

# United States Court of Appeals For the First Circuit

No. 20-1611

GLEN PLOURDE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF MAINE; WILLIAM ANDERSON, Penobscot County Superior Court Justice;  
CHARLES F. BUDD, JR., Newport District Court Judge; PENOBSCOT COUNTY DISTRICT  
ATTORNEY'S OFFICE; MARIANNE LYNCH, Penobscot County Assistant District Attorney;  
STEPHEN BURLOCK, Penobscot County Assistant District Attorney; PHILIP MOHLAR,  
Attorney at Law; DICK HARTLEY, Attorney at Law,

Defendants - Appellees.

Before

Lynch and Thompson,  
Circuit Judges.

## JUDGMENT

Entered: November 12, 2020

Plaintiff-appellant Glen Plourde appeals from a May 22, 2020 judgment dismissing his civil action. After careful review of the record and Plourde's arguments on appeal, we affirm.<sup>1</sup>

By the Court:

Maria R. Hamilton, Clerk

<sup>1</sup> While this case was submitted to a panel that included Judge Torruella, he did not participate in the issuance of the panel's judgment. The remaining two panelists therefore issued the judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 46(d).

deprivation of state and federal constitutional rights, malicious prosecution, attorney malpractice, defamation, perjury, tampering with public records, falsification of evidence, and failure to investigate or protect against torture.

## DISCUSSION

Issues of subject matter jurisdiction “can be raised *sua sponte* at any time” because they relate to the fundamental Article III limitations on federal courts. *See McBee v. Delica Co.*, 417 F.3d 107, 127 (1st Cir. 2005). Courts have determined that this permits them to dismiss a complaint prior to service of process on the named defendants when the complaint is frivolous or obviously lacks merit:

Because [Plaintiff] is neither a prisoner nor proceeding in *forma pauperis* in district court, the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2), 1915A, permitting *sua sponte* dismissal of complaints which fail to state a claim are inapplicable. However, frivolous complaints are subject to dismissal pursuant to the inherent authority of the court, even when the filing fee has been paid. In addition, because a court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over an obviously frivolous complaint, dismissal prior to service of process is permitted.

*Yi v. Soc. Sec. Admin.*, 554 F. App'x 247, 248 (4th Cir. 2014) (internal citations omitted); *see also, Evans v. Suter*, No. 09-5242, 2010 WL 1632902, at \*1 (D.C. Cir. Apr. 2, 2010) (“Contrary to appellant’s assertions, a district court may dismiss a complaint *sua sponte* prior to service on the defendants pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3) when, as here, it is evident that the court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction”); *Rutledge v. Skibicki*, 844 F.2d 792 (9th Cir. 1988) (“The district court may *sua sponte* dismiss a complaint prior to the issuance of a summons if the court clearly lacks subject matter jurisdiction or lacks jurisdiction because the claim is wholly insubstantial and frivolous”); *Best v. Kelly*, 39 F.3d 328, 331

(D.C. Cir. 1994) (suggesting that dismissal for lack of jurisdiction may be warranted for complaints such as “bizarre conspiracy theories,” “fantastic government manipulations of their will or mind,” or “supernatural intervention”). A court’s expeditious *sua sponte* review is based on the longstanding doctrine that federal subject matter jurisdiction is lacking when the legitimate federal issues are not substantial. *See Hagans v. Lavine*, 415 U.S. 528, 536–37 (1974) (jurisdiction is lacking when claims are “so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit,” “wholly insubstantial,” “obviously frivolous,” “plainly unsubstantial,” “no longer open to discussion,” “essentially fictitious,” or “obviously without merit”); *Swan v. United States*, 36 F. App’x 459 (1st Cir. 2002) (“A frivolous constitutional issue does not raise a federal question, however”).<sup>1</sup>

My review of the allegations in the complaint and the exhibits reveals many of the concerns that characterize unsubstantial claims. For example, Plaintiff implausibly asserts that there was a grand conspiracy among the prosecutors, private attorneys, and judges; that his original appointed attorney’s name was actually an alias; that a judge and two prosecutors committed perjury and falsified or tampered with official records to hide the identity of the judge who presided over one of his hearings; and that the defendants delayed

