



Report of Various Size – Fieldwork research (FRANET)

Criminal Detention in the EU – Conditions and Monitoring

Country Report Latvia

FRANET Contractor: Latvian Centre for Human Rights
Final Submission: June 2018

DISCLAIMER: This document was commissioned under contract as background material for a comparative analysis by the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) for the project 'Criminal Detention – Conditions and Monitoring'. The information and views contained in the document do not necessarily reflect the views or the official position of the FRA. The document is made publicly available for transparency and information purposes only and does not constitute legal advice or legal opinion.

1. Cell space

- a) What is the national standard for cell space available to prisoners in m²? Is it regulated by any legal instrument, such as a legislative act, internal prison regulations, manuals, policy papers etc.?

The national standard for living space per prisoner should not be less than 4m² in multi-occupancy cells, and 9 m² in single occupancy cells. It is regulated by the Latvian Sentence Enforcement Code (sentenced prisoners). The national standard for living space per (pre-trial) prisoner should not be less than 4m² (Law on the Procedure of Holding of Pre-Trial Detainees).

- b) Please indicate whether there are different standards applicable to different detention regimes (for example, if applicable in your jurisdiction: open, semi-open, closed etc.).

There are no different standards applicable to different detention regimes.

- c) Please, provide a link to the National Preventive Mechanism's reports **from the reference period** (1 January 2015 to 1 May 2018, if no report is available for this period, please provide a link to the most recent one) and whether there are any recommendations regarding this aspect (please provide the exact quotation in the national language and if official translation is available – in English). These reports can be found on the web-page of the National Preventive Mechanism. For ease of reference a list of links can be found here: <https://apt.ch/en/list-of-designated-npm-by-regions-and-countries/>

Latvia has neither signed nor ratified OPCAT, and there is no body designated as an NPM. The Ombudsman's Office which is mandated to conduct monitoring to places of detention does not publish prison monitoring visit reports. However, some selected information is included in their annual reports.

The most recent comprehensive publicly accessible report on prison conditions is the Council of Europe CPT 2016 visit report to Latvia, which was made public in 2017. The CPT "noted [...] that, with some exceptions [...], the new national minimum standard of 4 m² per prisoner was observed in all the establishments visited."

Please cite any relevant sources

Latvia, Sentence enforcement code (*Sodu izpildes kodekss*), Section 77 (1), 23 December 1970, available in Latvian at <https://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=90218>

Latvia, Law on the procedure of holding of pre-trial detainees (*Apcietinājumā turēšanas kārtības likums*), 22 June 2006, available in Latvian at <https://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=138990>

Council of Europe, European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) (2017), *Report to the Latvian Government on the visit to Latvia carried out by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment from 12 to 22 April 2016*, para 40, Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 29 June 2017, available at <https://rm.coe.int/pdf/168072ce4f>

2. Sanitary Facilities

- a) What is the national standard with regard to access to toilets? Are these located in cells? If not, do prisoners have access to these facilities without undue delay, even during the night? Do these facilities offer privacy to prisoners who use them?

There is no national standard with regard to access to toilets. According to the Section 77 of the Sentence Execution Code “convicted persons who are serving sentences in deprivation of liberty institutions shall be provided with living conditions in conformity with epidemiological safety and hygienic provisions.” According to the Section 19 (5) of the Law on the Procedure of Holding Pre-Trial Detainees cells are to be equipped with sanitary annex which is separated from the rest of the cell.

Cells have in-cell sanitation. Privacy concerning toilets varies across different prisons, and different prison sections.

- b) What is the national standard with regard to access to regularly cleaned shower/bathing facilities? How often is this access provided? Do these facilities offer privacy to prisoners who use them?

Rule 19 of the Cabinet of Ministers Regulations Nr 423 on the Rules of Internal Order in Places of Deprivation of Liberty of 30 May 2006 (*Brīvības atņemšanas iestādes iekšējās kārtības noteikumi*) provides that “a sentenced prisoner shall no fewer than in seven days take a shower or a bath.” Showers and baths are communal facilities. In the case of pre-trial prisoners the same standard is set in the Law on the Procedure of Holding Pre-Trial Detainees (Section 19 (6)).

