified of any complaints of torture or mistreatment. This is indicative of the lack of respect for the principle of not accepting evidence obtained in an unlawful manner.

2.4.2 The cases presented in this report confirm that the policy of escaping punishment for violations committed against media practitioners is still commonplace in Jordan. The official authorities have not undertaken any genuine or serious step to put a stop to this policy, which has been employed and enforced for many years, and to undertake the necessary measure to bring justice to the victims and to hold accountable the perpetrators of these violations of the right not to be subjected to torture or other cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment or punishment.

2.4.3 Despite these cases of violations presented in the report, including those that occurred during the sit-in at Al-Nakheel Square in downtown Amman on Friday, 15 July 2011 - Al-Nakheel Square was the location chosen by popular and youth forces to stage a sit-in demanding basic political and social reforms, during which media practitioners were subjected to physical attacks, proven by facts and evidence, by security parties - the prosecution general did not make any attempt to investigate these violations to find out those responsible and involved and to take them to court for punishment. It is worth noting here that, in cases involving criminal suspicions, the Jordanian law stipulates that the prosecution general rise up to the undertaking of its duties and authorities.

2.4.4 The CDFJ believes that the policy of escaping punishment, which is adopted by the security parties and other specialized entities in Jordan vis-à-vis serious violations of the Convention against Torture committed against media practitioners, contributes to the expansion of this form of violations, which, in turn, puts Jordan in a difficult situation. In this regard, the CDFJ would like to note that Jordan's ranking on the Reporters Without Borders' freedom of the

media indicator has decreased considerably since 2011 as a result of such violations.

2.4.5 In a noteworthy development, the same law was employed in the pursuit and punishment of journalists who complained and reported on the attacks they encountered at the hands of public security members. The CDFJ has documented several of these cases. The Public Security had given directives to authorized parties to pursue the journalists who filed complaints with the CDFJ about the attacks they suffered, and about how they were beaten, their cameras were broken, and their freedom was seized during their media coverage of a protest sit-in. The new development in the matter is the fact that the public security formed an investigative committee - according to letter number ٤/4/9/34952 dated 24 July 2014 - after the CDFJ sent official letters, in which the complaints of the journalists, who were attacked by the security and gendarmerie, were presented. This was considered a good step forward.

2.4.6 After listening to the statements of some of the journalists who suffered the attacks, the public security investigative committee concluded the following results, which were sent to the CDFJ in an official letter number ٤4/9/54666 dated 19 November 2014:

- The public security and gendarmerie members, who took part in the previously mentioned duties, were released of any responsibility due to the lack of incriminating evidence, pursuant to the provisions of Article 130 of the Law on the Principles of Criminal Trials.
- The complainant journalists were referred to the relevant administrative and legal parties, given the presence of evidence that they practiced journalism activities and are not registered with the association as per the rules, according to their sworn statements. This is contradictory with the provisions of the Jordan Press Association, which defines a journalist as a registered member of the Press Association, while indicating that the compulsory membership and the disallowance of membership in multiple associations are in contradiction with Jordan's international commitments and with the international Convention on Civil and Political Rights.

2.4.7 Apart of the results of the investigation, the threat to prosecute the complainants is cause for worry and fear for the journalists, who are forced to hesitate and to reconsider filing their complaints.

This is because they realize in advance that there is no real accountability and that such an action could backfire against them.

2.4.8 Generally speaking, one could say that the policy of escaping punishing is entrenched in Jordan. It is a major contributor to the continuing grave violations of media freedoms and the rights of journalists. It assumes the form of attacks by persons affiliated with the security apparatus. The identities of those are concealed by either removing any markings that would indicate their security affiliations or by using persons who are unidentifiable civilians. It also assumes the form of being silent about the violation and refusing to undertake any measures of investigation and prosecution.

2.4.9 More importantly, Jordan continues to refuse to transfer the authority of examining cases pertaining to security personnel involved in committing grave violations, such as torture and mistreatment, from police courts to the regular court system. This enhances the policy of escaping punishment due to the lack of institutional independence of the police courts, given that they would be the opposing counsel and the judge in these types of cases, in addition to the fact that these courts are not public and unable to bring justice to the victims.

2.4.10 In spite of the repeated cases of grave violations against media practitioners, none of the perpetrators, be they security personnel or those dubbed as "thugs" and outlaws, was prosecuted or faced any form of litigation. As far as we know and according to our documentation, no independent and neutral investigation has been carried out in any of these cases. For example, in spite of the clear and evidenced attack by the security personnel on the media practitioners in the Al-Nakheel Square incident, the public security settled for an investigation that was not independent and that resulted in not holding the security personnel accountable and in their escaping punishment.

2.4.11 Moreover, the CDFJ believes that official parties systematically employ the policy of escaping punishment for any person affiliated with the security apparatus who is involved in committing violence or torture. The security apparatus is careful to conceal the identity of the security, gendarmerie, and intelligence personnel who take part in breaking up sit-ins and demonstrations, which are accompanied on occasions by attacks on media practitioners and

others. These personnel do not have any signs or markings indicating their names or identification numbers. They also do not conduct any independent investigations in those cases, and if they do, they do include any measures to prosecute those suspected of involvement.

2.4.12 The CDFJ has not registered any case where journalist victims, who were subjected to torture and mistreatment, received proper compensation for damages incurred or restitution or any other measures, or even guarantees for their safety or health care and promises that they would not be subjected to future attacks.

