



**Optional Protocol to the  
Convention against Torture  
and Other Cruel, Inhuman  
or Degrading Treatment  
or Punishment**

Distr.: Restricted  
08 December 2017

Original: English  
English, French and Spanish only

---

**Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture and Other Cruel,  
Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment**

**Visit to Hungary undertaken 21 to 30 March 2017:  
observations and recommendations addressed to the  
national preventive mechanism**

**Report of the Subcommittee<sup>\*, \*\*, \*\*\*</sup>**

---

\* In accordance with article 16 (1) of the Optional Protocol, the present report was transmitted confidentially to the national preventive mechanism on 08.12.2017.

\*\* The present document is being issued without formal editing.

## Contents

	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction .....	3
II. National preventive mechanism .....	3
III. Recommendations to the national preventive mechanism.....	4
A. Recommendations relating to legal, institutional and structural issues.....	4
B. Recommendations on methodological issues .....	7
IV. Final recommendations .....	9
<b>Annexes</b>	
I. List of places of deprivation of liberty visited by the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture....	11
II. List of officials and other persons with whom the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture met .	12

## I. Introduction

1. In accordance with its mandate under the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT), the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture (SPT), carried out its first regular visit to the Hungary from 21 to 30 March 2017.
2. The Subcommittee members conducting the visit were: Mari Amos (head of delegation), Arman Danielyan, Nora Sveaass, Aneta Stanchevska. The Subcommittee was assisted by three Human Rights Officers from the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), United Nations security officers and interpreters.
3. During the visit, the Subcommittee conducted visits to places of deprivation of liberty, including police stations, remand prisons, immigration detention centres, guarded asylum centres, correctional educational establishments for juveniles, psychiatric and forensic institutions, and penitentiary hospital (Annex 1). The Subcommittee held meetings with relevant authorities of Hungary, the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights, the national preventive mechanism (NPM). The delegation met with the members of civil society and the Regional Representative of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees for Central Europe (Annex II).
4. Meetings held with members of the national preventive mechanism and with the members of Civic Consultative Body (CCB) permitted the Subcommittee to discuss the mechanism's mandate and working methods and to explore ways to strengthen and increase its effectiveness. In order to better understand how the mechanism works in practice, the Subcommittee also visited, together with the mechanism, a place of deprivation of liberty that had been chosen by the mechanism. The visit was led by the NPM, with the members of the Subcommittee as observers.
5. At the conclusion of the visit, the delegation presented its confidential preliminary observations orally to the authorities of Hungary. The Subcommittee will send a separate confidential report to the authorities in which it will make recommendations to the State party.
6. The present report sets out the observations and recommendations of the Subcommittee addressed to the national preventive mechanism of Hungary. These recommendations are made in accordance with the Subcommittee's mandate to offer training and technical assistance and to advise and assist the mechanism, in accordance with article 11 (b) (ii) and (iii) of the Optional Protocol. The present report remains confidential unless the mechanism decides to make it public, in accordance with article 16 (2) of the Optional Protocol.
7. The Subcommittee draws the attention of the national preventive mechanism to the Special Fund established in accordance with article 26 of the Optional Protocol. Recommendations contained in visit reports that have been made public can form the basis of an application for funding of specific projects through the Fund, in accordance with its rules.
9. The Subcommittee wishes to express its gratitude to the national preventive mechanism of Hungary for its assistance and cooperation during the visit.

## II. National preventive mechanism

10. Hungary acceded to the OPCAT in 2012 with a declaration under the article 24, postponing the establishment of its national preventive mechanism for three years. In October 2012, the SPT was notified that that as of January 2015 the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights will perform the function of Hungarian national preventive mechanism.<sup>1</sup> The

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/OPCAT/NPM/Hungary30102012.pdf>

Commissioner's role as the official NPM of Hungary was established under Chapter III/A of Act CXI of 2011 and came into effect in January 2015.<sup>2</sup>

11. Since its establishment in 2015 the NPM has carried out 15 visits to places of deprivation of liberty.<sup>3</sup> Due to the limited nature of the targeted budget support, the Commissioner had to allocate its own resources to the preparation for performing the tasks of the NPM. This amount was provided by Commissioner's Office through the transformation and reorganization of the operations of the Office.<sup>4</sup>

12. The Subcommittee was informed that compared to 2015 the budget of the Commissioner's Office has increased; however, there are no explicit provisions in the regulating acts regarding the earmarked funding of the NPM. In this connection the SPT underlines that the lack of budgetary independence negatively impacts the independent functioning of the NPM.

