



RIGSADVOKATEN

Justitsministeriet
Politi- og Strafferetsafdelingen

DATO 22. januar 2014

JOURNAL NR.

RA-2012-120-0033

BEDES ANFØRT VED SVARSKRIVELSE

SAGSBEHANDLER: CAK

RIGSADVOKATEN

FREDERIKSHOLMS KANAL 16
1220 KØBENHAVN K

TELEFON 72 68 90 00
FAX 72 68 90 04

Anvendelsen af varetægtsfængsling i isolation i 2012

Jeg fremsender herved Rigsadvokatens redegørelse om anvendelse af varetægtsfængsling i isolation i 2012. Redegørelsen bygger på politikredsens indberetninger om isolationsfængslinger afsluttet i 2012 og Justitsministeriets Forskningskontors bearbejdning af dette datamateriale. Redegørelsens hovedkonklusioner er gengivet nedenfor i punktform.

Som det fremgår af redegørelsen, har der fra 2011 til 2012 været et fald i antallet af varetægtsfængslinger i isolation fra 186 i 2011 til 132 i 2012, mens den gennemsnitlige varighed af isolationsfængslingerne var på 24 dage, hvilket svarer til gennemsnittet i 2011.

Jeg skal i den forbindelse bemærke, at anvendelsen af isolationsfængsling vil kunne bero på en række forskellige faktorer med hensyn til udviklingen i og bekæmpelsen af kriminalitet. Udviklingen i antallet af isolationsfængslinger kan derfor ikke vurderes isoleret og heller ikke i sig selv ses som udtryk for en ændret anvendelse af isolationsfængsling. Således vil f.eks. en stigning i kriminalitetstyper, hvor efterforskningen kan nødvendiggøre isolationsfængsling, naturligt kunne indebære en stigning i anvendelsen af isolationsfængsling. Tilsvarende vil en særlig politimæssig indsats over for sådanne kriminalitetstyper naturligt kunne føre til en stigning i anvendelsen af isolationsfængsling.

Det relativt begrænsede samlede antal tilfælde, hvor isolationsfængsling anvendes, indebærer samtidig, at blot enkelte større sager med et antal sigtede, der varetægtsfængsles i isolation, vil kunne have mærkbar betydning for udviklingen i det samlede antal

isolationsfængslinger på landsplan – og eventuelt for den gennemsnitlige varighed heraf. Da anvendelsen af isolationsfængsling beror på de helt konkrete omstændigheder i den enkelte sag, herunder på karakteren af kriminaliteten og den eller de involverede sigtedes forhold, vil det også af den grund kun i begrænset omfang være muligt ud fra udviklingen i antallet og varigheden af isolationsfængslinger at sige noget mere generelt om anvendelsen af varetægtsfængsling i isolation.

I 2012 blev der i alt foretaget 132 isolationsfængslinger.

Antallet af isolationsfængslinger er faldet med 29 % i forhold til 2011, hvor der blev foretaget i alt 186 isolationsfængslinger. Der er tale om det næstlaveste antal siden 2001, hvor Rigsadvokaten indførte indberetningsordningen vedrørende isolationsfængsling. I forhold til 2001 er der tale om et samlet fald på 76 %.

Den gennemsnitlige varighed af isolationsfængslinger i 2012 var 24 dage, hvilket svarer til gennemsnittet i 2011. Den gennemsnitlige varighed har været faldende fra 2003 til 2010 og uændret siden 2010.

Antallet af isolationsfængslinger i 2012 med en varighed på mere end 8 uger var 5, svarende til antallet i 2011.

Ingen unge under 18 år blev isolationsfængslet i 2012.

RIGSADVOKATEN

SIDE 2

1. Baggrund

1.1. Indberetningsordningen

Justitsministeriet tilkendegav i forarbejderne til lov nr. 428 af 31. maj 2000 om ændring af retsplejeloven og straffeloven (varetægtsfængsling i isolation mv.), at man løbende ville følge udviklingen i antallet og varigheden af varetægtsfængslinger i isolation.

I fortsættelse heraf anmodede Justitsministeriet ved brev af 16. juni 2000 Rigsadvokaten om at iværksætte en løbende statistikindsamling vedrørende udviklingen og varigheden af isolationsfængslinger, der kunne danne grundlag for en årlig redegørelse til Justitsministeriet.

På baggrund heraf iværksatte Rigsadvokaten ved Rigsadvokaten Informerer nr. 21/2001 en indberetningsordning vedrørende anvendelsen af varetægtsfængsling i isolation. Ved ordningen blev politikredsene pålagt at indberette en række oplysninger vedrørende afsluttede isolationsfængslinger til Rigsadvokaten.

Indberetningerne har dannet grundlag for, at Rigsadvokaten for hvert år siden 2001 har kunnet afgive en redegørelse til Justitsministeriet for anvendelsen af varetægtsfængsling i isolation.

I forarbejderne til lov nr. 1561 af 20. december 2006 om ændring af retsplejeloven (varetægtsfængsling i isolation) tilkendegav Justitsministeriet, at man fortsat ønskede

at modtage en årlig redegørelse fra Rigsadvokaten om anvendelse af isolationsfængsling og de initiativer, som udviklingen måtte give anledning til.

På den baggrund blev det i Rigsadvokatmeddelelse 4/2008 bestemt, at man skulle opretholde indberetningsordningen vedrørende afsluttede isolationsfængslinger.

Denne redegørelse vedrører anvendelsen af varetægtsfængsling i isolation i 2012 og er baseret på analyser, som Justitsministeriets Forskningskontor har gennemført på grundlag af politikredsens kvartalsvise indberetninger til de regionale statsadvokater vedrørende oplysninger om afsluttede isolationsfængslinger.

RIGSADVOKATEN

Justitsministeriets Forskningskontors analyse er vedlagt som bilag A.

SIDE 3

Endvidere vedlægges bilag B-E, der indeholder nærmere oplysninger og statistik om varetægtsfængslinger i isolation i 2012.

1.2. Datagrundlag

Denne redegørelse er udformet efter de retningslinjer, der efter drøftelser med Justitsministeriet, Direktoratet for Kriminalforsorgen og Rigspolicefen samt efter forelæggelse for Strafferetsplejeudvalget har været gældende for mine tidligere redegørelser om anvendelsen af varetægtsfængsling i isolation. Redegørelsen omfatter samtlige afsluttede isolationsfængslinger i 2012.

Oplysningerne til brug for statistikken for 2012 er i lighed med mine redegørelser for anvendelsen af isolationsfængsling i 2004-2011 udtrukket fra politiets journalsystem (POLSAS) og bearbejdet af Justitsministeriets Forskningskontor, jf. bilag A.

2. Anvendelsen af isolationsfængsling i 2012

- **Antal**

Der var 132 afsluttede varetægtsfængslinger i isolation i 2012.

Det frengår af Justitsministeriets Forskningskontors undersøgelse, at isolationsfængsling i næste alle tilfælde er anvendt i forhold til meget grove lovovertrædelser. 97,7 % af isolationsfængslingerne – 129 ud af 132 – vedrører således lovovertrædelser, der efter loven kan medføre 6 års fængsel eller derover.

Kun 2,3 % (3) af isolationsfængslingerne vedrører lovovertrædelser, der normalt ikke kan medføre fængsel i 4 år eller derover. For disse sager gælder en ufravigelig grænse på 14 dage for anvendelse af isolationsfængsling.

