

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



مركز حماية وحرية الصحفيين

Center for Defending Freedom of Journalists

**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 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 by a team of lawyers and legal advisors known as the Media Legal Aid Unit (MELAD). 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, which includes an assessment of violations against the media committed in the country. 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 and is currently preparing to launch its fourth report covering 2015.

We are committed to putting an end to practices that stand in contradiction with national and international human rights standards, including 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 improve 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) prior to its entering in a constructive dialogue with the Jordanian Government. Jordan has ratified the UN Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and we hope that this dialogue will strengthen the convention's enforcement in the Kingdom.
- 1.2 This report focuses on those issues identified by the CAT which are related to documented cases of violations against journalists. All cases are in some way related to the following items and references:
 - 1.2.1 **Item (3) of Article (2):** Article 2 of the Convention and including 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. Measures should be adopted to conduct effective monitoring of the following:
 - 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 proceedings in relation to the use of excessive force by Public Security Directorate (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 (the first and second additional 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. Although Jordan has conducted legislative amendments in recent years, these changes have not kept up with international human rights standards. 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, ranging from liberty depriving punishments to harsh fines.
- 2.1.2 For example, the Jordanian Penal Code includes several legal texts that restrict media and publishing freedom, 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. Journalists can be accused of charges such as defamation, 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 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 does not include amendments to, or cancellations of, any articles or controversial items related to the media, such as those 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 Following the 2014 amendment to the Anti-Terrorism Law, the charge of "harming relations with a foreign country" now falls under the jurisdiction 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 in cases where the sentence includes temporary hard labor. Human Rights Watch has criticized the amendments to the Law, and considered them a threat to freedoms and rights and an extensive expansion of what constitutes terrorist action.
- 2.1.4 Since 2001, the CDFJ has issued an annual report on 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. Pardons must not extend to serious violations of human rights, such as torture. Moreover, laws related to the termination of legal proceedings or punishment do not comply with the state's duties as outlined in the Convention. There must be a provision that clearly states that crimes of torture cannot be pardoned 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 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. 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 communication with 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 do not inform detainees of their right to have a lawyer at the time of their arrest and prior to the interrogation process. Therefore, it is necessary to 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/her arrest, as well as the right to have a lawyer present at all proceedings.

2.3.3 The right to contact relatives and to receive medical examinations

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 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 that of journalist and writer Jamal Ayyoub. On 23/4/2015, Mr. Ayoub was prohibited from using the telephone to inform his relatives of his detention at the Al-Husseini Security Center.

2.4 Impunity and lack of transparency and accountability in cases of torture

2.4.1 In line with Article 15 of the Convention, 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. 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 into the incident and pursue the perpetrator as per the law. However, it is disappointing that the prosecutor general has not adhered 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 impunity for violations committed against media practitioners is still commonplace in Jordan. The official authorities have not undertaken any genuine or serious step to put an end to this policy, which has been employed and enforced for many years. Furthermore, no measures have been taken to achieve justice for victims of these violations or to hold the perpetrators accountable.

2.4.3 Among the cases presented in the report, are 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, youth protesters to stage a sit-in demanding basic political and social reforms. During the sit in media practitioners were subjected to documented physical attacks, by security forces. Despite these documentations, the prosecutor general has not made any attempt to investigate these violations to find out those responsible and to bring them to court for trial. It is worth noting here that, in cases involving criminal suspicions, the Jordanian law stipulates that the prosecutor general undertake his duties and responsibilities of his own initiative.