13. The Civic Consultative Body was established in 2014 for a period of three years to provide advice to the NPM. It is composed of representatives of independent organizations which are either invited, such as Hungarian Medical Chamber, the Hungarian Psychiatric Association, the Hungarian Dietetic Association and the Hungarian Bar Association, or selected as a result of a public call, such as Hungarian Helsinki Committee, Hungarian Civil Liberties Union, Menedék - Hungarian Association for Migrants, and Mental Disability Advocacy Center. According to the NPM Annual Report, the CCB provides comments and suggestions on the content of the NPM's annual schedule of visits and inspection priorities, working methods, reports and other publications, and the training plan for NPM's members.<sup>5</sup>

14. The SPT welcomes the fact that NPM has been operational for more than a year, has conducted several visits to places of deprivation of liberty in Hungary and published its first annual report.

### **III. Recommendations to the national preventive mechanism**

#### **A. Recommendations relating to legal, institutional and structural issues**

##### **Structure and independence**

15. As a general observation, the Subcommittee notes that the national preventive mechanism does not have an identity distinct from Office of the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights, not only with respect to its legal framework but also in relation to its institutional framework and guarantees of independence. The Subcommittee is particularly concerned about the lack of functional independence of the mechanism within the Office of the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights. While the Optional Protocol does not provide for a unique model for an Optional Protocol-compliant mechanism structure, it is imperative for the mechanism that it is able to carry out its mandate in accordance with the principles of the Optional Protocol, as reflected in the Subcommittee's NPM guidelines<sup>6</sup>

16. Even though the decision about the institutional format of the NPM is left to State parties' discretion, it is imperative that the legal acts regulating the work of the NPM must be in full compliance with the OPCAT, the NPM Guidelines<sup>7</sup>, and Paris Principles<sup>8</sup> as well as with the compilation of advice provided by the Subcommittee in response to requests from NPMs annexed to its ninth annual report.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Act CXI of 2011 (n 48) Chapter III/A.

<sup>3</sup> 'Comprehensive Annual Report of the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights on the Activities of the OPCAT National Preventive Mechanism in 2015' (May 2016), 38.

<sup>4</sup> *ibid*, section 2.4.

<sup>5</sup> 'Comprehensive Annual Report of the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights on the Activities of the OPCAT National Preventive Mechanism in 2015' (May 2016) 20.

<sup>6</sup> Guidelines on national preventive mechanisms (CAT/OP/12/5).

<sup>7</sup> *Idem*.

<sup>8</sup> Principles relating to the Status of National Institutions.

<sup>9</sup> CAT/OP/C/57/4, annex.

17. In this connection the Subcommittee urges the NPM in close cooperation with the State party to review the legal framework in which the mechanism operates and bring it into full conformity with all relevant international norms and guidelines with a view to solve existing or potential issues that may hinder the NPM to carry out its mandate effectively. The practical needs and the operability of the mechanism have also to be also taken into account. Therefore, **the Subcommittee recommends the NPM be enabled by means of legislation to exercise effectively its core functions as stipulated by the Optional Protocol.**

18. **In this connection the SPT recommends the NPM to carry out a mapping exercise to assess the range of activities it ought to undertake in accordance with the OPCAT, Paris Principles, NPM Guidelines, SPT Assessment Tool<sup>10</sup> and compare it against current structure and activities of the NPM.**