2.4.13 The CDFJ believes that media practitioners, in general, suffer from the risks of physical attacks. These risks are expounded by the fact that public and security apparatuses, as well as those responsible for investigations and filing public right lawsuits, adopt a methodological policy to escape punishment. The CDFJ has already issued the Media Freedoms report for 2011 and entitled it "Escaping Punishment," given that it is the most prominent description of the state of media freedoms in Jordan.

2.5 Right to Restitution

2.5.1 The Jordanian law does not acknowledge the right of a victim of arbitrary or unlawful detention to fair, effective and executable restitution. It also does not encompass explicit provision regarding the right of victims of arbitrary detention to restitution, or explicit provisions that allow the victims of torture to demand financial restitution for damages incurred as a result of torture. This is in spite of the fact that the international Convention on Civil and Political Rights was published in the Official Gazette since 2006. Nevertheless, the law does not at all compensate victims of arbitrary and unlawful detention in accordance with it. This is why the media practitioners who were arrested by the State Security Court did not receive any compensation of the damages they incurred as a result of their detention.

2.6 Detention Facilities

2.6.1 From the testimonies of the journalists, who were arrested and detained in the cases presented in this report, as well as the statements of the lawyers in MELAD, CDFJ's Media Legal Aid Unit, it was noted that these cases were presented in the first

periodic report of the National Center for Human Rights on the state of reform and rehabilitation centers in Jordan in the period from 1 January 2013 to 30 June 2014, and these are as follows:

- The unsuitability of lawyers' conference rooms.
- The poor and limited legal aid services provided to inmates.

2.6.2 Additionally, the testimonies of the journalists who were detained point to the fact that detention rooms are overcrowded with criminals, as well as the poor state of the detention rooms from a health perspective.

3. Enforcement of the Convention against Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment according to the list of issues that precede the presentation of Jordan's third periodic report and that was adopted by the Committee in its 49th session (29 October-23 November 2012)

3.1 **Article 2 of the List of Issues:** Regarding Article 2 of the Convention and in view of the CAT's closing remarks and the Human Rights Committee's comments related to Paragraph 9, which requests information on Jordan's steps to ensure that all detainees attain, in law and in practice, basic guarantees from the moment of their detention, as well as measures adopted to carry out effective monitoring of the implementation of these guarantees, we provide the notes and cases that were documented by CDFJ's Media Violations Documentation and Monitoring Unit and that are related to the requirements of Item 3 of Article 2 of the List of Issues:

3.1.1 Notes:

3.1.1.1 A number of journalists and chief editors of electronic websites were referred to the State Security Court on charges of lese majesty, undermining the ruling regime, and harming Jordan's relations with foreign countries after they published news and press materials that included criticism of the policies of the Jordanian government and state, although what was published is considered in the context of freedom of expression and the media.

3.1.1.2 The journalists who were referred to the State Security Court were detained before the trial for a long period of time, in some cases exceeding 20 days, and this detention is considered unlawful according to international standards,

because it is not permissible to resort to detention or freedom denial in crimes related to publication.

3.2 Presenting and documenting cases related to the requirements of Item 3 of Article 2 of the List of Issues:

3.2.1 The CDFJ believes that the following cases involve violations related to not informing detained and arrested journalists of their rights at the time of their detention. Some of them were not informed of the charges leveled against them in line with Paragraph (A) of Item 3 of Article 2 of the List of Issues.

3.2.2 The said journalists in those cases were not able to seek the immediate help of an independent lawyer and to have an independent medical examination in line with Paragraph (B). Moreover, their families were not duly notified in accordance with Paragraph (C) of the same item, and some of them did not appear before a judge in a speedy manner in line with Paragraph (D). Finally, "lawyers' rooms" are not available in detention facilities in a manner that would allow confidentiality of deliberation between the lawyer and the client pursuant to Paragraph (E). The cases are:

3.2.2.1 Mistreatment and detention of journalist Khalil Qandil of Al-Sabil Newspaper

3.2.2.1.1 On 21 and 22 February 2010, journalist Khalil Qandil was the subject of mistreatment and detention by the protective security forces in Zarqa. On Sunday, 21 February 2010, Khalil Qandil was arrested while he was preparing a news report about the overcrowded situation in the vehicle licensing department in Zarqa. As he was filming the overcrowded situation, he was arrested after he identified himself. Protective security personnel questioned him about filming the congestion at the vehicle department in Zarqa. Khalil Qandil's questioning continued for hours, after which he was released on a JD5000 bail, while holding his personal identification card. When Qandil went to the Zarqa police directorate the following day to retrieve his identification card and sign a written pledge, he was detained again by the protective security forces and was referred to the Zarqa Governorate, which released him after hours of questioning and after he signed a pledge for JD3000.

3.2.2.1.2 The CDFJ noted that Khalil Qandil's mistreatment was decried and denounced by many media organizations in Jordan. It

constitutes a restriction on media freedoms and mistreatment of media practitioners. This is particularly since Qandil indicated in his complaint that he was detained for five hours in a holding cell on the first day, after which he was moved to the protective security office in handcuffs. On the next day, he was detained in a holding cell in the Zarqa police directorate for four hours, after which he was moved to the Zarqa Governorate in a vehicle for transporting detainees and convicts and he was in handcuffs. Qandil spent hours in detention in the holding cell with more than 20 suspects, sharing five old mattresses.

3.2.2.1.3 The public security directorate has implicitly acknowledged the incident in a statement issued by its media office. It said that journalist Khalil Qandil was filming a security facility without a license or prior coordination and that he was neither arrested nor detained, but under investigation.