- c) Is the provision of cleanly sanitary facilities regulated by any legal instrument such as a legislative act, internal prison regulations, manuals, policy papers etc.?

In the case of pre-trial prisoners access to shower/bathing facilities is regulated by law, in the case of sentenced prisoners, it is regulated by government regulations.

- d) *Please indicate whether there are different standards applicable to different detention regimes (for example, if applicable in your jurisdiction: open, semi-open, closed etc.).*

There are no different standards applicable to different prison regimes in Latvia.

- e) *Please, provide a link to the National Preventive Mechanism’s reports **from the reference period** (1 January 2015 to 1 May 2018, if no report is available for this =period, please provide a link to the most recent one) and whether there are any recommendations regarding this aspect (please provide the exact quotation in the national language and if official translation is available – in English). These reports can be found on the web-page of the National Preventive Mechanism. For ease of reference a list of links can be found here: <https://apt.ch/en/list-of-designated-npm-by-regions-and-countries/>*

Latvia has neither signed nor ratified OPCAT and there is no body designated as an NPM. The Ombudsman’s Office which is mandated to conduct monitoring to places of detention does not publish prison monitoring visit reports. However, sometimes selected information is included in their annual reports.

In its 2016 Report to Latvia, the CPT highlighted that at the *Daugavpils Section of Daugavgrīva Prison*, [...] the in-cell toilets were not fully partitioned in multiple-occupancy cells. In *Grīva Section of the Daugavgrīva Prison* in-cell sanitary facilities in a large number of cells were in an appalling state of hygiene. (para 47) It recommended that “immediate measures should be taken at the *Grīva Section of Daugavgrīva Prison* to ensure an acceptable level of hygiene throughout the prison (in particular, the in-cell sanitary facilities).”

Central Prison, Block 1 and 2 - in-cell toilets were often not fully partitioned.

Concerning access to showers, [...] the delegation received many complaints from prisoners that access to a shower was offered only once a week, which was not sufficient to maintain their personal hygiene. The CPT recommends that prisoners be allowed more frequent access to shower facilities, taking into account Rule 19.4 of the European Prison Rules²⁴. (para 53)

Please cite any relevant sources

Latvia, Sentence enforcement code (*Sodu izpildes kodekss*), 23 December 1970, available in Latvian at <https://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=90218>

Latvia, Cabinet of Ministers Regulations No. 423 on the Rules of internal order in places of deprivation of liberty (*Ministru kabineta noteikumi Nr.423 Brīvības atņemšanas iestādes iekšējās kārtības noteikumi*), 30 May 2006, available in Latvian at <https://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=136495>

Latvia, Law on the procedure of holding of pre-trial detainees (*Apcietinājumā turēšanas kārtības likums*), 22 June 2006, available in Latvian at <https://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=138990>

Council of Europe, European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) (2017), *Report to the Latvian Government on the visit to Latvia carried out by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment from 12 to 22 April 2016*, Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 29 June 2017, available at <https://rm.coe.int/pdf/168072ce4f>

3. Time out of cell

- a) What is the national standard set for time per day/week spent by prisoners outside of their cells:
- a. Outdoors (within the boundary of the prison)?

The national standard set for outdoors is for out-door-exercise - not less than one hour per day for both sentenced and pre-trial prisoners. For pre-trial prisoners, if advised by doctor, it can be 1.5 hours (Law on the Holding of Pre-Trial Detainees, Section 13)

Juveniles in pre-trial detention have the right to no less than 2 hours of outdoor exercise per day. (Law on the Holding of Pre-Trial Detainees, Section 18 (1) 2). If a juvenile in pre-trial detention has been placed in a disciplinary cell, they are entitled to no less than 1.5 hour of outdoor exercise per day. (Law on the Holding of Pre-Trial Detainees, Section 18 (3).) Sentenced prisoners placed in disciplinary cells have the right to one hour outdoor exercise per day. (Sentence Enforcement Code, Section 74 para 2))

- b. Indoors in the common area?