Det fremgår af Justitsministeriets Forskningskontors undersøgelse, at der i én af disse 3 sager er sket isolationsfængsling i mere end 14 dage. Denne isolationsfængsling varede 22 dage og vedrørte indbrud i virksomhed. Isolationsfængslingens udstrækning ud over 14 dage skyldtes, at indbruddets grovhed ifølge sigtelsen, jf. straffelovens § 286, stk. 2, gav mulighed for fængsel i indtil 8 år og dermed mulighed for isolationsfængsling i op til 8 uger.

- **Procentvis andel af varetægtsfængslinger i isolation**

Der blev anvendt isolation i 2,4 % af samtlige varetægtsfængslinger i 2012, jf. bilag A, tabel 2.

RIGSADVOKATEN

SIDE 4

- **Samlet varighed**

Der blev i alt isolationsfængslet i 3.182 dage i 2012, mens det var 4.535 dage i 2011. Det samlede antal dages isolationsfængsling er således faldet med 29,8 % fra 2011 til 2012.

- **Gennemsnitlig varighed**

Varetægtsfængslingerne i isolation havde i 2012 en gennemsnitlig varighed på 24 dage.

96,2 % (127) af isolationsfængslingerne blev afsluttet inden 8 uger. 87,1 % (115) blev afsluttet inden 6 uger. 74,2 % (98) blev afsluttet inden 4 uger, mens 47 % (62) blev afsluttet inden 2 uger.

3,8 % (5) af isolationsfængslingerne havde en varighed på mellem 8 uger og 3 måneder.

Isolationsfængslingerne med en varighed på mere end 8 uger er behandlet nærmere nedenfor.

For yderligere oplysninger om varigheden af de afsluttede isolationsfængslinger i 2012 henvises til bilag A, tabel 3 og 4.

- **Isolationsfængsling med en varighed på mere end 8 uger**

Efter retsplejelovens § 770 d, stk. 3, kan en isolationsfængsling ikke forlænges ud over 8 uger, hvis arrestanten er over 18 år, eller ud over 4 uger, hvis arrestanten er under 18 år, medmindre Rigsadvokatens godkendelse foreligger, og retten derefter tiltræder anklagemyndighedens begæring. Bestemmelsen lovfæster den tidligere gældende fore-

læggelsesordning vedrørende isolationsfængslinger ud over 3 måneder, der var fastsat af Rigsadvokaten. Formålet med forelæggelsesordningen er at sikre en restriktiv og ensartet praksis for dispensation fra tidsgrænserne.

Som nævnt var der i 2012 5 isolationsfængslinger med en varighed på mere end 8 uger. De angik alle narkotikakriminalitet (§ 191, stk.1) og var fra henholdsvis Sydsjællands og Lolland-Falsters Politi samt Syd- og Sønderjyllands Politi.

Bilag E indeholder en nærmere beskrivelse af disse isolationsfængslinger.

RIGSADVOKATEN

- **Isolationsfængsling af personer under 18 år**

SIDE 5

I 2012 var ingen unge under 18 år isolationsfængslet.

- **Fordeling på kriminalitetstyper**

Isolationsfængslingerne i 2012 har følgende fordeling efter kriminalitetstype: Narkotikakriminalitet (71,2 %), manddrab og forsøg herpå (11,4 %), terrorisme (6,8 %), forbrydelser vedrørende våben (3,8 %), vold og trusler mv. (3,8 %), anden berigelseskriminalitet (2,3 %) og røveri (0,8 %).

De 5 sager med mere end 8 ugers isolationsfængsling vedrørte sigtelser for henholdsvis smugling og salg af narkotika. I gennemsnit har disse 5 isolationsfængslinger været i 77 dage. Den gennemsnitlige varighed af isolationsfængsling ved manddrab og forsøg herpå var 33 dage, mens den gennemsnitlige varighed for sigtelser for narkotikakriminalitet var i 25 dage. I øvrigt bemærkes, at den gennemsnitlige varighed af isolationsfængslinger for manddrab, røveri, anden berigelse og narkotikakriminalitet var længere i 2012 end i 2011, mens den gennemsnitlige varighed for sager vedrørende terrorisme og våben var noget længere i 2011 end i 2012.

For nærmere oplysning henvises til bilag A, tabel 4.

- **Regional fordeling**

Københavns Politi foretog samlet set flest isolationsfængslinger i 2012, idet 61,4 % (i alt 81) af alle isolationsfængslinger blev foretaget i sager, der blev behandlet af Københavns Politi. Antallet af isolationsfængslinger i de øvrige kredse var væsentligt lavere. Bornholms Politi foretog næstflest isolationsfængslinger. Her blev 10,6 % (i alt 14) af samtlige isolationsfængslinger foretaget. Sydsjællands og Lolland-Falsters Politi samt Nordjyllands Politi foretog tredje flest isolationsfængslinger. Her blev i hver politikreds 6 % (i alt 8 i hver politikreds) af samtlige isolationsfængslinger foretaget. Herudover blev der foretaget mellem 4 og 6 isolationsfængslinger i 4 politikredse og henholdsvis 0 og 2 isolationsfængslinger i yderligere 4 politikredse.

Bornholms Politi foretog flest isolationsfængslinger set i forhold til antallet af varetægtsfængslinger, idet 37,8 % af samtlige varetægtsfængslede i Bornholms Politikreds blev anbragt i isolation i 2012. Det bemærkes, at det drejer sig om i alt 14 isolationsfængslinger ud af i alt 37 varetægtsfængslinger. Københavns Politi foretog næstflest isolationsfængslinger i forhold til antallet af varetægtsfængslede, idet 4 % (i alt 81) af samtlige varetægtsfængslede i denne kreds (i alt 2.002) blev anbragt i isolation i 2012.

Der henvises for yderligere oplysninger til bilag A, tabel 3, som indeholder en oversigt over antallet og varigheden af isolationsfængslinger og antallet af varetægtsfængslinger fordelt på politikredse, ligesom bilaget angiver den procentvise andel af isolationsfængslinger i forhold til antallet af varetægtsfængslinger i 2012. Om tilsynet med isolationsfængslinger, herunder evt. lokale og regionale forskelle i anvendelsen heraf, henvises til pkt. 4 nedenfor.

RIGSADVOKATEN

SIDE 6

3. Udvikling i forhold til tidligere år

- **Antallet af varetægtsfængslinger i isolation**

Udviklingen i anvendelsen af isolationsfængslinger har varieret en del i perioden 2001-2012.

Fra 2001-2003 faldt antallet af isolationsfængslede fra 553 til 476. I 2004 steg antallet til 580, mens det i perioden 2005-2007 igen faldt. I 2005 var der således 499 isolationsfængslinger, mens der var 475 isolationsfængslinger i 2006 og 273 isolationsfængslinger i 2007. I 2008 steg antallet af isolationsfængslinger til 327, mens der i 2009 var tale om et fald til 210 og i 2010 igen et fald til 127. I 2011 steg antallet af isolationsfængslinger til 186.

Fra 2011 til 2012 er der sket et fald fra 186 isolationsfængslinger til 132 isolationsfængslinger, svarende til et fald på 29 %.

Fra 2001, hvor Rigsadvokaten indførte indberetningsordningen vedrørende isolationsfængsling, til 2012 er der tale om et samlet fald på 76,1 %, og de 132 isolationsfængslinger i 2012 er det næstlaveste antal i hele perioden siden 2001.

For nærmere oplysning henvises til bilag A, tabel 1, og bilag B.