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the doctrine has been criticized for conflating jurisdiction over a claim with the merits of that claim, *see e.g.*, *Rosado v. Wyman*, 397 U.S. 397, 404 (1970) (the maxim is “more ancient than analytically sound”); *Bell v. Hood*, 327 U.S. 678, 682–83, 66 S. Ct. 773, 776, 90 L. Ed. 939 (1946) (regarding “wholly insubstantial and frivolous” claims, “[t]he accuracy of calling these dismissals jurisdictional has been questioned”), the doctrine nevertheless remains good law. *See Crowley Cutlery Co. v. United States*, 849 F.2d 273, 276 (7th Cir. 1988) (“Although most of the Court’s statements of the principle have been dicta rather than holdings, and the principle has been questioned, it is an established principle of federal jurisdiction and remains the federal rule. It is the basis of a large number of lower-court decisions, and at this late date only the Supreme Court can change it”) (internal quotations and citations omitted); *see also*, *Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Env’t*, 523 U.S. 83, 89 (1998) (approving of the doctrine); *Cruz v. House of Representatives*, 301 F. Supp. 3d 75, 77 (D.D.C. 2018) (applying the concept to dismiss obviously meritless claims).

dismissing the charges partly to observe him and gauge his legal acumen because they knew he had been tortured and would try to prove it.<sup>2</sup> Plaintiff's allegations cannot reasonably be construed to assert a substantial federal claim. Dismissal is, therefore, appropriate.

Because dismissal of the federal claims is warranted, I do not exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims. *See Rodriguez v. Doral Mortg. Corp.*, 57 F.3d 1168, 1177 (1st Cir. 1995) ("As a general principle, the unfavorable disposition of a plaintiff's federal claims at the early stages of a suit, well before the commencement of trial, will trigger the dismissal without prejudice of any supplemental state-law claims").

Because Plaintiff's complaint in this and several other cases lack merit, *see* 1:19-cv-00486-JAW; 2:19-cv-00532-JAW, 1:20-cv-00137-GZS, Plaintiff is hereby advised that filing restrictions "may be in the offing" in accordance with *Cok v. Family Court of Rhode Island*, 985 F.2d 32, 35 (1st Cir. 1993).

### **CONCLUSION**

Plaintiff's complaint is **DISMISSED**. Plaintiff is advised that filing restrictions may follow if he pursues further baseless or frivolous litigation.

### **SO ORDERED.**

Dated this 21st day of May, 2020.

/s/ Lance E. Walker  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>2</sup> Plaintiff submitted exhibits claiming he was the victim of torture in a top-secret government program, suffered a coordinated electronic hacking campaign, and has been sent hidden messages in various unrelated documents, numbers, and media, among other assertions.

# United States Court of Appeals For the First Circuit

No. 20-1611

GLEN PLOURDE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF MAINE; WILLIAM ANDERSON, Penobscot County Superior Court Justice; CHARLES F. BUDD, JR., Newport District Court Judge; PENOBCOT COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE; MARIANNE LYNCH, Penobscot County Assistant District Attorney; STEPHEN BURLOCK, Penobscot County Assistant District Attorney; PHILIP MOHLAR, Attorney at Law; DICK HARTLEY, Attorney at Law,

Defendants - Appellees.

Before

Howard, Chief Judge,  
Lynch, Thompson,  
Kayatta and Barron, Circuit Judges.

## ORDER OF COURT

Entered: January 25, 2021

Plaintiff-appellant's petition for rehearing and for rehearing en banc is denied. Plaintiff-appellant's motion for appointment of counsel is denied as moot.

By the Court:

Maria R. Hamilton, Clerk

cc:

Glen Plourde  
Aaron M. Frey  
Marianne Lynch  
Stephen Burlock

organization designated at the time of the training by the Secretary of State under section 219(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act as a foreign terrorist organization shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for ten years, or both. To violate this subsection, a person must have knowledge that the organization is a designated terrorist organization (as defined in subsection (c)(4)), that the organization has engaged or engages in terrorist activity (as defined in section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act), or that the organization has engaged or engages in terrorism (as defined in section 140(d)(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989).