Starting from prisoners serving their sentence in the medium regime of closed prison through all regimes in semi-closed prison, they have the right to remain in a specific area outside their cell from wake-up time in the morning until the time of retirement in the evening. There is no national standard set per day or per week. Internal prison rules provide for daily prison regime which includes time for work, education, regime activities, meals, head counts, out-door-exercise, rest time, and non-stop eight hour sleep time.

- b) Are sports or other recreational and educational facilities available to prisoners? If so what types?

Sports and educational facilities are available to prisoners. Sports facilities include gyms of smaller or larger size. Educational facilities include classrooms, workshops for the acquisition of general education,

technical and vocational secondary education and participation in informal education programmes. Educational and vocational programmes are available in 9 out of 10 prisons which co-operate with general secondary schools, technical and vocational secondary schools.

- c) Is time spent in cells regulated by any legal instrument, such as a legislative act, internal prison regulations, manuals, policy papers etc.?

Time spent in cells (e.g. sleep time) is regulated by internal prison rules.

- d) *Please indicate whether there are different standards applicable to different detention regimes (for example, if applicable in your jurisdiction: open, semi-open, closed etc.).*

The right to remain in a specific area outside their cell from wake-up time in the morning until time of retirement in the evening is not applicable to prisoners serving their sentence in the lowest regime of closed prison. Prisoners sentenced to life imprisonment are also subject to a different prison regime.

Prisoners in open prison live in common dormitory-type premises and are allowed to leave the prison for 2-5 days a month if disciplinary measures have not been applied to them during last 30 days.

- e) *Please, provide a link to the National Preventive Mechanism's reports **from the reference period** (1 January 2015 to 1 May 2018, if no report is available for this period, please provide a link to the most recent one) and whether there are any recommendations regarding this aspect (please provide the exact quotation in the national language and if official translation is available – in English). These reports can be found on the web-page of the National Preventive Mechanism. For ease of reference a list of links can be found here: <https://apt.ch/en/list-of-designated-npm-by-regions-and-countries/>*

Latvia has neither signed nor ratified OPCAT and there is no body designated as an NPM. The Ombudsman's Office which is mandated to conduct monitoring to places of detention does not publish prison monitoring visit reports. Hence, there is no reference in the APT list. However, sometimes selected information is included in their annual reports.

In its 2016 visit report to Latvia CPT calls upon the Latvian authorities to take the necessary steps at Daugavgrīva and Rīga Central Prisons to devise and implement a comprehensive regime of out-of-cell activities (including group association activities) for all prisoners, including sentenced prisoners on the low regime level and prisoners on remand. The aim should be to ensure that all prisoners are able to spend a reasonable part of the day (i.e. eight hours or more) outside their cells engaged in purposeful activities of a varied nature (work, preferably with a vocational value; education; sport; recreation/association). Further, steps should be taken at Jelgava Prison to increase the number of prisoners taking part in purposeful out-of-cell activities, with a particular focus on prisoners who are on the low regime level. (para 58)

CPT also concluded that in both prisons [Daugavgrīva and Jelgava Prisons], inmates on the medium and high regime levels benefited from an open-door policy; they had ready access during the day to the fitness room within each unit at Jelgava, and to facilities such as a library, an open-air fitness area and a small football field at Daugavgrīva. (para 56)

Please cite any relevant sources

Council of Europe, European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) (2017), *Report to the Latvian Government on the visit to Latvia carried out by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment from 12 to 22 April 2016*, para 40, Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 29 June 2017, available at <https://rm.coe.int/pdf168072ce4f>

Latvia, Cabinet of Ministers Regulations No. 423 on the Rules of internal order in places of deprivation of liberty (*Ministru kabineta noteikumi Nr.423 Brīvības atņemšanas iestādes iekšējās kārtības noteikumi*), 30 May 2006, available in Latvian at <https://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=136495>

Latvia, Law on the procedure of holding of pre-trial detainees (*Apcietinājumā turēšanas kārtības likums*), 22 June 2006, available in Latvian at <https://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=138990>

4. Solitary confinement

- a) What is the national standard set regarding solitary confinement? Is it regulated by any legal instrument, such as a legislative act, internal prison regulations, manuals, policy papers etc.?