Faldet i antal isolationsfængslinger fra 2011 til 2012 angår især sager om manddrab og forsøg herpå samt forbrydelser vedrørende våben, idet førstnævnte er faldet fra 48 til 15 isolationsfængslinger, mens sidstnævnte er faldet fra 16 til 5 isolationsfængslinger,

jf. bilag A, tabel 4. Dette afspejler en nedgang både i antallet af sigtelser for manddrab og forsøg herpå og i antallet af sigtelser i sager vedrørende våben fra 2011 til 2012, men faldet i isolationsfængslinger er dog for begge kriminalitetstyper noget mere markant end faldet i antal sigtelser.

- **Den samlede varighed af isolationsfængslingerne**

Det samlede antal dage i isolation er faldet fra 4.535 i 2011 til 3.182 i 2012, hvilket svarer til et fald på 29,8 %.

RIGSADVOKATEN

- **Den gennemsnitlige varighed af isolationsfængslingerne**

SIDE 7

Varetægtsfængslingerne i isolation varede i årene 2001 til 2011 i gennemsnit 28 dage (2001), 30 dage (2002), 37 dage (2003), 36 dage (2004), 33 dage (2005), 29 dage (2006), 27 dage (2007), 21 dage (2008), 22 dage (2009), 24 dage (2010) og 24 dage (2011), jf. bilag B.

I 2012 var den gennemsnitlige varighed af isolationsfængslingerne 24 dage, hvilket svarer til gennemsnittet i 2011. I øvrigt bemærkes, at den gennemsnitlige varighed af isolationsfængslinger for manddrab, røveri, anden berigelse og narkotikakriminalitet var længere i 2012 end i 2011, mens den gennemsnitlige varighed for sager vedrørende terrorisme og våben var noget længere i 2011 end i 2012.

- **Antallet af isolationsfængslinger med en varighed på mere end 8 uger**

Anvendelsen af isolationsfængslinger med en varighed på mere end 8 uger har varieret en del i perioden fra 2001 til 2012, jf. bilag B.

I 2001 var der således 79 isolationsfængslinger på mere end 8 uger. I 2002 faldt dette tal til 73. Herefter var der en kraftig stigning til 106 i 2003 og 142 i 2004. Siden 2004 er antallet faldet markant – til 63 i 2005, 55 i 2006, 19 i 2007, 7 i 2008, 10 i 2009, 1 i 2010 og 5 i 2011.

I 2012 var der 5 isolationsfængslinger på mere end 8 uger.

- **Ingen unge under 18 år isolationsfængslet i 2012**

Der var i 2012 ingen personer under 18 år, der var isolationsfængslede.

Anvendelse af isolationsfængsling i forhold til unge under 18 år i perioden 2001-2012 fremgår af bilag C.

Det fremgår heraf, at antallet af anvendte isolationsfængslinger har været lavt i hele perioden (2001-2012), idet isolationsfængsling alene har været anvendt overfor mellem 0 og 6 unge under 18 år hvert år. Det fremgår endvidere, at isolationsfængslingerne set over hele perioden har haft en varighed på mellem 1 og 56 dage, og at varigheden generelt har været faldende.

4. Rigsadvokatens fremtidige kontrol med anvendelsen af isolationsfængsling

Som en del af den generelle styrkelse af kvalitets- og legalitetskontrollen i anklagemyndigheden blev indberetningsordningen i Rigsadvokatmeddelelse 4/2008 i februar 2012 justeret således, at politikredsene skal sende deres kvartalsvise statistiske udtræk om afsluttede isolationsfængslinger til den regionale statsadvokat, således at de to regionale statsadvokater kan inddrage dem i det almindelige tilsyn med politikredsene.

RIGSADVOKATEN

SIDE 8

De regionale statsadvokater forudsættes i årsrapporten til Rigsadvokaten om kvalitets- og legalitetssikringen af straffesagsbehandlingen i politikredsene i relevant omfang at redegøre for udviklingen i antallet og varigheden af isolationsfængslinger, baggrunden herfor samt tiltag til at begrænse omfanget, ligesom statsadvokaterne forudsættes at forholde sig til eventuelle lokale og regionale forskelle i antallet og andelen af varetægtsfængslinger i isolation.

Som omtalt i de senere års redegørelser om langvarige varetægtsfængslinger har Rigsadvokaten gennem de senere år arbejdet målrettet med at forenkle og afskaffe manuelle indberetningsformer. I den forbindelse er der i 2013 blevet udviklet en ny applikation i anklagemyndighedens ledelsesinformationsværktøj, QlikView, som indebærer, at opgørelsen af brugen af varetægtsfængsling kan baseres på data direkte fra et centralt elektronisk datagrundlag i Politiets Sagsbehandlingssystem, POLSAS. Den nye applikation har dannet grundlag for min redegørelse for 2011 og 2012 om anvendelse af langvarige varetægtsfængslinger. Der arbejdes for tiden på, at applikationen tillige skal omfatte varetægtsfængsling i isolation.

Det forventes, at applikationen bl.a. kan styrke muligheden for løbende at følge varigheden og antallet af varetægts- og isolationsfængslinger og for at arbejde mere målrettet med at begrænse varetægtsfængslingernes længde, herunder varetægtsfængsling i isolation.

Den nye ledelsesinformation forventes samtidig at overflødigøre den hidtidige indberetningsordning for isolationsfængslinger, der dermed vil kunne udfases i 2014. Informationer, der hidtil er fremgået af de skemaer, politikredsene har indsendt, forventes således fremover i nødvendigt omfang tilvejebragt ved udtræk fra politiets og anklagemyndighedens sagsbehandlingssystemer.

Derudover er der i 2013 med baggrund i bl.a. den nye ledelsesinformation blevet udviklet og implementeret et nyt koncept for statsadvokaternes tilsyn med politikredsenes anvendelse af varetægtsfængslinger. I takt med, at den nye ledelsesinformation tillige udvikles for så vidt angår isolationsfængslinger, vil tilsynskonceptet tillige omfatte statsadvokaternes tilsyn med politikredsenes anvendelse af isolationsfængslinger.

Det er således forventningen, at min årlige redegørelse om anvendelse af varetægtsfængsling i isolation fremover vil basere sig på centrale elektroniske dataudtræk fra POLSAS på samme måde, som det nu er tilfældet med redegørelsen om langvarige varetægtsfængslinger. Jeg vil med afsæt i den nye ledelsesinformation og i statsadvokaterne årsrapporter samt i forbindelse med de konkrete sager, der forelægges for Rigsadvokaten med henblik på isolationsfængsling ud over 8 uger, fortsat nøje følge udviklingen i anvendelsen af varetægtsfængsling i isolation.

RIGSADVOKATEN

SIDE 9

Med venlig hilsen

Ole Hasselgaard



STATISTIK OM ISOLATIONSFÆNGLING

I forlængelse af ændring af reglerne om varetægtsfængsling i isolation i 2000 blev det besluttet, at der skal gennemføres en løbende statistikindsamling, således at Justitsministeriet årligt modtager oplysninger om anvendelsen af isolationsfængsling.

I det følgende redegøres for de statistiske oplysninger for år 2012. Data til brug for statistikken er indhentet af Rigsadvokaten og bearbejdet af Justitsministeriets Forskningskontor.

1. Datagrundlaget

Oplysninger til brug for denne statistik er tilvejebragt ved, at de enkelte politikredse er anmodet om at indberette samtlige *afsluttede isolationsfængslinger* i 2012. Indberetningen omfatter oplysninger om isolationsfængslingens varighed, den fængsledes alder samt arten af den kriminalitet, den isolationsfængslede er sigtet for.