(b) EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION.—There is extraterritorial Federal jurisdiction over an offense under this section. There is jurisdiction over an offense under subsection (a) if—

(1) an offender is a national of the United States (as defined in<sup>1</sup> 101(a)(22) of the Immigration and Nationality Act) or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States (as defined in section 101(a)(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act);

(2) an offender is a stateless person whose habitual residence is in the United States;

(3) after the conduct required for the offense occurs an offender is brought into or found in the United States, even if the conduct required for the offense occurs outside the United States;

(4) the offense occurs in whole or in part within the United States;

(5) the offense occurs in or affects interstate or foreign commerce; or

(6) an offender aids or abets any person over whom jurisdiction exists under this paragraph in committing an offense under subsection (a) or conspires with any person over whom jurisdiction exists under this paragraph to commit an offense under subsection (a).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the term “military-type training” includes training in means or methods that can cause death or serious bodily injury, destroy or damage property, or disrupt services to critical infrastructure, or training on the use, storage, production, or assembly of any explosive, firearm or other weapon, including any weapon of mass destruction (as defined in section 2232a(c)(2)<sup>2</sup>);

(2) the term “serious bodily injury” has the meaning given that term in section 1365(h)(3);

(3) the term “critical infrastructure” means systems and assets vital to national defense, national security, economic security, public health or safety including both regional and national infrastructure. Critical infrastructure may be publicly or privately owned; examples of critical infrastructure include gas and oil production, storage, or delivery systems, water supply systems, telecommunications networks, electrical power generation or delivery systems, financing and banking systems, emergency services (including medical, police, fire, and rescue services), and transpor-

tation systems and services (including highways, mass transit, airlines, and airports); and

(4) the term “foreign terrorist organization” means an organization designated as a terrorist organization under section 219(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

(Added Pub. L. 108-458, title VI, §6602, Dec. 17, 2004, 118 Stat. 3761.)

#### REFERENCES IN TEXT

Sections 101, 212, and 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, referred to in subsecs. (a), (b)(1), and (c)(4), are classified to sections 1101, 1182, and 1189, respectively, of Title 8, Aliens and Nationality.

Section 140(d)(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989, referred to in subsec. (a), is classified to section 2656f(d)(2) of Title 22, Foreign Relations and Intercourse.

### CHAPTER 113C—TORTURE

Sec.

2340. Definitions.

2340A. Torture.

2340B. Exclusive remedies.

#### AMENDMENTS

2002—Pub. L. 107-273, div. B, title IV, §4002(c)(1), Nov. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 1808, repealed Pub. L. 104-294, title VI, §601(j)(1), Oct. 11, 1996, 110 Stat. 3501. See 1996 Amendment note below.

1996—Pub. L. 104-132, title III, §303(c)(1), Apr. 24, 1996, 110 Stat. 1253, redesignated chapter 113B as 113C. Pub. L. 104-294, title VI, §601(j)(1), Oct. 11, 1996, 110 Stat. 3501, which made identical amendment, was repealed by Pub. L. 107-273, div. B, title IV, §4002(c)(1), Nov. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 1808, effective Oct. 11, 1996.

### § 2340. Definitions

As used in this chapter—

(1) “torture” means an act committed by a person acting under the color of law specifically intended to inflict severe physical or mental pain or suffering (other than pain or suffering incidental to lawful sanctions) upon another person within his custody or physical control;

(2) “severe mental pain or suffering” means the prolonged mental harm caused by or resulting from—

(A) the intentional infliction or threatened infliction of severe physical pain or suffering;

(B) the administration or application, or threatened administration or application, of mind-altering substances or other procedures calculated to disrupt profoundly the senses or the personality;

(C) the threat of imminent death; or

(D) the threat that another person will imminently be subjected to death, severe physical pain or suffering, or the administration or application of mind-altering substances or other procedures calculated to disrupt profoundly the senses or personality; and

(3) “United States” means the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the commonwealths, territories, and possessions of the United States.

(Added Pub. L. 103-236, title V, §506(a), Apr. 30, 1994, 108 Stat. 463; amended Pub. L. 103-415, §1(k), Oct. 25, 1994, 108 Stat. 4301; Pub. L. 103-429,

<sup>1</sup>So in original. The word “section” probably should appear after “in”.

<sup>2</sup>So in original. Probably should be section “2232a(c)(2)”.

§ 2(2), Oct. 31, 1994, 108 Stat. 4377; Pub. L. 108-375, div. A, title X, § 1089, Oct. 28, 2004, 118 Stat. 2067.)