Solitary confinement is generally used for disciplinary purposes (up to 15 days in case of adults and 10 days in case of juveniles) for systematic or grave violations of prison regime. (Sentence Enforcement Code, Section 70 6), 7)). However, there are cases when solitary confinement is used for protection or for holding prisoners with constant behavioural problems.

- b) *Please indicate whether there are different standards applicable to different detention regimes (for example, if applicable in your jurisdiction: open, semi-open, closed etc.).*

There are no different standards applicable to different detention regimes.

- c) *Please, provide a link to the National Preventive Mechanism's reports **from the reference period** (1 January 2015 to 1 May 2018, if no report is available for this period, please provide a link to the most recent one) and whether there are any recommendations regarding this aspect (please provide the exact quotation in the national language and if official translation is available – in English). These reports can be found on the web-page of the National Preventive Mechanism. For ease of reference a list of links can be found here: <https://apt.ch/en/list-of-designated-npm-by-regions-and-countries/> Latvia has neither signed nor ratified OPCAT and there is no body designated as an NPM. The Ombudsman's Office which is mandated to conduct monitoring to places of detention does not publish prison monitoring visit reports. Hence, there is no reference in the APT list. However, sometimes selected information is included in their annual reports.*

In its 2016 visit report to Latvia, the CPT reiterated its recommendation that immediate steps be taken to ensure that no prisoner is held continuously in disciplinary isolation for longer than the maximum time limit of 15 days. If the prisoner has been sanctioned to disciplinary confinement for a total of more than 15 days in relation to two or more offences, there should be an interruption of several days in the disciplinary confinement at the 15-day stage. The Committee would also like to stress once again that it would be preferable to lower the maximum possible period of disciplinary confinement for a given offence.

Please cite any relevant sources

Latvia, Law on the procedure of holding of pre-trial detainees (*Apcietinājumā turēšanas kārtības likums*), 22 June 2006, available in Latvian at <https://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=138990>

Council of Europe, European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) (2017), *Report to the Latvian Government on the visit to Latvia carried out by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment from 12 to 22 April 2016*, para 40, Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 29 June 2017, available at <https://rm.coe.int/pdf/168072ce4f>

5. Access to healthcare

- a) What is the national standard with regard to access to medical services in prisons? (*E.g. do prisoners have prompt access to medical services within prisons or externally? Do prisoners have access to dentists and opticians?*)

In Latvia, the responsibility for health care in prisons lies primarily with the Ministry of Justice. Prisoners have access to primary health care provided by the prison health care unit, emergency dental services, secondary health care services provided by prison health care unit or Central Prison Hospital. Prisoner out-patient care is provided by prison health care unit, while in-patient health care is provided by the Central Prison Hospital.

Secondary health care services which cannot be provided within the prison system are provided externally.

- b) Are there any special provisions relating to the provision of specialist care? (*E.g. for long-term diseases, for sick and elderly prisoners, the mentally ill, drug addicted prisoners etc.*)
There are no special provisions relating to the provision of specialist care.
- c) Is access to healthcare in prisons regulated by any legal instrument, such as a legislative act, internal prison regulations, manuals, policy papers etc.?

At the statutory level of laws, e.g. the Epidemiological Safety Law, the Medical Treatment Law and Patients' Rights Law enacted by the Parliament, there are no special provisions concerning issues pertaining to prisons and prisoners. Access to health care in prisons is regulated by the Cabinet of Ministers Regulations Nr 276 of 2 June 2015 On the Procedure for Implementing Health Care of Pre-Trial Detainees and Sentenced Prisoners (*Ministru kabineta noteikumi Nr.276 Apcietināto un notiesāto personu veselības aprūpes īstenošanas kārtība*)

- d) Please indicate whether there are different standards applicable to different detention regimes.