Oplysningerne stammer fra udtræk fra POLSAS i de enkelte politikredse, idet politikredsene anvender et særligt registreringsmodul for isolationsfængslinger.

2. Udviklingen i antallet af isolationsfængslinger

Der er modtaget oplysninger om i alt 132 afsluttede isolationsfængslinger i 2012, jf. tabel 1.

Tabel 1. Udviklingen i antallet af isolationsfængslinger, 2001-2012.

	Antal isolationsfængslinger
2001	553
2002	501
2003	476
2004	580
2005	532
2006	475
2007	273
2008	327
2009	210
2010	127
2011	186
2012	132

Som det ses af tabellen, har antallet af isolationsfængslinger varieret noget, men har de fleste år frem til 2006 har ligget på ca. 500 årlige isolationsfængslinger. I 2007 var antallet noget mindre, hvilket kan hænge sammen med en lovændring fra 1. januar 2007, som har sigtet på at reducere brugen af isolationsfængsling. Desuden kan det efterslæb, retsreformen måtte have medført, have influeret på mindskningen. Fra 2007 til 2008 ses en stigning på 20 pct. i antallet af isolationsfængslinger, men dette følges af et markant fald (på 36 pct.) fra 2008 til 2009 og endnu et markant fald fra 2009 til 2010 (på 40 pct.). Fra 2010 til 2011 er det sket en stigning på 46 pct., men i 2011 er der dog stadig tale om et relativt lille antal isolationsfængslinger, nemlig i alt 186. Fra 2011 til 2012 er antallet af isolationsfængslinger faldet med 29 pct. fra 186 til 132 isolationsfængslinger og ligger dermed på et relativt lavt niveau.

Faldet i isolationsfængslinger fra 2011 til 2012 angår især sager om manddrab og forsøg herpå samt forbrydelser vedrørende våben, idet førstnævnte er faldet fra 48 til 15 isolationsfængslinger, mens sidstnævnte er faldet fra 16 til 5 isolationsfængslinger, jf. tabel 4. Dette afspejler en mindskning både i antallet af sigtelser for manddrab og forsøg herpå og i antallet af sigtelser i sager vedrørende våben fra 2011 til 2012, men faldet i isolationsfængslinger er dog for begge kriminalitetstyper noget mere markant end faldet i antal sigtelser.

3. Antallet og varigheden af isolationsfængslinger og antallet af varetægtsfængslinger fordelt efter politikreds

I 2012 blev 2,4 pct. af de varetægtsfængslede blev anbragt i isolation.¹

Tabel 2. Udviklingen i antallet af isolationsfængslinger i forhold til antal varetægtsfængslinger, 2001-2012.

	Andel varetægtsfængslinger med isolation
2001	9,5 %
2002	8,2 %
2003	7,7 %
2004	9,8 %
2005	9,2 %
2006	8,0 %
2007	4,6 %
2008	5,3 %
2009	3,2 %
2010	1,9 %
2011	2,8 %
2012	2,4 %

I 2012 var varigheden af isolationsfængslingerne i 47 pct. af tilfældene på indtil 14 dage, mens yderligere 40 pct. varede fra 2 uger og til og med 6 uger. De resterende 13 pct. varede mere end 6 uger, jf. tabel 3. Ingen isolationsfængslinger varede mere end 3 måneder.

¹ Beregningerne for de tidligere år er baseret på ikke-opdaterede oplysninger om påbegyndte varetægtsfængslinger i stedet som i 2012 på opdaterede, afsluttede varetægtsfængslinger, hvorfor oplysningerne over årene, jf. tabel 2, ikke er helt sammenlignelige. Et ensartet beregningsgrundlag ville give en større andel isolationsfængslede i de tidligere år.

Tabel 3 viser, at Bornholms Politi har den største andel isolationsfængslinger i forhold til antallet af varetægtsfængslinger, idet 37,8 pct. af de varetægtsfængslede har været anbragt i isolation. Også i de tidligere år har Bornholms Politi ligget højt med hensyn til anvendelse af isolationsfængsling. På andenpladsen ligger Københavns Politi, hvor 4,0 pct. af varetægtsfængslingerne i 2012 har været forbundet med isolationsfængsling, mens der for Sydsjællands og Lolland-Falsters Politi er tale om 2,9 pct. – den tredjestørste andel isolationsfængslinger i forhold til antal varetægtsfængslinger.

Tabel 3. Antallet og varigheden af isolationsfængslinger og antallet af varetægtsfængslinger fordelt på politikreds 2012.*

Politikreds	Varetægtsfængslinger	Afsluttede isolationsfængslinger	Andel isolationsfængslinger i forhold til varetægtsfængslinger	Varighed af isolationsfængslinger						
				1-7 dage	8-14 dage	15-28 dage	29-42 dage	43-56 dage	57 dage-3 mdr.	over 3 mdr.
Nordjylland	284	8	2,8 %	0	5	3	0	0	0	0
Østjylland	387	2	0,5 %	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Midt- og Vestjylland	414	0	0,0 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sydøstjylland	237	0	0,0 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Syd- og Sønderjylland	431	5	1,2 %	0	3	1	0	0	1	0
Fyn	311	6	1,9 %	1	3	2	0	0	0	0
Sydsjællands og Lolland-Falster	276	8	2,9 %	0	3	1	0	0	4	0
Midt- og Vestsjælland	330	4	1,2 %	0	3	1	0	0	0	0
Nordsjælland	457	4	0,9 %	1	3	0	0	0	0	0
Københavns Vestegn	341	0	0,0 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
København	2.002	81	4,0 %	6	18	28	17	12	0	0
Bornholm	37	14	37,8 %	6	8	0	0	0	0	0
I alt	5.507	132	2,4	14	48	36	17	12	5	0

* Oplysninger om antal varetægtsfængslede stammer fra Rigsadvokaten og angår afsluttede varetægtsfængslinger.

Tabellen viser også, at isolationsfængslingerne i København er længerevarende end i dem i de øvrige politikredse, idet andelen af isolationsfængslinger på over to uger er større i denne politikreds end i de øvrige. Dette kan hænge sammen med, at København både har relativt mange og relativt komplicerede sager med narkotikakriminalitet, idet andelen af isolationsfængslinger vedrørende narkotikakriminalitet dels er større i Københavns politikreds og dels varer længere end i andre politikredse.

4. Kriminalitetens art sammenholdt med varigheden af isolationsfængslinger

Tabel 4 viser sammenhængen mellem isolationsfængslingens varighed og den kriminalitet, de isolationsfængslede er sigtet for. Den gennemsnitlige varighed af alle isolationsfængslingerne i 2012 var 24 dage, hvilket svarer til gennemsnittet i de to foregående år.

De fem tilfælde af mere end otte ugers isolationsfængsling angår sigtelser for hhv. smugling og salg af narkotika. I gennemsnit har de fem isolationsfængslinger været i 77 dage. Manddrab og forsøg herpå indtager en førsteplads med hensyn til varigheden af isolationsfængslingen med et gennemsnit på 33 dage, men isolationsfængslede for narkotikakriminalitet i gennemsnit har været varetægtsfængslet i isolation i 25 dage. I øvrigt bemærkes, at den gennemsnitlige varighed af isolationsfængslinger for manddrab, røveri, anden berigelse og narkotikakriminalitet var længere i 2012 end i 2011, mens den gennemsnitlige varighed for sager vedrørende terrorisme og våben var noget længere i 2011 end i 2012.