3.2.2.1.4 It was clear beyond the shadow of doubt to the CDFJ that the detention of Khalil Qandil was without legal cause, and that his detention was accompanied by inhuman treatment, given that he was handcuffed.

3.2.2.1.5 The treatment that Khalil Qandil received constitutes arbitrary deprivation of freedom, which is a violation of the provisions of Article 9 of the Convention on Civil and Political Rights. It was accompanied by inhuman and cruel treatment, which is a violation of the provisions of Article 7 of the aforementioned Convention, as well as Article (1/2) and (16) of the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman, and Degrading Treatment and Punishment. It is also a violation of freedom of expression and the media and of the provisions of the Jordanian law, especially since Khalil Qandil's detention was neither necessary nor appropriate to the cause stated by the public security. It would have been possible to coordinate with Qandil without the need to detain or mistreat him.

3.2.2.2 Detention of the publisher and the chief editor of Saraya news website for a news report in January 2015

3.2.2.2.1 On 28 January 2015, the two journalists, Hashem Hasan Sa'eed Al-Khalidi and Sayf Nawwaf Hussein Obeidat, as well as the Saraya news website were all referred to the public prosecutor of the State Security Court for questioning about the publication of

a news report entitled "The lawyer of Islamic organizations: The exchange deal with Da'ish was done and Sajeda Al-Rishawi is now in Iraq." An arrest warrant was issued for them for a 14 day investigation.

3.2.2.2.2 After that, the CDFJ assigned MELAD, the Media Legal Aid Unit, to work on the case, and on 31 January 2015, lawyers Marwan Salem and Abdel Rahman Al-Sharari visited the two journalists in the Marka reform and rehabilitation center. The two journalists hired MELAD's lawyers to defend them in the case according to legal proceedings.

3.2.2.2.3 On 1 February 2015, lawyer Al-Sharari went to the State Security Court to deposit the necessary documents and begin the process of representing the two journalists in order to ensure their right to defense during the investigation. It became clear that the public prosecution of the State Security Court did not receive the file and that the file is immediately sent to the prosecution's clerk in the Military Judiciary Directorate.

3.2.2.2.4 After that, MELAD's lawyer went to the Military Judiciary Directorate and checked with the prosecution's clerk. He was informed that the paper and electronic investigative records do not show any investigative case in the name of the two journalists or the website.

3.2.2.2.5 The lawyer continued to refer to the public prosecution from 31 January 2015 to 10 February 2015, and the clerk's response was always the same: the case file was not received by the prosecution, was not recorded, and was not given a case file number.

3.2.2.2.6 The public prosecutor extended the detention of Al-Khalidi and Obeidat beyond the initial 14 days. Regardless, MELAD was not able to perform its legal role, which is summarized in the following actions: the lack of authority on the part of the State Security Court's public prosecution to investigate, request for release, and request the cancellation of the decision to block the website.

3.2.2.2.7 On 11 February 2015, MELAD sent a legal reading to Dr. Mohammad Al-Momani, Minister of State for Media Affairs/ the government's official spokesman, in which it was stated: "The

Jordanian Constitution, the international Convention on Civil and Political Rights, the Law on Principles of Criminal Trials, and the Press and Publications Law all stipulated legal rules that must be followed and that not be violated or compromised. These are legal rules that guarantee the sacred right of defense, both objectively and practically, and one of the priority rules is the impermissibility of detaining journalists in cases of expression and opinion, even if they are related to the state's internal and external security."

3.2.2.2.8 The reading added: "The detention of the two journalists in this manner constitutes a blatant violation of the law and the rules of justice, beginning with the accused person being innocent until proven guilty, the guarantees of a fair trial that must be applied from the moment of the detention to enable them to exercise their right to defense during the investigation and the trial, and finally their right to contest all decisions issued by the investigative authority or court. This did not happen in the case of Hashem and Sayf."

3.2.2.2.9 The reading added: "The continued lack of a record for the file case constitutes a violation of legal rules and impedes the implementation of the law's provisions. It also denies the journalists, Hashem and Sayf, of exercising their right to defense and prevents the presentation of the aforementioned applications. The continuation of this situation calls for bringing this issue to the attention of decision-makers and the implementers of the provisions of the Constitution and international treaties ratified by Jordan, as well as the laws related in this regard."

3.2.2.2.10 On his part, lawyer Marwan Salem of MELAD indicated, after he visited the two journalists in Al-Hashimiya prison, that "Saraya news website received a telephone call from the lawyer of Islamic organizations, Musa Al-Abdallat, indicating that the deal was done between Da'ish and Jordan, whereby Sajeda Al-Rishawi, who was convicted of the death penalty and is in a Jordanian prison after she attempted to blow up a hotel in Amman, was handed over and Mu'ath Al-Kasasbeh will be handed back. He continued to say that, at three o'clock, Foreign Minister Naser Judeh denied that Sajeda Al-Rishawi was handed over in return for Mu'ath Al-Kasasbeh. The workers of Saraya cancelled the news.

3.2.2.2.11 At four o'clock, the public prosecutor, Fawwaz Al-Utoun, called Hashem Al-Khalidi and asked him to come to the

General Intelligence Department. Both Al-Khalidi and Obeidat arrived at five o'clock and were interrogated by Lieutenant Amer Alwan about the published news. This pushed Al-Khalidi to ask if they were being detained, and the answer was a yes, after which they were blindfolded and taken to the back, from where they were transported in a SUV car to Marka prison. They remain there under arrest up to the time of publishing this report.