19. **The Subcommittee further recommends the NPM to carry out internal review of the existing legal acts stipulating the functioning of the mechanism in order to have full overview of all aspects that need to be revised to enable it to carry out its mandate effectively. The NPM has to be involved in the drafting of the amendments in close cooperation with the Ministry of Justice. Furthermore, the NPM, together with the authorities, has to work proactively on the possible solutions to increase the efficiency and independence of the Mechanism.**

#### **Human and financial resources**

20. According to the provisions of the Act CXLIII of 2011, the tasks related to the NPM shall be performed by at least eleven staff members of the Office of the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights.<sup>11</sup> During the SPT visit the NPM was composed of 9 staff members: two medical positions were vacant.

21. The Subcommittee is concerned that only 9 staff members perform tasks related to the mechanism's mandate that affects the ability of the mechanism to fully execute its mandate under the Optional Protocol. An effective system of regular visits to all the places of deprivation of liberty in the State party cannot function properly with limited number of staff and vacant medical positions. Moreover, the mechanism should have full operational autonomy with regard to hiring its staff, including medical, which is not currently the case. As explained by the NPM, there were legal caveats hindering the recruitment of medical personnel since reportedly all the NPM members had to be civil servants, whereas in Hungary doctors could not be civil servants.

22. The Subcommittee is further concerned that a lack of financial resources presents a major obstacle to the effective and efficient functioning of the national preventive mechanism. The designation of the Office of the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights as the national preventive mechanism of Hungary has not been followed by the allocation of sufficient resources necessary to allow the Office to undertake this additional role. The Subcommittee is further concerned that the failure to allocate necessary resources seems to be due to the fact that the government authorities do not consider that the mechanism needs additional support to carry out its mandate effectively. This is a misconception that the mechanism needs to address urgently.

23. The Subcommittee reminds the mechanism that the evaluation of its financial needs must take into account all its mandated activities under the Optional Protocol, including the provision of interpretation, when necessary, in order to communicate with detained migrants.

24. **Recalling that OPCAT article 18 (3) obliges States parties to provide NPMs with the necessary resources to undertake their work, the SPT reiterates that the NPM shall be provided with a budget sufficient for accomplishing all mandated tasks, in addition to granting the NPM the institutional autonomy to use its resources. This funding should be provided through a separate line in the national annual budget referring specifically to the NPM<sup>12</sup> and not through the general budget of the Office of the**

<sup>10</sup> Analytical assessment tool for national preventive mechanisms (CAT/OP/1/Rev.1).

<sup>11</sup> Chapter III/A, enacted by Section 9 of Act CXLIII of 2011, effective as of 1 January 2015.

<sup>12</sup> See Compilation of advice provided to NPMs, (CAT/OP/C/57/4), Part III.

**Commissioner. This funding shall be at such a level as to allow the NPM to carry out its visiting programme, to engage outside experts as and when appropriate, to increase its human resources and to regularly access training, in accordance with its own work plan.**

**25. In order to ensure the functional and operational independence of the NPM and with a view to clearly identify the nature and extent of these additional needs, the NPM has to enter into constructive dialogue with the relevant State authorities in order to ascertain what is needed by the NPM to permit it to properly fulfil its NPM mandate in accordance with the provisions of the OPCAT.**

**26. The Subcommittee recommends that the national preventive mechanism evaluate its financial needs in order to more effectively fulfil its mandate under the Optional Protocol, and that it submit proposals to the governmental authorities, as a matter of priority, concerning its financial needs.**

27. The above-mentioned exercise will make it possible to design concrete plans for development and future activities of the mechanism. Based on this exercise, the NPM can enter into constructive dialogue with the State authorities for concrete proposals, and that it may be provided with sufficient resources through a separate budget line.

#### **Cooperation with the Civic Consultative Body (CCB)**

28. The Subcommittee welcomes the cooperation established between the NPM and civil society organizations. Taking into consideration that NPM has only limited resources and given the number of places of detention in Hungary it is not feasible with such capacity to cover all the places of deprivation of liberty as well as to undertake other activities NPM is mandated to. Better communication and an improved coordination between the NPM and the Civic Consultative Body (CCB) is a key element for them to work efficiently as a collegial body.