Tabel 4. Kriminalitetens art sammenholdt med varigheden af isolationsfængslinger, 2011 og 2012.

Kriminalitetens art	Varighed af isolationsfængslinger										
	1-7 dage	8-14 dage	15-28 dage	29-42 dage	43-56 dage	57 dage - 3 mdr.	over 3 mdr.	I alt 2012	I alt 2011	Gennemsnit dage 2012	Gennemsnit i dage i 2011
Manddrab og forsøg herpå	1	2	6	0	6	0	0	15	48	33	28
Vold og trusler m.v.	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	11	11
Seksualitetsforbrydelser	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	-	6
Røveri	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	10
Anden berigelse	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	16	11
Narkotikakriminalitet	11	33	22	17	6	5	0	94	100	25	24
Våben	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	11	18
Terrorisme	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	9	3	22	107
Andre straffelovsovertrædelser	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	-	6
I alt	14	48	36	17	12	5	0	132	186	24	24

Det samlede antal dages isolationsfængsling i 2012 var på 3.182 dage mod 4.535 i 2011 og 3.083 i 2010. Det samlede antal dages isolationsfængsling er faldet med 30 pct. fra 2011 til 2012.

5. Isolationsfængsling af unge under 18 år

Der var i 2012 ingen personer under 18 år, der var isolationsfængslede.

6. Nye længstetider for isolationsfængslingen

Ifølge reglerne om isolationsfængsling må isolation ikke finde sted i et samlet tidsrum af mere end 14 dage, såfremt sigtelsen angår en lovovertrædelse, der ikke kan medføre fængsel i 4 år (retsplejelovens § 770 c, stk. 1), ikke i mere end 4 uger, hvis lovovertrædelsen kan medføre fængsel i mindst 4 år, men under 6 år (stk. 2), og ikke i mere end 8 uger, hvis lovovertrædelsen kan medføre fængsel i 6 år eller derover (stk. 3). Der kan dog af retten undtagelsesvis dispenseres fra 8-ugers reglen, hvis lovovertrædelsen forventes at medføre fængselsstraf på mindst 2 år (stk. 3).

I 2012 har der været tre isolationsfængslinger i sager, der angår lovovertrædelser, der i normale tilfælde ikke kan medføre fængsel på 4 år eller derover. I ét af disse tilfælde har isolationsfængslingen været mere end de 14 dage, loven foreskriver som maksimum. Denne sag omhandler tyveri (indbrud i virksomhed) og er fra Sydsjællands og Lolland-Falsters politi.

Alle de øvrige 129 isolationsfængslinger i 2012 angår lovovertrædelser, der kan medføre mindst 6 års fængsel. Heraf varede fem isolationsfængslinger som nævnt mere end 8 uger, og samtlige angår narkotikakriminalitet. Fire af dem er fra Sydsjællands og Lolland-Falsters politi, og disse er i sag sammen vedrørende salg af narkotika (§ 191, stk. 1). Herudover er der en enkelt sag om smugling af narkotika (§ 191, stk. 2) fra Syd- og Sønderjyllands politi.

Oversigt over antallet af afsluttede isolationsfængslinger fordelt efter varighed i perioden 2001-2012

Varighed	1-7 dage	8-14 dage	15-28 dage	29-42 dage	43-56 dage	57dage - 3 mdr.	Over 3 mdr.	I alt over 8 uger	Gennemsnit i dage	I alt
2001	70	173	132	57	42	71	8	79	28	553
2002 ¹	52	143	128	66	39	69	4	73	30	531
2003	28	142	109	52	39	85 ²	21 ²	106	37	476
2004	48	173	114	50	53	126	16	142	36	580
2005	70	148	105	69	44	52	11	63	33	499
2006	57	142	110	67	45	53	2	55	29	475
2007	37	95	60	28	34	15	4	19	27	273
2008	52	134	73	32	29	5	2	7	21	327
2009	36	90	41	18	15	5	5	10	22	210
2010	10	44	35	22	15	0	1	1	24	127
2011	29	67	36	14	35	2	3	5	24	186
2012	14	48	36	17	12	5	0	5	24	132

¹ I ét tilfælde har isolationsfængslingen været afbrudt og herefter genoptaget. I tabellen er isolationsperioderne registreret særskilt. Der er derfor registreret i alt 501 isolationsfængslinger vedrørende i alt 500 personer.

² Korrigeret på baggrund af nye oplysninger i forhold til Rigsadvokatens redegørelse for isolationsfængslinger i 2003. Justitsministeriets Forskningsenhed har oplyst, at korrektionen ikke medfører ændringer i de gennemsnitlige tal for 2003.

Oversigt over antal og varighed af afsluttede isolationsfængslinger af personer under 18 år i perioden 2001-2012

	Isolationsfængslinger af personer under 18 år	Varighed					I alt
		1-7 dage	8-14 dage	15-28 dage	29-42 dage	43-56 dage	
2001				1			1
2002				1	2		3
2003			1	4			5
2004		1	2	1		1	5
2005			2			2	4
2006		5	1				6
2007		1	4				5
2008		1	3				4
2009							0
2010				1			1
2011							0
2012							0

Oversigt over det samlede antal varetægtsfængslinger samt det samlede antal afsluttede varetægtsfængslinger i isolation i absolutte tal og i % af det samlede antal varetægtsfængslinger for 2001 – 2012

År	Antal påbegyndte varetægtsfængslinger ¹	Antal afsluttede varetægtsfængslinger i isolation ²	Andel isolationsfængslinger i forhold til varetægtsfængslinger
2001	5.839	553	9,5%
2002	6.086	501	8,2 %
2003	6.202	476	7,7 %
2004	5.907	580	9,8 %
2005	5.762	532	9,2 %
2006	5.919	475	8 %
2007	5.919	273	4,6 %
2008	6.124	327	5,3 %
2009	6.509	210	3,2 %
2010	6.663 (5.641) ³	127	1,9 %
2011	6.676 (5.558) ⁴	186	2,8 %
2012	5.507 ⁵	132	2,4 %

¹Kilde: Rigspolitiet. Det bemærkes, at antal varetægtsfængslede er opgjort på samme måde som i tidligere års redegørelser og omhandler som anført *påbegyndte* varetægtsfængslinger i 2011. Antallet kan ikke sammenlignes med det samlede antal varetægtsfængslinger i redegørelsen om langvarige varetægtsfængslinger i 2011 og 2012, der er opgjort på et andet grundlag og omfatter antallet af *afsluttede* varetægtsfængslinger inden for strafferetsplejen i henholdsvis 2011 og 2012 (se Rigsadvokatens redegørelse om anvendelsen af langvarige varetægtsfængslinger i 2011 og 2012).

²Kilde: Bilag A, tabel 1 (Justitsministeriets Forskningskontor, Statistik om isolationsfængsling i 2012).

³ Tallene i parentes stammer fra Rigsadvokatens redegørelse om anvendelsen af langvarige varetægtsfængslinger i 2011 og 2012. Se også note 1.

⁴ Se note 3.

⁵ Se bilag A, note 2 på side 2 samt tabel 3 side 3 inkl. noten hertil. Se også note 1 ovenfor.

Sager om varetægtsfængsling i isolation udover 8 uger i 2012

I 2012 var der 5 afsluttede isolationsfængslingsforløb med en varighed på mere end 8 uger.

1. fængslingsforløb

Isolationsperioden havde en varighed på i alt 84 døgn.