#### AMENDMENTS

2001—Par. (3). Pub. L. 108-375 amended par. (3) generally. Prior to amendment, par. (3) read as follows: “United States” includes all areas under the jurisdiction of the United States including any of the places described in sections 5 and 7 of this title and section 46501(2) of title 49.”

1994—Par. (1). Pub. L. 103-415 substituted “within his custody” for “with custody”.

Par. (3). Pub. L. 103-429 substituted “section 46501(2) of title 49” for “section 101(38) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. App. 1301(38))”.

#### EFFECTIVE DATE

Section 506(c) of Pub. L. 103-236 provided that: “The amendments made by this section [enacting this chapter] shall take effect on the later of—

“(1) the date of enactment of this Act [Apr. 30, 1994]; or

“(2) the date on which the United States has become a party to the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.” [Convention entered into Force with respect to United States Nov. 20, 1994, Treaty Doc. 100-20.]

#### § 2340A. Torture

(a) OFFENSE.—Whoever outside the United States commits or attempts to commit torture shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both, and if death results to any person from conduct prohibited by this subsection, shall be punished by death or imprisoned for any term of years or for life.

(b) JURISDICTION.—There is jurisdiction over the activity prohibited in subsection (a) if—

(1) the alleged offender is a national of the United States; or

(2) the alleged offender is present in the United States, irrespective of the nationality of the victim or alleged offender.

(c) CONSPIRACY.—A person who conspires to commit an offense under this section shall be subject to the same penalties (other than the penalty of death) as the penalties prescribed for the offense, the commission of which was the object of the conspiracy.

(Added Pub. L. 103-236, title V, § 506(a), Apr. 30, 1994, 108 Stat. 463; amended Pub. L. 103-322, title VI, § 60020, Sept. 13, 1994, 108 Stat. 1979; Pub. L. 107-56, title VIII, § 811(g), Oct. 26, 2001, 115 Stat. 381.)

#### AMENDMENTS

2001—Subsec. (c). Pub. L. 107-56 added subsec. (c).

1994—Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 103-322 inserted “punished by death or” before “imprisoned for any term of years or for life”.

#### § 2340B. Exclusive remedies

Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as precluding the application of State or local laws on the same subject, nor shall anything in this chapter be construed as creating any substantive or procedural right enforceable by law by any party in any civil proceeding.

(Added Pub. L. 103-236, title V, § 506(a), Apr. 30, 1994, 108 Stat. 464.)

#### CHAPTER 114—TRAFFICKING IN CONTRABAND CIGARETTES AND SMOKELESS TOBACCO

Sec.

2341.	Definitions.
2342.	Unlawful acts.
2343.	Recordkeeping, reporting, and inspection.
2344.	Penalties.
2345.	Effect on State and local law.
2346.	Enforcement and regulations.

#### AMENDMENTS

2006—Pub. L. 109-177, title I, § 121(g)(3), (4)(A), Mar. 9, 2006, 120 Stat. 224, substituted “TRAFFICKING IN CONTRABAND CIGARETTES AND SMOKELESS TOBACCO” for “TRAFFICKING IN CONTRABAND CIGARETTES” in chapter heading, added items 2343 and 2345, and struck out former items 2343 “Recordkeeping and inspection” and 2345 “Effect on State law”.

#### § 2341. Definitions

As used in this chapter—

(1) the term “cigarette” means—

(A) any roll of tobacco wrapped in paper or in any substance not containing tobacco; and

(B) any roll of tobacco wrapped in any substance containing tobacco which, because of its appearance, the type of tobacco used in the filler, or its packaging and labeling, is likely to be offered to, or purchased by, consumers as a cigarette described in subparagraph (A);

(2) the term “contraband cigarettes” means a quantity in excess of 10,000 cigarettes, which bear no evidence of the payment of applicable State or local cigarette taxes in the State or locality where such cigarettes are found, if the State or local government requires a stamp, impression, or other indication to be placed on packages or other containers of cigarettes to evidence payment of cigarette taxes, and which are in the possession of any person other than—

(A) a person holding a permit issued pursuant to chapter 52 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as a manufacturer of tobacco products or as an export warehouse proprietor, or a person operating a customs bonded warehouse pursuant to section 311 or 555 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1311 or 1555) or an agent of such person;