2.4.4 The CDFJ believes that the policy of impunity, adopted by the security forces and other official entities in Jordan vis-à-vis serious violations of the Convention against Torture committed against media practitioners, leads to the perpetuation of these violations, which, in turn, endangers media freedoms in Jordan. 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 officers. The CDFJ has documented several of these cases. The Public Security Directorate authorized officers to pursue journalists who filed complaints with the CDFJ regarding physical attacks, property damage and deprivation of liberty during their media coverage of the sit-in. However, after the CDFJ sent official letters presenting the complaints of journalist attacked by the police and gendarmerie, the Public Security Directorate formed an investigative committee numbered ٤/4/9/34952 dated 24 July 2014. This is considered a 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, due to evidence contained in their sworn testimonies that they practiced journalism while not registered with the Jordan Press Association. While this is violates the provisions of the Jordan Press Association, which defines a journalist as a registered member of the Press Association, 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 Regardless of the results of the investigation, the threat to prosecute the complainants is cause for worry among these journalists, who may hesitate to file future 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 impunity is entrenched in Jordan. It is a major contributor to the continuing grave violations of media freedoms and the rights of journalists, carried out by persons affiliated with the security apparatus. The identities of the perpetrators are concealed by either removing any markings that would indicate their security affiliations or by using

unidentifiable civilians to carry out attacks. Furthermore, responsible government entities remain silent about such violations and refuse to undertake investigations or prosecutions.

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 impunity due to the lack of institutional independence of the police courts, given that they represent both the opposing counsel and the judge in these cases. Furthermore, these cases are closed to the public.

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," has been 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 Directorate's investigation lacked any semblance of independence and resulted in the security personnel escaping accountability and punishment.

2.4.11 Moreover, the CDFJ believes that government institutions systematically avoid prosecuting 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 not include any measures to prosecute those suspected of involvement.

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

2.4.13 The CDFJ believes that media practitioners, in general, are at risk of physical attacks. These risks are expounded by the fact that the public and security apparatuses, as well as those responsible for investigations and filing public interest lawsuits, adopt a methodological policy of impunity. 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 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 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 in 2006. Nevertheless, the courts do not compensate victims of arbitrary and unlawful detention. This is why the media practitioners who were arrested by the State Security Court did not receive any compensation for the damages they incurred as a result of their detention.

2.6 Detention Facilities

2.6.1 It is worth noting that some of the issues regarding detention facilities mentioned by those journalists included in this report and by lawyers in CDFJ's Media Legal Aid Unit (MELAD), were previously brought to light in the National Center for Human Rights first periodic report on the state of detention and rehabilitation centers in Jordan covering the period from 1 January 2013 to 30 June 2014. They include the following:

- 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 and unsanitary.

3.0 Enforcement of the Convention against Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment pursuant to the list of issues that precede the presentation of Jordan's third periodic report 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 media websites were referred to the State Security Court on charges of defamation, 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. This is despite the fact that the published material should have been considered a form of free speech.

3.1.1.2 The journalists who were referred to the State Security Court were detained before the trial for an extended period of time, in some cases exceeding 20 days. This detention is considered unlawful according to international standards, because it is not permissible to impose freedom depriving punishment on media related crimes.

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 following are cases in which detained journalists were not informed 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 These journalists 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" were not made 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 include:

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 subject to mistreatment and detention by the protective security forces in Zarqa. On Sunday, 21 February 2010, Khalil Qandil was arrested while reporting on overcrowding at the vehicle licensing department in Zarqa. Qandil was arrested while filming the scene and after he had identified himself to the police. Protective security personnel questioned Qandil about filming the congestion at the vehicle department in Zarqa. Khalil Qandil's questioning continued for hours, after which his personal identification card was confiscated and he was released on a JD5000 bail. When Qandil went to the Zarqa police directorate to receive his ID the following day, he was referred to the Zarqa Governorate, which released him after hours of questioning and after he signed a pledge promising to pay JD3000 if the offense were repeated.

3.2.2.1.2 The CDFJ noted that Khalil Qandil's mistreatment was denounced by many media organizations in Jordan. It constitutes a restriction on media freedoms and mistreatment of media practitioners. 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 while in handcuffs. Qandil spent hours in detention in the holding cell with more than 20 suspects, sharing five worn-out 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 a doubt to the CDFJ that the detention of Khalil Qandil was without legal cause, and that his detention was accompanied by inhuman treatment.