There are no different standards applicable to different detention regimes.

- e) Please, provide a link to the National Preventive Mechanism's reports from the reference period (1 January 2015 to 1 May 2018, if no report is available for this period, please provide a link to the most recent one) and whether there are any recommendations regarding this aspect (please provide the exact quotation in the national language and if official translation is available – in English). These reports can be found on the web-page of the National Preventive Mechanism. For ease of reference a list of links can be found here: <https://apt.ch/en/list-of-designated-npm-by-regions-and-countries/>

The CPT 2016 visit revealed that the health-care teams in most of the prisons (Daugavgrīva, Central and Jelgava Prisons) visited were under-resourced. In particular, the CPT was concerned to learn that some establishments had not been attended by a general practitioner (e.g. Cēsis Correctional Institution) or by a dentist and a psychiatrist (e.g. Daugavgrīva Prison) for a very long time. The number of vacant posts was high, and, as acknowledged by the prison administration, the relatively low remuneration offered did little to attract medical professionals to this challenging field.

CPT urged the Latvian authorities to give the highest priority to addressing the causes of the persistent problem of vacancies among medical personnel in prison establishments.

The CPT recommended that the Latvian authorities take the necessary steps to ensure that there is a sufficient supply of appropriate medication at Daugavgrīva Prison. It is essential that prisoners without resources are able to receive the medication that their state of health requires.

The CPT urged the Latvian authorities to develop a comprehensive strategy for the provision of assistance to prisoners with drug-related problems (as part of a wider national drugs strategy).

Serious problems with access to dental care were also recognised in the information report “On the organisation and financing of health care in the prison system” drafted by the Ministry of Health Care in co-operation with the Ministry of Justice in autumn 2017. Lack of dentists within the prison, unwillingness by external dentist offices to provide services to prisoners (e.g. of 20 dentist offices in the 2nd largest city Daugavpils, only two were willing to provide dental services to prisoners), high transportation costs to external dentist offices were cited as key challenges.

Please cite any relevant sources

Latvia, Cabinet of Ministers Regulations No. 276 on the Procedure for implementing health care of pre-trial detainees and sentenced prisoners (*Ministru kabineta noteikumi Nr.276 Apcietināto un notiesāto personu veselības aprūpes īstenošanas kārtība*), 2 June 2015, available in Latvian at <https://likumi.lv/ta/id/274511-apcietinato-un-notiesato-personu-veselibas-aprupes-istenosanas-kartiba>

Latvia, Ministry of Health (2017), *Informative report on the organisation and financing of health care in the prison system (Informatīvais ziņojums Par veselības aprūpes organizēšanu un finansēšanu ieslodzījuma vietās)*, available in Latvian at <http://tap.mk.gov.lv/lv/mk/tap/?pid=40441420&mode=mk&date=2018-04-17>

Kamenska, A., Olsena, S. (2016), *Improving prison conditions by strengthening the monitoring of HIV, HCV, TB and harm reduction mapping report Latvia*, Riga, Latvian Centre for Human Rights, p. 60, available at http://cilvektiesibas.org.lv/media/attachments/20/06/2016/PrisonProjectReport_Latvia_3.pdf

6. Special measures in place to protect juvenile prisoners.

- a) Are there any legal instruments, such as a legislative act, internal prison regulations, manuals, policy papers etc. regulating the separation of juvenile prisoners from adults? (e.g. a separate juvenile ward, or part of the building, canteen, common area etc.?)

Sentenced juveniles are held separately from sentenced adults. (Sentence Enforcement Code, Section 18 para 1). Juveniles in pre-trial are held separately from adults. (Law on the Procedure of Holding Pre-Trial Prisoners, Section 11 (2)).

Sentenced male juveniles shall serve their prison sentence in juvenile correctional facilities. Sentenced female juveniles shall serve their prison sentence in separate wards in women's prison equipped for the needs of juveniles. (Sentence Enforcement Code, Section 13 para 3).