3.2.2.2.12 On 23 February 2015, the CDFJ sent a letter to the director of the Military Judiciary, Muhannad Hijazi, saying that "the The continued lack of a record for the file case is impeding and preventing the lawyers from undertaking their work, thereby depriving the two journalists and the website of the simplest rights to defense guaranteed by the Jordanian Constitution, the international Convention on Civil and Political Rights, the Law on Principles of Criminal Trials, and the Press and Publications Law."

3.2.2.2.13 Later, the two colleagues, Al-Khalidi and Obeidat, were released on 8 March 2015.

3.2.2.3 Detention and imprisonment of journalist writer Jamal Ayyoub in the State Security Court for an article

3.2.2.3.1 On 23 April 2015, the public prosecutor of the Amman Court of First Instance detained writer Jamal Ayyoub for 15 days in Marka prison for questioning over an article he published entitled "Why did Saudi Arabia launch war on Yemen." He later appeared before the court, along with journalist Usama Al-Ramini, the chief editor of the website that published the article and who was questioned but not detained.

3.2.2.3.2 Ayyoub's son, Mohammad Jamal Ayyoub, told the National Team for Monitoring and Documenting Violations Against Media Practitioners in Jordan that "the Amman public prosecutor asked my father to appear in court after he published an article entitled "Why did Saudi Arabia launch war on Yemen" and after it was published in more than 17 websites, including 13 Jordanian websites."

3.2.2.3.3 Ayyoub's son indicated that "the public prosecutor asked my father, as well as journalist Usama Al-Ramini, to appear in court on Wednesday, 22 April 2015, and the court was postponed to the following day." He added that "after the public prosecutor

questioned my father, he was detained in Marka prison for 15 days for questioning."

3.2.2.3.4 The son added that "on 26 April 2015, my father's lawyer demanded a bail at the court of first instance, which was denied, saying that the case is not under its jurisdiction. The case was transferred to the State Security Court."

3.2.2.3.5 Lawyer Taher Nasser, who is handling Ayyoub's defense, told the National Team: "I visited my client, who is held in Marka prison for an article he published entitled Desert Storm and the attack on Yemen, on 25 April 2015. My client argued in his article that giving assistance to the Yemeni people is better than launching war on them."

3.2.2.3.6 Lawyer Nassar added: "The Amman public prosecutor charged my client with harming relations with a friendly country and detained him for 15 days for questioning in Marka prison on Thursday, 23 April 2015 while he was before the Amman Court of First Instance."

3.2.2.3.7 Lawyer Nassar said that "the Amman public prosecutor notified him that the main news website that published the article is Akhbar Al-Balad, and that the other websites simply copied the article."

3.2.2.3.8 Lawyer Nassar indicated: "My detained client is a prisoner in a case of freedom of opinion and expression. He should have been placed with detainees accused of similar charges, not with convicts and criminals. My client needed medications, because he is sick, and these are not available inside the prison."

3.2.2.3.9 Lawyer Nassar explained his client's case, saying: "My client's case is a press and publications case and there must not be any detention according to the Press and Publications Law. This is in addition to the fact that it is about the writer's viewpoint, which is guaranteed. He did not curse or insult anyone, but presented his viewpoint, and this guaranteed in the texts of the Constitution. Yet, the court interpreted it in a manner that is not correct. What happened with my client is part of efforts to gag opinions and repress public freedoms."

3.2.2.3.10 Lawyer Nassar indicated that "on 26 April 2015, I asked for bail to release my client, but the court denied bail saying that the case is not under its jurisdiction, and the case was then referred to the State Security Court."

3.2.2.3.11 On his part, journalist Usama Al-Ramini told the National Team that "on 22 April 2015, the director of the public prosecutor of the Amman Court of First Instance called me and asked me to appear before the court in a case of complaint filed against me."

3.2.2.3.12 Al-Ramini said: "I asked to postpone my appearance before the public prosecutor to Thursday, 23 April 2015, but the office director refused. So I called the public prosecutor to ask for postponement until 23 April 2015, given that I have a work related engagement outside of the capital city, and the public prosecutor agreed. After that, I went to public prosecutor's office with Jamal Ayyoub, who published an article on Akhbar Al-Balad news website entitled "Why does Saudi Arabia bomb the Yemeni people and Al-Sisi's legitimacy."

3.2.2.3.13 Al-Ramini added: "After that, I appeared before the public prosecutor along and without a lawyer, since the public prosecutor did not allow the JPA's representative to attend the investigation, saying it would be illegal. The public prosecutor asked me if I wanted to give a statement on my own or in the presence of a lawyer, and I chose the first option, and the investigation began and lasted around one hour, focusing on the article, its title, its aspects and some excerpts of it."

3.2.2.3.14 Al-Ramini explained: "Several charges were leveled against me, such as harming relations with a foreign countries, libel and slander, not being accurate and objective, lacking balance of the press material, and harming military institutions. After that, the public prosecutor called for me detention by the police until the investigation with the other party, Jamal Ayyoub, is completed. After that, a decision to release me without any detention was issued."

3.2.2.3.15 As for the writer Jamal Ayyoub, Al-Ramini said that "he was detained in Marka prison for 15 days for questioning, given that Ayyoub was the one who wrote the article and published it on more than 17 websites, some of which were Jordanian while

other were Arab website publishing from outside Jordan. Ayyoub also published the article on his Facebook page."