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 Directorate. 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 entire 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 "*Islamist Lawyer: "The exchange deal with Da'ish is complete 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, 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 was 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 did not show any case under the name of the two journalists or the website.

3.2.2.2.5 The lawyer continued to follow-up with 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. Nevertheless, MELAD was not able to perform its legal role, namely the announcement that the State Security Court did not have jurisdiction, the filing of a request for the journalists release and a request to reverse 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 stipulate 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 other relevant laws."

3.2.2.2.10 For his part, lawyer Marwan Salem of MELAD indicated, after he visited the two journalists in Al-Hashimiya prison, that "Saraya news received a telephone call from Musa Al-Abdallat, a lawyer representing the Salafist Movement in Jordan, indicating that the deal had been completed between Da'ish and Jordan, whereby Sajeda Al-Rishawi, who had been convicted of the death penalty and was in a Jordanian prison after she attempted to blow up a hotel in Amman, was handed over and Mu'ath Al-Kasasbeh would be returned. 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. The answer was yes. The journalists were blindfolded, handcuffed and transported by SUV to Marka prison. They remain there as of the publishing of 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 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 Al-Khalidi and Obeidat were released on 8 March 2015.

3.2.2.3 Detention and imprisonment of journalist Jamal Ayyoub in the State Security Court for an article discussing the war in Yemen.

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 its war on Yemen.*" He later appeared before the court, along with the chief editor of the website that published the article Usama Al-Ramini, 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 its war on Yemen.*" This was after the article had been published on more than 17 websites, including 13 Jordanian websites."

3.2.2.3.3 Ayyoub's son continued that "the public prosecutor initially asked my father, as well as journalist Usama Al-Ramini, to appear in court on Wednesday, 22 April 2015. However, the court date 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. The request was denied, under the pretense that the case was not under its jurisdiction. The case was then 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 would be preferable to waging war on them."

3.2.2.3.6 Lawyer Nasser added: "On Thursday, 23 April 2015, 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."

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 those carrying serious criminal records. 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. Moreover, the article expressed its author's viewpoint. He did not curse or insult anyone, but presented his viewpoint, a right which the constitution guarantees. However, the court misinterpreted the law. What happened with my client is part of an effort to silence the press and repress public freedoms."

3.2.2.3.10 Lawyer Nassar indicated that "on 26 April 2015, I asked that my client be released on bail, 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 For 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 due to a 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. I called the public prosecutor to ask for postponement until 23 April 2015, given that I had a work related engagement outside of the capital city, and the public prosecutor agreed. After that, I went to the public prosecutor's office with Jamal Ayyoub, who published an article on the 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 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 foreign countries, libel, lack of accuracy and objectivity, lacking balance in reporting, and harming military institutions. After that, the public prosecutor ordered that I be detained by the police until the investigation with the other party, Jamal Ayyoub, was completed. After that, a decision to release me 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 Jordanian and Arab websites as well as his Facebook page.

3.2.2.3.16 Jamal Ayyoub remained in custody and was tried before the State Security Court on the charge of harming relations with a foreign country in accordance with the Anti-Terrorism Law. The court refused several requests for bail during his detainment, 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 Jamal Ayyoub told the CDFJ that the public prosecution ordered his detention in the holding cell of Al-Hussein security center, where he remained 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 prior to his transfer 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 people all of whom had been arrested on criminal charges. The detention cell had only "one dirty, unsanitary toilet" not fit for usage. Moreover, Ayyoub was not 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 serious criminal charges.

3.2.2.3.20 Following his transfer, Ayyoub 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. The section 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. The intense security measures were exhausting.

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 prison officials were following "instructions."