**29. While recalling that the Optional Protocol envisages the NPM as a collegial body of experts, the Subcommittee urges the NPM to improve information sharing through regular meetings and other channels of communication in a collaborative manner as well as to adopt clearly defined working methods. It is recommended that the NPM in cooperation with the CCB establish clear and productive framework for cooperation and mutual enforcement.**

**30. The Subcommittee further recommends that the NPM engage more directly and independently with civil society organizations, including, at a minimum, through their increased participation in NPM visits, internal trainings, outreach activities, in report writing and in dialogue with the authorities.**

31. In this connection the SPT encourages to follow-up to the concrete proposals put forward during the joint CBB – NPM meeting held on 22 March 2017. This includes involving civil society experts in detention activities; creating a database of experts and including also the experts by experience in the monitoring teams; increasing the number of visits up to 25; consulting the CCB on the selection of the places to be visited by the NPM (one third to be selected by the CCB); discussing with the CCB the NPM report at least 2 weeks prior to its publication as well as following-up to the NPM recommendations with the latter; consulting with the CCB about the types of places to be visited and the methodology to be used; adopting Terms of Reference of the cooperation with the CCB, including on chairmanship and the venue of the NPM-CCB meetings.

**32. In addition, the Subcommittee recommends that the NPM ensure that the standard operating procedures are uniformly applied by all its staff and members of the CCB, with a view to ensuring consistency of working methods and sharing of knowledge among all. Adequate training for all persons participating in visits, including external experts, is essential and should be sought, including through the development of handbooks and assistance of international partners.**

33. **While noting the professionalism of some of the NPM members when conducting interviews with the detainees, the Subcommittee recommends that all NPM participants undergo regular trainings, including on interview techniques, visiting procedures and skills to detect signs and risks of torture and ill treatment, to develop working methods and a comprehensive visiting methodology that will highlight institutional and systematic challenges, including those affecting vulnerable populations in places where persons are deprived of liberty. Experienced NPM members could train the new members and the external experts on interviewing techniques.**

## **B. Recommendations on methodological issues relating to visits**

### **Work plan, reporting and follow-up**

34. The NPM plans its visiting activities on a yearly basis, taking into account the different type and geographical location of places of deprivation of liberty and the categories of persons deprived of liberty as well as thematic target(s) of the year. However, the SPT observed that the NPM is mainly focusing on detention monitoring activities.

35. **The Subcommittee recommends that the NPM should focus not only on visiting places of deprivation of liberty but also on other preventive activities. The Subcommittee further recommends the NPM to develop an annual plan of work which should include all preventive activities, such as commenting on draft legislation, awareness raising and training activities, in accordance with article 19 of the Optional Protocol and article 9 of the NPM assessment tool.**

36. **To properly fulfil its mandate under the Optional Protocol in various areas and keeping in mind its preventive role the NPM is advised to critically analyse its activities against relevant international guiding acts. Such an exercise can be done by using Subcommittee's NPM assessment tool<sup>13</sup> and its matrix. Having clear overview of areas that are insufficiently covered, the NPM can (together with its partners) make well-grounded working plan for immediate implementation and future development.**

37. Following the visits, the members of the visiting delegation prepare partial reports that are summarised by the head of visiting delegation. Visit reports are subsequently submitted to the respective authorities, as well as to the head of the place of detention concerned, the addressees of the recommendations, and the members of the CCB as well as to the Hungarian member of the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture. Then the visits reports are made publicly available in Hungarian. Some of them are also translated into English, depending on the availability of funds.

38. The Office of the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights publishes its annual reports and the reports on the inspections conducted by the NPM on Commissioner's website. However, the Subcommittee was informed that the drafting and publication of the NPM reports could take very long time due to the wish to aim for high quality and the comprehensiveness of the reports. In this regard the Subcommittee underlines that extended delays in drafting and publication of the reports can have a negative impact on the timely follow-up to the visit report recommendations and eventually overall conditions of people in detention.