3.2.2.3.16 Jamal Ayyoub remained in custody and tried before the State Security Court on the charge of harming relations with a foreign country and in accordance with the Anti-Terrorism Law. The court refused several requests for bail since his arrest, until he was finally released on bail on 17 August 2015. His case continued to be examined by the court of first instance as well as before the State Security Court.

3.2.2.3.17 with regard to the conditions of his detention, journalist writer Jamal Ayyoub told the CDFJ that the public prosecution ordered his detention in the holding cell of Al-Hussein security center, and he remained there for two hours. All the detainees there were allowed to use the telephone to call their parents or lawyers, but he was excluded and prevented from using the telephone. When he asked one of the security officers about this exception, the latter said that they had instructions to prevent him from using the telephone.

3.2.2.3.18 With regard to the holding cell where he was detained until he was moved to Marka prison, Ayyoub said that he was held in the holding cell of Al-Hussein security center, which is a room that is no larger than 2m X 2m. There were around 19 other person and they were all arrested on criminal charges. The detention cell had only "one dirty and unclear toilet" not fit for usage. He said that he was allowed to wash in preparation for prayers.

3.2.2.3.19 Two hours after his detention at Al-Hussein security center, Ayyoub was taken to Marka prison in handcuffs. He was placed in a small room with more than 30 other people, most of them accused of criminal charges.

3.2.2.3.20 After that, he was taken to the permanent detention cell. Marka prison is divided into three permanent detention sections: A) Section for detainees of general cases; B) Section for detainees on drug charges; C) Section for detainees on theft and larceny charges. Ayyoub was placed in Section B, with those accused of drug charges, and it is basically a room encompassing 11 double-beds and holding 11 persons.

3.2.2.3.21 Jamal Ayyoub indicated that the prison administration identified his room and section, and that he was classified as a "very dangerous" suspect, which is a classification related to how the prisoner is transported from the prison to the court and vice versa.

3.2.2.3.22 In his testimony, Jamal Ayyoub said that he was mistreated in the prison and that the prison administration prevented him from having visitors, with the exception of close family relatives (his wife and children). He filed a complaint about the mistreatment he experienced to the prison administration, which did not respond, but explained that his treatment is part of "instructions."

3.2.2.3.23 Jamal Ayyoub claimed that he was falsely accused by the prison administration of not liking the national laws and legislation and was questioned about that. He declared a hunger strike in protest of the mistreatment and the false accusations, and asked the prison administration to meet with human rights activists, but all his requests were denied.

3.2.2.3.24 Ayyoub claimed that he tried to bring in a Koran with large print to be able to read it, but the prison administration did not allow it. He added that he was able to purchase a "towel" after three weeks of trying, and was banned from getting it from outside prison. Moreover, after 45 days of asking to "shorten his trousers," he managed to see the prison's tailor, only to be treated in a degrading manner. Every time he went to see the tailor, he would get looks of "disgust" and "contempt." Ayyoubi said: "He would look at me in a dirty manner."

3.2.2.3.25 Ayyoubi said that he was taken to court at the Palace of Justice from Marka prison around three times in handcuffs, because he was classified as "very dangerous." He was also taken to the State Security Court in the same manner around four times.

3.2.2.3.26 At the start of his trial before the State Security Court, Jamal Ayyoub was not charged except after 85 days of detention. His lawyer was not banned from seeing him, and he was released on bail after 119 days.

3.2.2.3.27 Jamal Ayyoub continues to appear before the court at the Palace of Justice and the State Security Court.

3.3 Present and document what is related to item (14) of article (2): Results of investigations and prosecutions related to Public Security Directorate officers use of excessive force on 15 April 2011 during the Al-Nakheel Square demonstrations in Amman:

3.3.1 Testimonies presented by the report hereunder indicate beyond a reasonable doubt that there was an intention to target the media and media practitioners, to prevent them from covering the events and practicing their work freely, and that these events are not individual, random or accidental. Most cases documented by CDFJ regarding the use of excessive force by the Public Security Directorate officers during the Al-Nakheel Square demonstration in the capital Amman on 15 April 2011 reveal a specific pattern when committing this assault by the security men and the gendarmerie. The methodological nature of the assault is emphasized by the fact that security men and gendarmerie, and other security forces were wearing their uniforms without any reference to their names or numbers, in order to conceal their identity. Furthermore, the assault against media practitioners took place while the media practitioners were wearing vests that distinguish them from other demonstrators, and involved verbal abuses by the security men towards them, using specific terms that indicate they were targeted.

3.3.2 CDFJ emphasizes that what reinforces the methodological nature of the Al-Nakheel Square assault is that the authorities concerned did not take any preventive measure to prevent the assault by public security men, and their keenness to ensure the ineffectiveness or seriousness of measures to pursue the perpetrators among the security and gendarmerie men, and members of other security systems, as well as failure to reveal the identities of those responsible or involved. Furthermore, the authorities never started an independent and neutral investigation in order to find the truth and hold those responsible for the assault accountable, including those who perpetrated it, kept silent about it, ordered it, or approved it. It is noteworthy in this context that the Public Security Directorate issued, three days after the Al-Nakheel incident, a detailed report by the investigation committee formed under the umbrella of public security. The report included a clear confession by the public security to the assault against the media practitioners, together with an apology for the assault against them and the physical, material, and psychological damage they sustained. It also stated that public security will take the

necessary measures to pursue the criminals and compensate the victims. The Public Security Directorate, however, did not take any subsequent action and did not reveal the identity of those involved in the assault. None of them was prosecuted. A verbal apology was mentioned in the Directorate's report, without any practical or actual measure taken by the Directorate to prosecute the criminals and those involved with them.