(B) a common or contract carrier transporting the cigarettes involved under a proper bill of lading or freight bill which states the quantity, source, and destination of such cigarettes;

(C) a person—

(i) who is licensed or otherwise authorized by the State where the cigarettes are found to account for and pay cigarette taxes imposed by such State; and

(ii) who has complied with the accounting and payment requirements relating to such license or authorization with respect to the cigarettes involved; or

(D) an officer, employee, or other agent of the United States or a State, or any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States or a State (including any political subdivision of a State) having posses-

# **Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment**

**Adopted and opened for signature, ratification and accession by General Assembly resolution 39/46 of 10 December 1984 entry into force 26 June 1987, in accordance with article 27 (1)**

The States Parties to this Convention,

Considering that, in accordance with the principles proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations, recognition of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world,

Recognizing that those rights derive from the inherent dignity of the human person,

Considering the obligation of States under the Charter, in particular Article 55, to promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms,

Having regard to article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and article 7 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, both of which provide that no one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment,

Having regard also to the Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Being Subjected to Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, adopted by the General Assembly on 9 December 1975,

Desiring to make more effective the struggle against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment throughout the world,

Have agreed as follows:

## **PART I**

### ***Article 1***

1. For the purposes of this Convention, the term "torture" means any act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted on a person for such purposes as obtaining from him or a third person information or a confession, punishing him for an act he or a third person has committed or is suspected of having committed, or intimidating or coercing him or a third person, or for any reason based on discrimination of any kind, when such pain or suffering is inflicted by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity. It does not include pain or suffering arising only from, inherent in or incidental to lawful sanctions.

2. This article is without prejudice to any international instrument or national legislation which does or may contain provisions of wider application.

#### ***Article 2***

1. Each State Party shall take effective legislative, administrative, judicial or other measures to prevent acts of torture in any territory under its jurisdiction.

2. No exceptional circumstances whatsoever, whether a state of war or a threat of war, internal political instability or any other public emergency, may be invoked as a justification of torture.

3. An order from a superior officer or a public authority may not be invoked as a justification of torture.

#### ***Article 3***

1. No State Party shall expel, return ("refoul") or extradite a person to another State where there are substantial grounds for believing that he would be in danger of being subjected to torture.

2. For the purpose of determining whether there are such grounds, the competent authorities shall take into account all relevant considerations including, where applicable, the existence in the State concerned of a consistent pattern of gross, flagrant or mass violations of human rights.

#### ***Article 4***

1. Each State Party shall ensure that all acts of torture are offences under its criminal law. The same shall apply to an attempt to commit torture and to an act by any person which constitutes complicity or participation in torture. 2. Each State Party shall make these offences punishable by appropriate penalties which take into account their grave nature.

#### ***Article 5***

1. Each State Party shall take such measures as may be necessary to establish its jurisdiction over the offences referred to in article 4 in the following cases:

(a) When the offences are committed in any territory under its jurisdiction or on board a ship or aircraft registered in that State;

(b) When the alleged offender is a national of that State;

(c) When the victim is a national of that State if that State considers it appropriate.

2. Each State Party shall likewise take such measures as may be necessary to establish its jurisdiction over such offences in cases where the alleged offender is present in any territory

under its jurisdiction and it does not extradite him pursuant to article 8 to any of the States mentioned in paragraph I of this article.

3. This Convention does not exclude any criminal jurisdiction exercised in accordance with internal law.

#### ***Article 6***

1. Upon being satisfied, after an examination of information available to it, that the circumstances so warrant, any State Party in whose territory a person alleged to have committed any offence referred to in article 4 is present shall take him into custody or take other legal measures to ensure his presence. The custody and other legal measures shall be as provided in the law of that State but may be continued only for such time as is necessary to enable any criminal or extradition proceedings to be instituted.

2. Such State shall immediately make a preliminary inquiry into the facts.

3. Any person in custody pursuant to paragraph I of this article shall be assisted in communicating immediately with the nearest appropriate representative of the State of which he is a national, or, if he is a stateless person, with the representative of the State where he usually resides.

4. When a State, pursuant to this article, has taken a person into custody, it shall immediately notify the States referred to in article 5, paragraph 1, of the fact that such person is in custody and of the circumstances which warrant his detention. The State which makes the preliminary inquiry contemplated in paragraph 2 of this article shall promptly report its findings to the said States and shall indicate whether it intends to exercise jurisdiction.