Om sagen kan følgende oplyses:

- 1 person
- Isolationsfængsling i 84 dage og 10 timer
- Sigtet for overtrædelse af straffelovens § 191

A var sigtet for overtrædelse af straffelovens § 191, ved i perioden fra 2009 til februar 2012 i forening med andre at have indsmuglet ikke under 25 kg amfetamin fra Holland og Tyskland til Danmark med henblik på overdragelse til en større kreds af personer eller mod betydeligt vederlag.

A blev den 27. februar 2012 varetægtsfængslet i isolation, da der var bestemte grunde til at antage, at varetægtsfængslingen i sig selv ikke var tilstrækkelig til at hindre arrestanten i at vanskeliggøre forfølgningen i sagen, jf. retsplejelovens § 762, stk. 1, nr. 3, jf. § 770 a og b, idet der var ukendte medgængsmænd, herunder udenlandske leverandører, på fri fod, og da der var tale om organiseret indsmugling af meget store mængder amfetamin, ligesom A havde den ledende rolle i forhold til de øvrige sigtede og stod for kontakten til de ukendte udenlandske leverandører.

A blev den 11. juni 2013 ved Retten i Esbjerg idømt fængsel i 16 år for overtrædelse af straffelovens § 191 samt udvist for bestandig. Dommen er under anke til Vestre Landsret.

2.-5. fængslingsforløb

Isolationsperioderne havde en varighed på i alt 74-77 døgn.

Om sagen kan følgende oplyses:

- 4 personer
- Isolationsfængsling i 74-77 døgn
- Sigtet for overtrædelse af straffelovens § 191

A, B, C og D var sigtet for overtrædelse af straffelovens § 191 ved den 4. juli 2012 ved en navngiven motorvejsafkørsel at have overdraget henholdsvis modtaget brutto 40 kg amfetamin med henblik på videreforarbejdning og videresalg til en større gruppe af personer på Sjælland og i København. A og B var tillige sigtet for overtrædelse af straffelovens § 192 a ved samme dato på en angiven adresse i København i forening at have været i besiddelse af en pistol samt skarpe patroner.

De sigtede blev varetægtsfængslet i isolation, da der var bestemte grunde til at antage, at varetægtsfængslingen i sig selv ikke var tilstrækkelig til at hindre arrestanterne i at vanskeliggøre forfølgningen i sagen, jf. retsplejelovens § 762, stk. 1, nr. 3, jf. § 770 a og b, idet der var tale om 40 kg amfetamin samt risiko for påvirkning af medsigtede samt leverandører og aftagere på fri fod.

A blev den 30. oktober 2012 ved Retten i Næstved idømt en anbringelsesdom.

B blev den 7. december 2012 ved Retten i Næstved idømt 4 års fængsel, hvoraf 3,5 år blev gjort betinget

C og D blev den 21. februar 2013 ved Retten i Næstved idømt henholdsvis fængsel i 10 år og udvisning for bestandig samt en behandlingsdom.

COMPLAINTS AND CRIMINAL CASES AGAINST POLICE OFFICERS

2007-2011 (Director of Public Prosecutions)

The total number of complaints received is as follows:

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Chapter 93 b-conduct cases	457	447	424	407	415
Chapter 93 c-criminal cases	566	534	629	564	515
-thereof traffic offences	214	231	290	228	230
Total (not including traffic cases)	809	750	763	743	700

It appears from the table that there has been a minor decrease in the number of complaints filed against police officers from 809 in 2007 to 700 in 2011. However, the number of complaints fluctuate over the period.

Number of cases where the Regional Public Prosecutors have found grounds for prosecution:

It appears from the tables below that the number of cases where the Regional Public Prosecutors have found ground for prosecution varied between 165 in 2007 and 119 in 2010. Selected provisions of the Criminal Code are listed at the end of this annex.

2007:

	Prosecution, including fine notice	Waiver of prosecution	Warning
Criminal Code			
Section 152 and/or Section 155	10		
Section 246, see Section 245	1		
Section 245	2		
Section 244	1		

Traffic cases			
ATK (automatic traffic control)	118	1	
Other	33	2	
Total	165	3	0

In 2007 there were grounds for prosecution in four cases regarding violations of Sections 244, 245 or/and 246. These sections all deal with acts of violence (simple assault, aggravated assault and assault under particularly aggravating circumstances respectively).

2008:

	Prosecution, including fine notice	Waiver of prosecution	Warning
Criminal Code			
Section 155	2		
Section 155 and Section 175	2		
Section 244	1		
Section 244 and 266	2		
Traffic cases			
ATK (automatic traffic control)	130		
Other	14	1	2
Total	151	1	2

In 2008 there were grounds for prosecution in one case regarding a violation of Section 244 of the Danish Criminal Code, which deals with acts of violence, and in two cases there were grounds for prosecution regarding violations of both Section 244 and Section 266 of the Danish Criminal Code, which deals with violence and threats respectively.

2009:

	Prosecution, including fine notice	Waiver of prosecution	Warning
Criminal Code			
Section 152	1		
Section 152 and Section 155	1		
Section 152 and Section 157	1		
Section 155	6		

Section 244	2		
Section 276	1		
Traffic cases			
ATK (automatic traffic control)	111		
Other	34	1	6
Other specific regulations			
Emergency notice	1		
Fireworks and weapons notice	1		
Total	159	1	6

In 2009 there were grounds for prosecution in two cases regarding a violation of Section 244 of the Danish Criminal Code, which deals with acts of violence.

2010:

	Prosecution, including fine notice	Waiver of prosecution	Warning
Criminal Code			
Section 152 (1)	1		
Section 152 and Section 155	2		
Section 155	2		
Sections 155, 244 and 260	1		
Sections 181 and 279 etc.	1		
Section 246, see Section 245(1)	1		
Traffic cases			
ATK (automatic traffic control)	96		
Other*	15	4	
Other specific regulations			
Nature Protection Act		1	
Total	119	5	0

*Including cases concerning violation of the emergency notice.

In 2010 there were grounds for prosecution in one case regarding a violation of Sections 244 and 260 of the Danish Criminal Code, which deal with acts of violence and acts of unlawful coercion respectively. In one case there were grounds for prosecution regarding a violation of Section 246, cf. Section 245. Read together these sections deal with assault of particularly heinous or brutal or dangerous character under particularly aggravating circumstances.

2011:

	Prosecution, including fine notice	Waiver of prosecution	Warning
Criminal Code			
Section 152(1)	1		
Section 155	7		
Section 157	1		
Sections 155 and 293 a	1		
Section 244	1		
Section 245	1		
Traffic cases			
ATK (automatic traffic control)	96		
Other*	18	10**	1
Other specific regulations			
Total	126	10	1

* Including cases concerning violation of the emergency notice.

** In one case the indictment was withdrawn, *inter alia*, based on an error in the indictment.

In 2011 there were grounds for prosecution in one case regarding a violation of Section 244 of the Danish Criminal Code, which deals with acts of violence. In one case there was ground for prosecution regarding Section 245, which deals with assault of particularly heinous or brutal or dangerous character.

Section 1020a(2) of the Danish Administration of Justice Act:

Section 1020a(2) of the Danish Administration of Justice Act deals with persons who died or got seriously injured owing to the intervention of the police.