3.3.3 The assault in which various security systems participated against media practitioners in Al-Nakheel Square represented a clear violation of the provisions of the Jordanian constitution, the Jordanian law, and human rights conventions ratified by Jordan and published in the Official Gazette. This assault is one against the freedom of opinion and expression, including media freedom, prohibiting torture and other forms of harsh, inhumane, or degrading treatment or punishment, and the right to access justice and effective equity means. It also involves a violation of the United Nations principles regarding the use of force in the context of implementing the law. These are all violations that require serving justice and compensation to victims and holding the perpetrators criminally and administratively accountable.

3.3.4 Regarding the CDFJ role in dealing with Al-Nakheel incident, it issued on 15/7/2011 a preliminary report regarding the incident after investigating the facts and collecting information. The responsibility of all security systems for the assault became clear to CDFJ. CDFJ sought to raise criminal and civil lawsuits to pursue the perpetrators and serve justice to the victims. A number of colleagues who were assaulted signed powers of attorney for lawyers within the CDFJ Legal Assistance Unit for media practitioners (MELAD). However, they all withdrew, with the exception of colleagues Nidal Salameh and Islam Sawalha. The legal opinion, however, was that the case of these two colleagues was not legally solid, and judicial procedures will be futile in light of the facts and circumstances surrounding them.

3.3.5 CDFJ was able to document 19 cases of assault against media practitioner colleagues who were targeted on 15/7/2015 by members of the public security, gendarmerie, and traffic police, or those wearing their official uniforms from other security agencies. These cases which were documented by CDFJ against media practitioners include the following:

- Colleague Sami Mahasneh, who sustained a serious injury including a broken arm, degraded tissue of the thumb, and serious injuries in his left eye close to the vision nerve. He was beaten with a stick and kicked by security forces boots.
- Colleague Raed Awartani from Jordan Days, who sustained a knee fracture as a result of being beaten by the security forces. His camera was broken.
- Yazan Khawas from Nourmina Channel, who was beaten on the left arm that was carrying a microphone, resulting in bruised tissues.
- Colleague Mohammad Al-Najjar, Al-JazeeraNet correspondent, who was beaten and insulted by the public security personnel, and prevented from covering the event or taking pictures.
- Colleague Yasser Abu-Hilaleh, Bureau Chief of Al-Jazeera Channel who was also beaten and insulted to prevent him from covering the event.
- Colleague Amal Ghabayen from Ammon News Agency, whom the public security personnel tried to stop from covering their assault on one of the young participants in the sit-in. She was insulted using lewd language and chased in order to confiscate her camera. She was beaten with clubs.
- Colleague Ahmad Malkawi from Saraya News, who was beaten and his camera was broken by the public security personnel, using clubs they were wielding.
- Colleague Ali Al-Zu'bi from Nourmina TV Channel, who was beaten by the public security personnel using a thick club from the back, concentrating on his arm so he would drop the camera. His camera fell but was not broken.
- Colleague Mohammad Fdailat from Amman Net, who was insulted by the public security personnel using lewd language, and was prevented from reaching the venue to take pictures.
- 10. Colleague Anas Damra from Ammon News Agency, who was assaulted by public security men with a club from the back because he attempted to thwart public security men from continuing to beat colleagues Mohammad Al-Kiswani and Mohammad Abu Qatti.
- 11. Colleague Mohammad Abu-Qatti from Reuters and Ad-Dustour, who was beaten by public security personnel, breaking one of his cameras because he was taking pictures of the protestors being beaten, and because he tried to help his media colleagues who were being badly beaten and insulted.

- 12. Colleague Rana Ismail Za'rour from Al-Arabiyah TV Channel who was insulted by public security personnel using lewd language, and was prevented from taking pictures.
- 13. Colleague Hiba Kiwan from the online Saraya News Agency, who was exposed to the vicious violence of public security men like her colleagues.
- 14. Colleague Islam Sawalha from the Amman Post website, who was asked to stop taking pictures by the public security men, and was beaten from the back with a public security man's helmet. Sawalha's camera fell to the ground. When he resumed taking pictures using his mobile phone, public security men and traffic police beat him on the arms and his phone fell to the ground.
- 15. Colleague Nidal Salameh from the Electronic Iris, who was beaten by the gendarmerie and insulted using degrading terms. They snatched his camera and smashed it.
- 16. Colleague Amer Abu Hamdeh from the Amman BBC office, who was attacked from behind with a shield while taking pictures of the events. He was beaten again with a public security man's belt, on his arm and neck to prevent him from taking pictures.
- 17. Colleague Faheem Kareem from the New York Times, who was physically assaulted.
- 18. Colleague Khalil Mazra'awi from Al-Dustour, who was beaten.
- 19. Colleague Mohammad Hannoun from the Associated Press, who was beaten.

3.3.6 In all these cases, the CDFJ found that severe physical, psychological and material damages were incurred as a result of the attack of public security and gendarmerie personnel on the journalists. These cases shared common aspects, such as targeting the journalist's hand to drop the camera or beating from behind to conceal the identity of the attacker. Additionally, the majority of the journalist victims were wearing vests identifying them as members of the press, and it was clear to the security personnel and the gendarmerie that they were not demonstrators.

3.3.7 In his complaint, colleague Ra'ed Awartani said: "I went to cover the events in front of Al-Nakheel Square. I saw a heavy argument between the journalists and the security. Voices raised on the opposite street, near the pastry shop. I went to the edge of the wall.