39. While the Subcommittee notes that reports of visits are prepared and submitted to the authorities, it also notes that there is no clear policy concerning the systematic follow-up and dialogue procedure.

40. **Further to making the annual report public, pursuant to article 23 of the Optional Protocol, the Subcommittee recommends that it should be discussed publicly in parliament and widely publicized. The annual report of the NPM should be distinct from the annual report of the Office of the Commissioner for Fundamental.**

41. **The Subcommittee further recommends that the NPM enters into a continuous dialogue with the relevant State and other authorities as well as with other addressees**

<sup>13</sup> [http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/OPCAT/CAT-OP-1-Rev-1\\_en.pdf](http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/OPCAT/CAT-OP-1-Rev-1_en.pdf)

**of the recommendations, with a view to implementing the NPM's recommendations. Following the transmittal of the report, the mechanism should develop a strategy for following up on the recommendations and using the report as a platform for dialogue with the authorities of the place of detention visited as well as with the respective state or other authorities.**

42. **The Subcommittee also recommends that the mechanism meet with the relevant public authorities directly to discuss the implementation of its recommendations, in accordance with article 22 of the Optional Protocol. Finally, the mechanism should disseminate its annual reports, including by transmitting them to the Subcommittee, for the purposes set out in the Optional Protocol.**

#### **Recommendations on visit methodology**

43. During the joint visit to Budapest Remand Prison (Unit I), the Subcommittee was pleased to note that the NPM enjoyed full access to all facilities within the prison and had access to all information concerning numbers of detainees and conditions of detention.

44. *Preparations for visits:* taking into consideration that the year 2017 is dedicated to food/nutrition in the places of deprivation of liberty, the NPM shall collect overall information regarding the topic for appropriate state supervisory bodies in general and specific format before conducting the visit. This would enable the experts to understand better the situation in the place to be visited and to ensure the appropriate preparations for the visit. In case the NPM needs additional data from the administration of the place of detention they can provide the managements with the list of required information at the beginning of the visit so that all such information is ready to collect by the end of the visit or it can be sent via email. This will enable to save time on the spot for carrying out actual monitoring activities.

45. *Interviews:* The Subcommittee observed that during the joint visit the members of the NPM often introduced themselves as representatives of the Office of the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights, because the latter is more widely recognized and better known institution. This may lead to confusion about the separate mandates of each institution, by both detaining authorities and detainees. The Subcommittee also noted that the members of the mechanism were not clearly identified as such and some of them did not systematically introduce themselves to detainees as representatives from the national preventive mechanism and at times did not explicitly explain their mandate (including making a clear distinction between activities of the NPM and the Office of the Commissioner). In addition, some "exchanges of information" with detainees were conducted in the presence or in hearing distance of detention officers.

46. **The Subcommittee recommends that members of the NPM, particularly the external experts, introduce themselves to the interviewees with their name and the position they occupy within the mechanism. The Subcommittee is of the view that an appropriate and complete presentation builds trust with the interviewees and facilitates communication and information sharing. In addition, the visiting team should be clearly identified as the national preventive mechanism, for example, by wearing badges or vests, and provide an information leaflet to the authorities as well as to the detainees.**

47. *Confidentiality and risk of reprisals:* The Subcommittee reiterates that the location where the individual interviews take place should be carefully chosen to ensure that the content of the interview remains confidential and that the "do no harm" principle is applied, without exception. The interviewers should also indicate that the interviewees can report any reprisal they may face subsequent to the visit and encourage them to do so. If necessary, follow-up visits should be conducted. The Subcommittee underlines the need always to seek ways to protect those interviewed from possible reprisals, even when there appears to be little risk. The Subcommittee noted that the mechanism did not mention to the authorities of the place of detention at the final debriefing that any form of intimidation or reprisal against persons deprived of their liberty constitutes a violation of the State party's obligation.<sup>14</sup>

48. The Subcommittee recommends that the national preventive mechanism always consider that there is a risk of intimidation, sanctions or reprisals, and therefore take steps to

---

<sup>14</sup> Article 13 of the Convention and article 20 of the Optional Protocol.



address that risk. In addition to the precautions mentioned above, the mechanism should clearly inform the authorities that reprisal of any kind is impermissible, will be reported and will be followed up by the mechanism. This is done with the clear intention of ensuring that those responsible for such reprisals are promptly investigated, and if found guilty, receive appropriate penalties. The mechanism should also, inter alia, undertake preventive follow-up visits.