It appears from the below table that the number of investigations according to Section 1020a(2) in the period of 2007 to 2011 has varied between 21 in 2007 to 12 in 2009 and 2010.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Death in detention	2	0	0	1	1
Attempted suicide in detention etc.	0	0	0	0	1
Injuries caused by firearms	6	2	6	5	3

- including Death caused by firearms	0	1	3	1	0
Other deaths	2	2	3	2	5
Other injuries	11	10	3	4	4
Total	21	14	12	12	14

In cases where no grounds for prosecution have been found and in cases related to police conduct, there are no available statistics indicating the specific nature of the conduct or the alleged criminal behavior. The statistic material therefore does not specify the number of cases regarding violence, threats etc. or the number of complaints against police officers' conduct concerning the use of force etc.

It would call for a manual investigation of all the cases treated by the Regional Public Prosecutors in the years from 2007 to 2011 to work out such statistics.

Police officers' conduct:

As regards the Regional Prosecutors decisions in matters of police officers' conduct, information regarding the type of decisions are available as set out below.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Complaint settled in the police district	147	151	152	123	101
Complaint withdrawn	18	9	7	8	11
Complaint dismissed as obsolete	9	9	16	17	9
Complaint dismissed as unfounded	272	266	240	215	244
Not grounds for	8	5	9	9	11

criticism, but the incidence was regretted					
Criticism	14	8	5	3	7
Dissent	0	0	0	0	0
Other	21	13	11	9	52
Total	489	461	440	384	435

It appears from the table, that 7 out of the total number of 435 decisions in 2011 resulted in criticism while 11 resulted in regretting the incident although there were no grounds for criticism.

2012-2013 (IPCA)

Since its establishment the Independent –Police Complaint Authority (IPCA) has experienced an increase in the number of complaints filed against police officers from 686 in 2011 (415 cases regarding police officers’ conduct, 285 cases regarding criminal proceedings against police officers (not including traffic cases)) to 1053 in 2012 and 1085 in 2013. Furthermore, the IPCA has received 401 traffic cases in 2012 and 446 in 2013. The increase in traffic cases is partly due to a different way of registering these types of cases.

Out of the total amount of cases filed in 2012/2013 there were 655/652 complaints regarding police officers’ conduct and 398/433 regarding criminal proceedings against police officers (not including traffic cases). IPCA does not have any statistics that indicates the different types of complaints against police officers’ conduct or different types of criminal proceedings against police officers. The statistics material therefore does not show the number of criminal proceedings that concerns violence, threats etc. or how many of the complaints against police officers’ conduct that concerns use of force etc.

The number of investigations in accordance with section 1020a(2) of the Danish Administration of Justice Act regarding persons who died or got seriously injured owing to the intervention of the police were ~~14 in 2011~~, 18 in 2012 and 16 in 2013.

IPCA made 521 decisions in 2012 concerning complaints against police officers’ conduct. 16 of the cases resulted in criticism while 11 of the cases resulted in regretting the incident although there were no grounds for criticism.

In 2013 IPCA made 715 decisions concerning complaints against police officers' conduct. 22 of the cases resulted in criticism while 14 of the cases resulted in regretting the incident although there were no grounds for criticism.

Number of cases where the Regional Public Prosecutors have found grounds for prosecution:

It appears from the tables below that the number of cases where the Regional Public Prosecutors have found ground for prosecution against a police officer varied between 85 in 2012 and 96 in 2013. Selected provisions of the Criminal Code are listed at the end of this annex.

2012:

	Prosecution, including fine notice	Waiver of prosecution	Warning
Criminal Code			
Section 152 and 155	2		
Section 155	6		
Section 157 and 164	1		
Sections 157	1		
Section 123 and 155	1		
Section 155 and 156	1		
Section 155, 278 and 280	1		
Traffic cases			
Decisions made by the Regional Public Prosecutors	25		
Decisions made by the Police Commissioner	47		
Total	85		

2013:

	Prosecution, including fine notice	Waiver of prosecution	Warning
Criminal Code			
Section 155	3		

Section 152 and 155	2		
Sections 155 and 171	1		
Section 156	1		
Section 119	1		
Section 244	1		
Traffic cases			
Decisions made by the Regional Public Prosecutors	31	4	
Decisions made by the Police Commissioner	49		
Other specific regulations			
Regulation of dogs	1		
Regulation of weapons	1		
Regulation of traffic and order of use of emergency signals	1		
Total	92	4	

Section 1020a(2) of the Danish Administration of Justice Act:

It appears from the below table that the number of investigations according to Section 1020a(2) has varied from 18 in 2012 and 16 in 2013. Charged were raised in 2 cases in 2012 and in 1 case in 2013.

	2012	2013
Death in detention	0	0
Attempted suicide in detention etc.	0	0
Injuries caused by firearms	0	4
- including Death caused by firearms	0	2
Other deaths	6	4
Other injuries	11	2
Other investigations*	1	6
Total	18	16

* For example shooting against a car without injury, accidental shooting without injury.

Extracts from the Danish Criminal Code:

119. Any person who, through the exertion of violence or threats of violence, assaults someone with a duty to act by virtue of a public function or office during the performance of his function or office or on the occasion of such performance of his function or office, or who similarly attempts to prevent such person from carrying out a lawful duty or to coerce him to carry out a duty, is sentenced to a fine or imprisonment for a term not exceeding eight years.

(2) The same penalty is imposed on any person who threatens with violence, with the deprivation of liberty or with a provisional charge of a criminal or defamatory act against someone granted power to issue judgments or make decisions concerning legal matters or concerning the exercise of the criminal jurisdiction of the state on the occasion of the function or office or who similarly attempts to prevent such person from carrying out a lawful duty or to coerce him to carry out a duty, without such act falling within subsection (1).

(3) Any person obstructing the performance by the said persons of their functions or offices is sentenced to a fine or imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year and six months. When determining a sentence, it must be considered an aggravating circumstance if the act was committed during or directly after a serious breach of the peace in a public place in the area.

123. Any person who molests another person, his significant others or other persons attached to him by threats of violence, or who commits a criminal act against such other person by the use of violence, duress under section 260, threats under section 266 or by other means on the occasion of a statement that such person is expected to make or has already made to the police or in court, is sentenced to a fine or imprisonment for a term not exceeding eight years.

152. Any person who performs or has performed a public function or office and who unduly discloses or utilises confidential information imparted to him in the course of his duties is sentenced to a fine or imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months.

(2) If a person commits the act referred to in subsection (1) with intent to obtain an unlawful gain for himself or others, or if particularly aggravating circumstances apply, the penalty may increase to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years. Especially situations where information is disclosed or utilised in circumstances that inflict serious harm on others or entail a risk of such harm are considered particularly aggravating circumstances.

(3) Information is confidential when it has been classified by law or other valid regulations as confidential, or when secrecy is otherwise required to safeguard significant considerations for public or private interests.

155. Any person performing a public function or office who abuses his position to infringe a right of an individual or the public is sentenced to a fine or imprisonment for a term not exceeding four

months. If such abuse is committed to obtain undue benefit for himself or others, the maximum sentence is imprisonment for two years.

156. If a person performing a public function or office refuses or fails to observe a duty incumbent on him by virtue of his function or office, or to obey an official command, he is sentenced to a fine or imprisonment for a term not exceeding four months. Offices held by virtue of a public election fall outside the scope of the preceding provision.

157. If a person performing a public function or office is guilty of gross or frequently repeated negligence or recklessness in performing his function or office or in performing the duties implied by the function or office, he is sentenced to a fine or imprisonment for a term not exceeding four months. Offices held by virtue of a public election fall outside the scope of the preceding provision.

157 a. When determining a sentence for violation of this Code, it must be considered an aggravating circumstance if the offence was committed by torture.