There were security personnel running with batons. This is clear in the film that I took. When I arrived at the edge of the wall and standing there for five seconds, I was hit on the knee from behind with a baton. I turned around, but the hit caused me to lose balance and fall off the wall. The man who hit me was wearing the public security uniform."

3.3.8 In her statement, colleague Amal Ghabayen said: "I saw a young man being severely beaten by the public security personnel. As I was filming the scene, several security men tried to stop me from filming, calling names and cursing at me. When I did not respond, they threatened to break the camera and to beat me. A lieutenant told: get out of here, traitor, or I will break the camera over your head. I moved away and filmed from a distance. They started cursing at me and asking me to stop filming, but I did not respond. This is when two security men chased me. So I ran towards the Square, and I heard some yelling to break me. I was cornered, because many security people were chasing my colleague Sami Mahasneh. I was cornered between the security barricade and the security men who were beating on Mahasneh. They took advantage of the situation and started beating me with batons, and one security man beat me with his hand. In an attempt to keep me where I was longer, the security men did not open the barricade, but some of them tried to beat me from beyond the barricade. According to several colleagues, like Hamdan Al-Haj and Mahmoud Abu Dari, I fell to the ground after on security man hit me with his shoulder."

3.3.9 In his complaint, colleague Mohammad Rif'at from Sama Al-Urdon news website said: "The security men beat me hard on my hand with a wooden stick and without any prejudice given that I am a journalist and I was filming the events. One security man told me not to film. I was beaten again without the camera, and I begged him not to beat me, but he did not listen, and beat me again on my hand."

3.3.10 Colleague Ahmad Malkawi from Saraya news talked about the things that strengthen the idea of the targeted and systematic attacks against journalists. He confirmed: "While we were carrying out our job and upon our arrival at Al-Nakheel Square, the gendarmerie beat up many. I was standing behind some stairs and I was wearing Saraya's badge. One of the gendarmerie turned to me and I told him I was a journalist, but he read the badge, pulled

the camera out of my hand and broke it, after which two others attacked me with sticks, and I was hit on my right leg. Medical reports confirmed the presence of bruises and swelling in my right leg."

3.3.11 As for colleague Yazan Khawas from Normina TV, he said that one of the security personnel "beat me while I was carrying the microphone. This caused a tear in the ligaments of my left hand, and I was put in a cast at Al-Khalidi Hospital. I do not think that the stick that I was beaten with is one of the tools that the security men usually carry."

3.3.12 In his complaint, colleague Anas Damra from Ammon News said: "As I was trying to prevent the security men from attacking my colleague Mohammad Al-Kiswani, and after succeeding, I continued to do my job, and I was wearing the press vest. I was attacked from behind with a baton or a stick on the back of my head, which rendered me unconscious."

3.3.13 Colleague Islam Sawalha said: "After I got the press vest and as I was filming the security personnel as they were dismantling the sit-in and as one of the demonstrators was being beaten by five security personnel, I was asked to stop filming. Although I showed my press badge and he knew I was a journalist, he attacked me from behind on my head. My camera fell from my hand. When I tried to use my mobile phone to film, one of the security men beat me on my hand with a wooden stick to drop the phone."

3.3.14 In his complaint, colleague Nidal Salameh said: "When the gendarmerie started beating and attacking the demonstrators, I started filming the incidents. A group of the gendarmerie saw me and moved towards me. One of them cursed at me, and then they beat me with their hands and took away my camera and broke it. I yelled at them, telling them I was a journalist and I was wearing the vest, but they did not stop. They broke the camera and continued beating. I assure you I was personally targeted by them."

4 Recommendations

4.3 Commence immediately to introduce legislative amendments that totally prevent including the perpetrators of acts of torture in any laws pardoning them, and to indicate clearly and unequivocally the inadmissibility of any pardon to include serious violations of

- human rights, such as torture, and that these crimes shall not be dropped and that their perpetrators are brought to justice.
- 4.4 Guarantee the right of victims of torture, abuse, or any form of harsh and inhumane treatment, to justice and reparation through resorting to civil courts to submit complaints and grievances, and raise court cases.
 - 4.5 Repeal the jurisdiction of police courts in addressing issues related to security systems and police officers practicing torture and other harsh, inhumane and degrading treatment methods, and to refer such cases to the criminal courts with jurisdiction.
 - 4.6 Guarantee the right of those detained to contact lawyers and family members, and punish members of the police and security agencies in case they are refused or failed to ensure that the detainees practice this right in a manner that ensures reporting abuse or torture to parties outside the detention locations.
 - 4.7 Ensure the privacy and specificity of communications between lawyers and detainees at detention locations in order to guarantee freedom of communication away from the observation of the staff at those locations, about what they may have been exposed to in terms of abuse or torture.
 - 4.8 Pursue a public policy in providing protection for peaceful congregations and demonstrations in accordance with Jordan's obligations, and penalizing members of the security systems who were involved in physical assaults or degrading behavior, including assault against journalists and issuing instructions in this respect, in a manner that enhances the seriousness of this policy.
 - 4.9 Open an investigation, with the participation of observers from independent human rights organizations and civil society organizations, in all acts of aggression and harsh, inhumane, and degrading treatment since 2011, and enabling those performing the investigation to access all sources of evidence available, to meet witnesses, examine documents, visit sites, and issue an independent report on the responsibility of those involved in these assaults.
 - 4.10 Enable the public prosecution office to raise court cases against all those involved in serious acts of aggression, including torture and harsh treatment, on behalf of the public right.
 - 4.11 Ensure the right of members in demanding reparations and compensations for the torture or abuse they were subjected to within the context of fair and transparent legal procedures.