3.2.2.3.23 Jamal Ayyoub claimed that he was falsely accused by the prison administration of being displeased with national laws and legislation, an issue he was questioned about later. Ayyoub 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 enter a large print Koran into the prison, but the prison administration did not allow it. He added that he was able to purchase a "towel" after three weeks, but was banned from getting it from outside the 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 disparaging 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 approximately four times.

3.2.2.3.26 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 be summoned before the court at the Palace of Justice and the State Security Court.

3.3 Documentation of incidents 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 of the cases documented by CDFJ regarding the use of excessive force by the Public Security Directorate officers during the Al-Nakheel Square demonstration in Amman on 15 April 2011 reveal a specific pattern of behavior among the security forces and 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 officers. Furthermore, officials ensured the ineffectiveness of measures to pursue the perpetrators among the security and gendarmerie officers, and members of other security systems. The identities of those responsible or involved were never revealed. Finally, 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 directorate to assaulting 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 the Public Security Directorate would 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 were 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 or accomplices.

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, Jordanian law, and human rights conventions ratified by Jordan and published in the Official Gazette. This is an assault against the freedom of opinion and expression, including media freedom as well as prohibitions of torture and other forms of harsh, inhumane, or degrading treatment or punishment, and equal access to justice. 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 would 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 practitioners who were targeted on 15/7/2015 by members of the public security, gendarmerie, and traffic police, or those wearing 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, damaged tissue on his thumb, and serious injuries to his left eye close to the nerve. He was beaten with a stick and kicked by security forces.
- Colleague Raed Awartani from Jordan Days, who sustained a knee fracture as a result of being beaten by the security forces. Awartani's camera was also broken.
- Yazan Khawas from Nourmina Channel, who was beaten on the left arm while 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..
- Colleague Ali Al-Zu'bi from Nourmina TV Channel, who was beaten by the public security personnel, 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 clubs because he attempted to stop 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 violence of public security officers 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 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 and his phone fell to the ground.
- 15. Colleague Nidal Salameh from the Black Iris Blog, 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 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 Al-Nakheel Square. I heard an intense argument between the journalists and the security forces and heard raised voices 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. I was standing at the edge of the wall for about five seconds when I was hit on the knee from behind with a baton. I turned around, but the strike caused me to lose balance and fall off the wall. The man who hit me was wearing a 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 me names and cursing at me. When I did not respond, they threatened to break the camera and to beat me. A lieutenant said: 'get out of here, traitor, or I will break that 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 someone yelling to stop 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 officers 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 one security officer hit me with his shoulder."

3.3.9 In his complaint, colleague Mohammad Rif'at from Sama Al-Urdon news website said: "The security officers beat me hard on my hand with a wooden stick despite that I am a journalist and I was filming the events. One security officer 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 corroborated the theory that the attacks on journalists were targeted and systematic. He confirmed: "While we were carrying out our job at Al-Nakheel Square, the gendarmerie attacked 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. My right leg was struck. 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: "I prevented the security officers from attacking my colleague Mohammad Al-Kiswani and then continued to do my job. Despite that I was wearing a 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 striking me. I assure you I was personally targeted by them."

4 Recommendations

- 4.3 The immediate introduction of legislative amendments that prevent the pardoning of perpetrators of acts of torture and which indicate clearly and unequivocally the inadmissibility of any pardon of serious human rights violations such as torture.
- 4.4 Guarantee the right of victims of torture, abuse, or any form of harsh and inhumane treatment, to justice and reparation through civil courts.
- 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. Refer such cases to the criminal courts with jurisdiction.
- 4.6 Guarantee the right of those detained to contact lawyers and family members. Punish members of the police and security agencies in cases in which this right is refused or in which detainees are not able to practice this right in a manner that ensures transparency.
- 4.7 Ensure the privacy of communications between lawyers and detainees at detention centers in order to guarantee freedom of communication regarding 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. 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. Enable 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.

- 4.9 Enable the Public Prosecutor's office to raise court cases against all those involved in serious acts of aggression, including torture and harsh treatment, on behalf of the public interest.
- 4.10 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.