#### ***Article 7***

1. The State Party in the territory under whose jurisdiction a person alleged to have committed any offence referred to in article 4 is found shall in the cases contemplated in article 5, if it does not extradite him, submit the case to its competent authorities for the purpose of prosecution.

2. These authorities shall take their decision in the same manner as in the case of any ordinary offence of a serious nature under the law of that State. In the cases referred to in article 5, paragraph 2, the standards of evidence required for prosecution and conviction shall in no way be less stringent than those which apply in the cases referred to in article 5, paragraph 1.

3. Any person regarding whom proceedings are brought in connection with any of the offences referred to in article 4 shall be guaranteed fair treatment at all stages of the proceedings.

#### ***Article 8***

1. The offences referred to in article 4 shall be deemed to be included as extraditable offences in any extradition treaty existing between States Parties. States Parties undertake to include such offences as extraditable offences in every extradition treaty to be concluded between them.
2. If a State Party which makes extradition conditional on the existence of a treaty receives a request for extradition from another State Party with which it has no extradition treaty, it may consider this Convention as the legal basis for extradition in respect of such offences. Extradition shall be subject to the other conditions provided by the law of the requested State.
3. States Parties which do not make extradition conditional on the existence of a treaty shall recognize such offences as extraditable offences between themselves subject to the conditions provided by the law of the requested State.
4. Such offences shall be treated, for the purpose of extradition between States Parties, as if they had been committed not only in the place in which they occurred but also in the territories of the States required to establish their jurisdiction in accordance with article 5, paragraph 1.

#### *Article 9*

1. States Parties shall afford one another the greatest measure of assistance in connection with criminal proceedings brought in respect of any of the offences referred to in article 4, including the supply of all evidence at their disposal necessary for the proceedings.
2. States Parties shall carry out their obligations under paragraph I of this article in conformity with any treaties on mutual judicial assistance that may exist between them.

#### *Article 10*

1. Each State Party shall ensure that education and information regarding the prohibition against torture are fully included in the training of law enforcement personnel, civil or military, medical personnel, public officials and other persons who may be involved in the custody, interrogation or treatment of any individual subjected to any form of arrest, detention or imprisonment.
2. Each State Party shall include this prohibition in the rules or instructions issued in regard to the duties and functions of any such person.

#### *Article 11*

Each State Party shall keep under systematic review interrogation rules, instructions, methods and practices as well as arrangements for the custody and treatment of persons subjected to any form of arrest, detention or imprisonment in any territory under its jurisdiction, with a view to preventing any cases of torture.

#### *Article 12*

Each State Party shall ensure that its competent authorities proceed to a prompt and impartial investigation, wherever there is reasonable ground to believe that an act of torture has been committed in any territory under its jurisdiction.

#### *Article 13*

Each State Party shall ensure that any individual who alleges he has been subjected to torture in any territory under its jurisdiction has the right to complain to, and to have his case promptly and impartially examined by, its competent authorities. Steps shall be taken to ensure that the complainant and witnesses are protected against all ill-treatment or intimidation as a consequence of his complaint or any evidence given.

#### *Article 14*

1. Each State Party shall ensure in its legal system that the victim of an act of torture obtains redress and has an enforceable right to fair and adequate compensation, including the means for as full rehabilitation as possible. In the event of the death of the victim as a result of an act of torture, his dependants shall be entitled to compensation.
2. Nothing in this article shall affect any right of the victim or other persons to compensation which may exist under national law.

#### *Article 15*

Each State Party shall ensure that any statement which is established to have been made as a result of torture shall not be invoked as evidence in any proceedings, except against a person accused of torture as evidence that the statement was made.

#### *Article 16*

1. Each State Party shall undertake to prevent in any territory under its jurisdiction other acts of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment which do not amount to torture as defined in article I, when such acts are committed by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity. In particular, the obligations contained in articles 10, 11, 12 and 13 shall apply with the substitution for references to torture of references to other forms of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.
2. The provisions of this Convention are without prejudice to the provisions of any other international instrument or national law which prohibits cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment or which relates to extradition or expulsion.

### **PART II**

#### *Article 17*