### **Visibility and awareness**

49. The Subcommittee observed a lack of visibility of the NPM among the authorities, and among persons deprived of their liberty, something which may have a detrimental effect on NPM's efficiency and effectiveness. In many places of deprivation of liberty neither the administration nor persons held in detention were aware of the NPM, its role and/or function. Moreover, the Subcommittee is further under the impression that some officials in places of detention are not familiar with recommendations of the NPM after their institutions were visited by the NPM.

50. **The Subcommittee recommends increasing the visibility of the NPM, including through activities that raise awareness of the OPCAT and of the NPM mandate. The NPM should undertake activities to increase the awareness of the general public, and especially persons deprived of their liberty, about its mission and its mandate. The NPM should engage in legislative processes, advocacy, which NPMs are encouraged to undertake under OPCAT article 19, and which increases their overall visibility. The Subcommittee further recommends the NPM to engage in outreach activities and other events as appropriate.**

51. **The Subcommittee also recommends elaborating and distributing further materials on the NPM's mandate and activities to personnel and detainees in the places of deprivation of liberty, and to the civil society at large to increase the visibility of the NPM as well as enhance understanding about its mandate.**

## **IV. Final recommendations**

52. **In conclusion, the Subcommittee is aware that the national preventive mechanism of Hungary is facing complex challenges regarding its legal, institutional and structural framework. It recommends that the mechanism take a proactive attitude and submit to the authorities a proposal to revise its legal, institutional and structural framework, including within the Office of the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights, and to submit proposals on how to secure the necessary financial resources, further to a thorough internal evaluation of the level of financial resources needed to adequately fulfil its mandate under the Optional Protocol.**

53. **In the light of scarcity of human and financial resources available to the national preventive mechanism, the Subcommittee recommends that the mechanism also increase its international cooperation with other national preventive mechanisms to reinforce its capacities, share information and practices and develop its working methods so as to improve its ability to carry out its mandate under the Optional Protocol adequately.**

54. **The Subcommittee also recommends that the NPM continue to develop its capacity through increasing cooperation with the Subcommittee, as well as through engagement with other NPMs and appropriate NPM networks.**

55. The Subcommittee regards its visit and the present report as the beginning of a constructive dialogue with the national preventive mechanism of Hungary. The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights stands ready to provide technical assistance and advice to the mechanism to reinforce its capacity to prevent torture and ill-treatment in all places of deprivation of liberty in the State party and to make the common goal of prevention a reality.

56. The Subcommittee recalls that prevention of torture constitutes an ongoing and wide-ranging obligation of the State party, the likelihood of whose achievement is greatly enhanced

by an efficient mechanism. The Subcommittee encourages the mechanism to review and strengthen its working methods and to avail itself of training courses to improve its ability to discharge its responsibilities under the Optional Protocol, including through the assistance of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights with following up on the present recommendations.

57. The Subcommittee also encourages the mechanism to transmit its annual reports to the Subcommittee, and reaffirms its readiness to help in achieving the shared aims of preventing torture and ill-treatment and ensuring that commitments are translated into action.