Center for Defending Freedom of Journalists [CDFJ]

ABOUT CDFJ

Center for Defending Freedom of Journalists [CDFJ] was established in 1998 as a civil society organization that works on defending media freedom in Jordan; the center was established after a series of major setbacks on a local level, starting with issuing the temporary press and publication law in 1997, which added more restrictions on media and caused many newspapers to shut down.

CDFJ works on protecting freedoms and democracy in Jordan and the Arab world, in addition to respect of human rights, justice, equal rights, and development in the society encouraging non-violence and open dialogue.

CDFJ always maintain an independent role like any other civil society organizations, and is not part of the political work, but in terms of defending media and journalists freedoms CDFJ stands against all policies and legislations that may impose restrictions on media freedom.

CDFJ is active on regional level to develop media freedom and strengthen the skills and professionalism of journalists in the Arab countries, through specialized and customized programs and activities, in addition CDFJ works with media and the civil society on protecting the democracy and promoting respect of human rights principles.

CDFJ Vision:

Creating a democratic environment in the Arab Countries that protects media freedom and freedom of expression and enhances the society's right in knowledge through building professional Journalists committed to the international standards of independent and free media.

CDFJ Mission:

CDFJ is a non-government organization, committed to defending the freedom and security of journalists through addressing the violations to which they are exposed, and building sustainable professional capacities as well as enabling them to have free access to information, along with developing and changing restrictive media related legislations, and building a supportive political, social, and cultural environment for free and independent media.

CDFJ main Goals are:

- Supporting the freedom and independence of media organizations and journalists.
- Defending journalists, protecting their safety, and stand against the violations committed against them.
- Strengthening the professionalism of media and its role in defending democracy, freedoms and reform.
- Developing the legislative, political, social, and cultural environments that embrace media and journalists.

Media Legal Aid Unit for Journalists (MELAD)

Objectives:

1. Assigning lawyers 1. to defend journalists who are detained or prosecuted for carrying out their duties.
2. Providing legal consultation to journalists without increasing restrictions or self censorship.
3. Enhancing the legal awareness of the journalists and helping them exercise their constitutional rights of expression and defending the society's right to knowledge without violating the law.
4. Exhorting lawyers to give attention to journalism and media freedom issues, and developing their legal skills in this field.
5. Presenting draft laws to the parliament and government to improve the legal
6. structure governing the freedom of media in Jordan in harmony with the international standards.
7. Establishing streams of communication with the judicial authority to enhance press freedoms and create an understanding of the international standards for the freedom of media.

Mechanism of work:

1. Rebuilding the media legal aid unit by recruiting specialized qualified lawyers, organizing the unit's mechanisms of work and activating the voluntary efforts of lawyers.
2. Organizing advanced and specialized training for a number of lawyers who took part in previous training workshops with CDFJ, and involving new lawyers who are already engaged in defending newspapers, radio and TV stations to enrich their experience and encourage them to support the efforts of media legal aid unit.
3. Re-distributing and restructuring the work of media legal aid unit MELAD along three lines:
 - Defending journalists before juridical authorities and extending legal advice through building a network of lawyers which can provide legal protection for the journalists in a proper and professional manner.
 - Documenting the lawsuits filed against journalists and institutions in Jordanian courts.
 - Studying and analyzing verdicts issued in press and publication cases to determine their compatibility with international standards and to identify the Jordanian judiciary trends in dealing with media-related cases.
4. Establishing a forum for exchanging expertise on the freedom of media between judges, lawyers, and journalists.
5. Providing legal advice to journalists through the following website: www.cdfj.org.
6. Activating the hotline service and providing journalists with the names and telephone numbers of lawyers working with the media legal aid unit to seek their assistance in urgent cases.

Sanad

Network for Media Freedom Defenders in The Arab World

The Network for Media Freedom Defenders in The Arab World (Sanad) is a coalition of civil society institutions advocating the freedom of the press.

Sanad was established in implementation of recommendation by the First Forum for the Defenders of Media Freedom in the Arab World, organized by the center for Defending the Freedom of Journalists (CDFJ) in Amman, in December 2012, immediately after the birth of the Arab Spring.

The first achievement of Sanad was the “Ain” (eye) Program for Monitoring and Documentation of Violations against the Media. Work was kicked off by training national teams to monitor and document such violations in Egypt and Tunisia, while work was still underway in Jordan to achieve that goal.

Under Ain Program, a plan was designed to expand in the Arab world through setting up national teams for monitoring and documentation, within a realistic and workable timeframe.

The national teams will be working on detecting and documenting violations against the media in the countries where they function, applying a scientific rights-based approach consistent with international media and human rights criteria. Side by side with that, professional researchers will be monitoring violations in the countries where Ain monitors do not exist, relying on data collected from the media, communication with rights group and monitoring their reports on violations against the press, along with field visits and direct contacts with journalists who are victims of these violations.

Sanad seeks to institutionalize efforts exerted to defend the media freedom in the Arab world. Towards that end, it has launched its web-based observatory to shed light on the violations against journalists, providing an electronic platform that works effectively to expose violators, mobilize support for journalists and offer a venue for networking between advocates of media freedoms.

Sanad will continue embracing the Forum for Defenders of Media Freedom in the Arab World, and working to expand the base of media supporters, eyeing a wider margin of freedom, enhancement of achievements and attracting international experts to back Arab journalists who are struggling with huge challenges to win their freedom and independence.