In Latvia, for male juvenile prisoners (sentenced/pre-trial) there is only one correctional/educational facility while juvenile girls are accommodated in a separate ward in the only women's prison.

- b) What age category falls under this specific juvenile prison regime?

Normally under 18 years of age. Sentenced juveniles who have reached the age of 18, upon the decision of the prison evaluation commission may be transferred to adult prisons, if their conduct excludes the possibility for them to remain in the juvenile facility or benefit from early release. In this case, sentenced juveniles shall be transferred to high regime of the semi-closed prison.

In order to strengthen the results of resocialisation and to provide an opportunity to receive general education or vocational experience, upon the decision of the evaluation commission the juvenile may be allowed to remain in the correctional educational facility until the end of the school year or the end of the prison sentence, but no later than 25 years of age. In exceptional case, upon the decision of the evaluation commission, a sentenced prisoner may be allowed to remain beyond 25 years of age until the end of the school year. (Sentence Enforcement Code, Section 50.7).

Juveniles, pre-trial detainees who have reached the age of 18, by the decision of the Director of Prison Services, shall be transferred to pre-trial prison accommodating adults. To strengthen the results of social rehabilitation and to provide an opportunity to receive general or professional education, pre-trial detainees who have reached the age of 18, may, upon the decision of the Director of Prison Services remain in the pre-trial prison accommodating juveniles by the day of the coming into force of the court decision, but no later than the age of 21. In exceptional cases, upon the decision of the Director of Prison Services, a pre-trial detainee who has reached the age of 21, may remain in the pre-trial prison for juveniles until the end of the school year. Decisions of the Director of Prisons Services cannot be challenged or appealed. (Law on the Holding of Pre-Trial Detainees, Section 18 (5)).

- c) *Please indicate whether there are different standards applicable to different detention regimes (for example, if applicable in your jurisdiction: open, semi-open, closed etc.).*

There are no different standards applicable to different detention regimes, except for sentenced juvenile prisoners (up to 25 years of age) and pre-trial juvenile prisoners (up to 21 years of age)

- d) *Please, provide a link to the National Preventive Mechanism's reports **from the reference period** (1 January 2015 to 1 May 2018, if no report is available for this period, please provide a link to the most recent one) and whether there are any recommendations regarding this aspect (please provide the exact quotation in the national language and if official translation is available – in English).*

Latvia has neither signed nor ratified OPCAT and there is no body designated as an NPM. The Ombudsman's Office which is mandated to conduct monitoring to places of detention does not publish prison monitoring visit reports. Hence, there is no reference in the APT list. However, sometimes selected information is included in their annual reports.

Please cite any relevant sources

Latvia, Law on the procedure of holding of pre-trial detainees (*Apcietinājuma turēšanas kārtības likums*), 22 June 2006, available in Latvian at <https://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=138990>

Latvia, Sentence enforcement code (*Sodu izpildes kodekss*), 23 December 1970, available in Latvian at <https://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=90218>

7. Special measures in place to protect prisoners from violence

- a) *Are any special measures in place to protect prisoners against violence, including sexual violence? (E.g. are prisoners supervised by prison staff? Are there emergency call buttons? Do guards receive training in de-escalation? Do prisoners have access to a complaints mechanism?)*

The allocation of prisoners in the unit, ward and cell of the specific prison is determined by the prisoners allocation commission of the specific prison in line with psychological compatibility of prisoners, health situation, attitude towards smoking, security criteria (previous criminal experience). (Section 13.², SEC).

Convicted prisoners whose personal characteristics criminal record negatively impacts other convicted prisoners and who subjugate and use others are held separately from other prisoners. (Section 18, SEC)

Prisoners are supervised by prison staff, but situation varies across the prison system due to prison staff shortages. Most cells do not have emergency call buttons, except for those in newly refurbished wards.

Prisoners can complain to internal investigation unit of the Latvian Prison Administration and Office of the Prosecutor General. Depending on the the case, the prisoner can be moved to another cell, ward or prison.