58. **The Subcommittee recommends that the mechanism make the present report public, and requests that it be notified of the mechanism's decision in this regard.**

## Annexes

### Annex I

#### **List of places of deprivation of liberty visited by the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture**

Correctional educational institution for juveniles, Aszod  
 Correctional educational institution for juveniles, Budapest  
 Correctional educational institution for juveniles, Debrecen  
 Correctional educational institution and child care home of Rákospalota for girls and young mothers (EMMI)

Békéscaba asylum detention centre  
 Kiskunhalas Immigration Detention Centre  
 Niyarbator Guarded Asylum Centre  
 Niyarbator Immigration Detention Centre (Alien Policing)  
 Rözske transit zone  
 Tompa transit zone

Budapest Strict and Medium Regime Prison  
 Budapest Remand Prison (Units II and III)  
 Hajdú-Bihar County Remand Prison (Debrecen)  
 Szeged Strict and Medium Regime Prison (Units I and II)  
 Tököl National Prison

Budapest Police Station Központi Fogda  
 Budapest district police station (BRFK III)  
 Budapest district police station (BRFK VII)  
 Budapest district police station (BRFK VIII)  
 Budapest district police station (BRFK IX)

Debrecen police station Debreceni Rendőrkapitányság  
 Debrecen police station Debreceni Rendőrkapitányság Fogda- és Kísérőőri Alosztály  
 Gyöngyös police station (Gyöngyösi Rendőrkapitányság)  
 Szeged police station (Szegedi Rendőrkapitányság)

Forensic Psychiatric and Mental Health Institution (IMEI), Budapest  
 Central Penitentiary Hospital, Tököl

#### **Joint visit with the NPM**

Budapest Remand Prison (Unit I)

## **Annex II**

### **List of officials and other persons with whom the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture met**

#### **Ministry of Interior**

Mátyás Hegyaljai, Deputy State Secretary for European Union Affairs and International Relations

Tímea Erzsébet Lehoczki, Deputy Head of Department of European Cooperation

Gábor Tóthi, Head of Unit (Department of European Cooperation)

János Iványi, Legal Expert (Department of European Cooperation)

#### **National Police Headquarters**

Tibor Lakatos, Police Colonel

László Balázs, Police Colonel

Csaba Borsa, Police Lieutenant-Colonel

Emese Kertész, Police Lieutenant-Colonel

#### **Hungarian Prison Service Headquarters**

Róbert Bogotyán, Prison Guard, Lieutenant Colonel

Gergely Vattay, Head of Department of Legal Issues

#### **Hungarian Immigration and Asylum Office**

Gyula Mikolicz

Katalin Miklós

#### **Independent Police Compliant Body**

Nóra Fráterné Ferenczy

Dóra Deák-Kondákor

#### **Ministry of Justice**

Anikó Raisz, Political Adviser.

Zoltán Tallódi, Deputy Head of Department of Human Rights

Gergely Kunyák, Prosecutor, Department of Criminal Procedure.

Veronika Pázsit, Legal Expert, Department of Criminal Law and Penal Law

Balázs Belovics, Legislator, Department of Criminal Law and Penal Law

#### **Office of the Prosecutor General of Hungary**

András Szűcs, Prosecutor, Head of Unit

#### **Central Investigative Prosecutor's Office**

Rolland Waltner, Deputy Prosecutor General

Zoltán Margl, Deputy Prosecutor General

#### **Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade**

Tamás Kuntár, Head of Department of International Organisations

Ágnes Hegyesi, Deputy Head of Department of International Organisations

Marianna Klaudia Lévai, Human Rights Expert, Department of International

#### **Ministry of Human Capacities**

Csilla Lantai, Deputy Head of Department

Éva Bódy, Deputy Head of Department

Éva Dr Gellénné dr Lukács, Advisor

Edina Molnár, Social Expert

Judit Mária Tóth, Health Care Expert

#### **Representatives of Hungarian Parliament**

Márk Ádám Janó

Csaba Gergely Tamás  
Szilvia Madarasi  
Mónika Pozsgai

**National Preventive Mechanism**

Laszlo Szekely, Commissioner for Fundamental Rights  
Gergely Fliegau, Head of the OPCAT Department  
Katalin Haraszti, Deputy Head of the OPCAT Department  
Members of the OPCAT Department and Civic Consultative Body

**United Nations**

Montserrat Feixas Vihe, UNHCR Regional Representative for Central Europe

---