- b) Are there any special measures in place to protect LGBTI prisoners, who are particularly vulnerable to violence/sexual violence?

There are no special measures in place to protect LGBTI prisoners other than measures in relation to vulnerable prisoners.

- c) Are these measures regulated by any legal instrument, such as a legislative act, internal prison regulations, manuals, policy papers etc.?

General criteria in Sentence Enforcement Code and Law on the Procedure of Holding Pre-Trial Prisoners.

- d) *Please indicate whether there are different standards applicable to different detention regimes (for example, if applicable in your jurisdiction: open, semi-open, closed etc.).*

There is no publicly available information on the existence of different standards applicable to different regimes.

- e) *Please, provide a link to the National Preventive Mechanism's reports from the reference period (1 January 2015 to 1 May 2018, if no report is available for this period, please provide a link to the most recent one) and whether there are any recommendations regarding this aspect (please provide the exact quotation in the national language and if official translation is available – in English) These reports can be found on the web-page of the National Preventive Mechanism. For ease of reference a list of links can be found here: <https://apt.ch/en/list-of--designated-npmb-by-regions-and-countries/>*

In its 2016 visit report to Latvia, the CPT findings at Daugavgrīva, Jelgava and Rīga Central Prisons indicate “that inter-prisoner violence remained a problem. As in the past, this state of affairs appeared to be the result of a combination of factors, including an insufficient staff presence in prisoner accommodation areas, the existence of informal prisoner hierarchies and the lack of purposeful activities for most inmates. The CPT recommends that the Latvian authorities vigorously pursue their efforts to combat the phenomenon of inter-prisoner violence. It also calls upon the authorities to review staffing levels at Daugavgrīva, Jelgava and Rīga Central Prisons, with a view to increasing the number of custodial staff present in the detention areas.” (p.6)

At Daugavgrīva, Jelgava and Rīga Central Prisons, information gathered through interviews with staff and inmates and an examination of registers of body injuries indicated that inter-prisoner violence remained a problem. The delegation gained the impression that efforts were being made by the management of the prisons concerned to prevent incidents of inter-prisoner violence, in particular by segregating prisoners who were vulnerable and/or sought protection and prisoners known for aggressive behaviour towards fellow-

inmates. [...] it also transpired that all alleged or detected incidents of inter-prisoner violence, as well as any injuries indicative of such violence, were recorded by staff (including health-care staff) and reported to the internal investigation unit of the Latvian Prison Administration. However, as acknowledged by staff, even the inquiries regarding cases clearly indicative of the infliction of bodily injuries were usually inconclusive, as the victims chose not to denounce the perpetrators (as did any witnesses among the prisoners) and claimed to have sustained the injuries accidentally. (para 44)

Please cite any relevant sources

Latvia, Sentence enforcement code (*Sodu izpildes kodekss*), 23 December 1970, available in Latvian at <https://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=90218>

Council of Europe, European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) (2017), *Report to the Latvian Government on the visit to Latvia carried out by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment from 12 to 22 April 2016*, para 40, Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 29 June 2017, available at <https://rm.coe.int/pdf/168072ce4f>

8. Responsible authorities

- a) What authority is responsible for the provision of additional information requested under Article 15 of the EAW Framework Decision? *(Please specify whether there a central authority deals with these requests, if yes, please provide contact details, such as the name of the institution, a website, physical and email addresses, and a telephone number. In the absence of a central authority, who deals with those requests?)*

Office of the Prosecutor General is the responsible central authority.

LR Ģenerālprokuratūra
International Co-operation Department
Address: Kalpaka bulvāris 6, Rīga, LV 1801
e-mail: Int.coop@lrp.gov.lv
phone: + 371 67044448
website: <http://www.prokuratūra.gov.lv/lv>

- b) What authority is responsible for monitoring conditions of detention and putting forward recommendations?

Ombudsman of the Republic of Latvia (LR Tiesībsargs) is the authority responsible for monitoring conditions of detention and putting forward recommendations,

Please cite any relevant sources