(2) An offence is considered committed by torture if it was committed by someone exercising a public function or office with a Danish, foreign or international organisation by causing injury to the body or health of another person or strong physical or mental pain or suffering on such person - (i) to obtain information or a confession from someone; (ii) to punish, frighten or coerce someone to do, accept or fail to do something; or (iii) due to the person's political views, gender, race, colour, national or ethnic origin, religious faith or sexuality.

164. Any person who gives incorrect information to a public authority with the intent that an innocent person will thereby be charged with, convicted of or subjected to a penal sanction for a criminal offence is sentenced to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six years.

(2) The same penalty is imposed on any person who destroys, distorts or removes evidence or furnishes false evidence with the intent that another person will thereby be charged with or convicted of a criminal offence.

(3) Any person who commits an act as referred to in subsections (1) and (2) with the intent that he himself or another person who has consented thereto will be charged with, convicted of or subjected to a penal sanction for a criminal offence not committed by him is sentenced to a fine or imprisonment for a term not exceeding six years.

(4) A court may decide if so requested by the victim that the conclusion and as many of the grounds as deemed necessary by the court must be promulgated in one or more official gazettes by order of a public authority.

171. Any person who uses a false document to deceive in legal matters is guilty of forgery.

(2) A document means any written or electronic form of verification bearing the name of the issuer and appearing to be intended to serve as evidence.

(3) A document is false when it does not originate from the issuer named in the document, or the contents given to it do not originate from the issuer.

175. Any person who makes a false statement or representation in a public document or book, in a private document or book incumbent on him by law or a particular relationship of obligation to issue or keep, or in a medical certificate from a doctor, dentist, midwife or veterinarian regarding matters for which the statement is to serve as evidence in order to deceive in legal matters is sentenced to a fine or imprisonment for a term not exceeding three years.

(2) The same penalty is imposed on any person who uses such document or book as if it represented the truth to deceive in legal matters.

(3) The provisions of subsections (1) and (2) apply correspondingly when such document or book is issued or kept on another readable medium.

181. Any person who otherwise causes a fire to the property of another is sentenced to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six years.

(2) The same penalty is imposed on any person who causes a fire to his own property or with the owner's consent to the property of another with intent to defraud the fire insurance company or infringe the rights of mortgagees or with a similar unlawful intent.

(3) The sentence may increase to imprisonment for ten years in particularly aggravating circumstances.

244. Any person who commits an act of violence against or otherwise assaults the person of another is sentenced to a fine or imprisonment for a term not exceeding three years.

245. Any person who commits an assault on the person of another in a particularly offensive, brutal or dangerous manner, or is guilty of mistreatment, is sentenced to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six years. It must be considered a particularly aggravating circumstance if such assault causes serious harm to the body or health of another person.

(2) Any person who harms the body or health of another person in cases other than those referred to in subsection (1) is sentenced to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six years.

246. The sentence may increase to imprisonment for ten years if an assault on the person of another falling within section 245 or section 245a is considered to be committed in highly aggravating circumstances because it was an act of a particularly aggravating nature or an act causing serious harm or death.

260. A fine or imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years for duress is imposed on any person who - (i) coerces someone to do, accept or fail to do something through the exertion of violence or

through threats of violence, of considerable damage to property, of deprivation of liberty, of making an incorrect allegation of a criminal or defamatory act, or of disclosing private details;

(ii) coerces someone to do, accept or fail to do something through threats of reporting or disclosing a criminal act, or of making true defamatory accusations, and such coercion is considered not to be properly justified by the underlying cause of the threat.

(2) If someone is coerced into marriage or to participate in a religious marriage ceremony with no legal effect, the punishment may increase to imprisonment for a term not exceeding four years.

(3) If someone is coerced into wearing a garment covering the face, the punishment may increase to imprisonment for a term not exceeding four years.

266. Any person who threatens to commit a criminal act in a manner suited to create a serious fear in another person of his or other people's life, health or welfare is sentenced to a fine or imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years.

276. A person is guilty of theft if he removes any tangible property belonging to another person without the owner's consent to obtain an unlawful gain for himself or others by its appropriation. For the purpose of this and the following provisions, a quantity of energy produced, stored or used to produce light, heat, power or movement or for other economic purposes is comparable to tangible property.

278. A person is guilty of embezzlement if, to obtain an unlawful gain for himself or others, he -

(i) appropriates any tangible property in his possession, where the offence does fall within section 277; (ii) denies the receipt of a cash loan or other property left in his care for ownership or of any service for which remuneration is payable; or (iii) wrongfully spends money entrusted to him even though he was not obliged to keep it apart from his own assets.

(2) The provision of subsection (1)(i) does not prohibit transactions involving goods sold to which the seller has retained legal ownership until payment of the full purchase price.

279. A person is guilty of fraud if, by wrongfully creating, confirming or exploiting a mistake to obtain an unlawful gain for himself or others, he induces another person to perform or fail to perform an act and thereby inflicts a property loss on such other person or someone to whom the performance or failure becomes essential.

280. A person is guilty of breach of trust if, to obtain an unlawful gain for himself or others where the offence does not fall within sections 276-279a, he - (i) abuses a right created for him to act with legal effect for another person; or (ii) acts contrary to the best interests of another person whose property has been entrusted to him for a specific purpose.

293 a. Any person who wrongfully uses a motor vehicle belonging to another person is sentenced to a fine or imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year and six months for taking a vehicle without the owner's consent. In particularly aggravating circumstances, including especially repetitive offending, the sentence may increase to imprisonment for a term not exceeding four years."

COMPLAINTS AGAINST PRISON STAFF			
Year	Description of the incident involved	Decision of the Department of Prison and Probation Service or the Police	Sex, age and ethnicity of alleged victim
2005 0 cases			
2006 5 cases	1: Violence against an inmate during transport reported to the police	Staff member suspended from work at time of indictment, but dismissed because of illness before verdict (court decision unknown)	Male Born 1977 Danish citizen
	2: Staff member hit an inmate in the face with his fist. Convicted by District Court, but acquitted by High Court	Returned to work after acquittal	Male Born 1978 Danish
	3: Lawyer notified police that his client was a victim of violence committed by staff member	The Prison and Probation service found no reason to suspend staff member. Police dismissed the case	Male Born 1960 Danish citizen
	4: Inmate had reported to the police that he had received threats of violence from staff (inmate rumored to want transfer to another prison)	Police dismissed the case	Male Born 1978 Lithuanian citizen
	5: Bruises found on inmate's shoulder by doctor. Employer notified police of suspected staff member	Police dismissed the case	Male Born 1981 Danish citizen
2007 4 cases	1: Former inmate under supervision (released on parole) claimed rape during custody	Staff member suspended. Convicted by court. Staff member was dismissed by the Prison and Probation Service	Female Born 1966 Danish Citizen

	2: Inmate claimed violence during transport – hand- cuffed and thrown into car, his back stepped on, dragged out causing bruises on knees	Hearing of staff involved resulted in Department deciding to express criticism towards staff for not having complied with the rules of use of force	Male Born 1973 Danish Citizen
	3: A prisoner's inability to use a urine bottle or a bedpan in connection with being placed in a security cell made it necessary for him to relieve himself in his trousers	The reason why the prisoner did not receive a urine bottle or a bedpan was confusion as to which staff group would have to assist in this. The Department apologized for this but did not find that any sanctions in terms of employment law were needed. The prisoner received a discretionary compensation of DKK 2500	Male Born 1972 Danish citizen
	4: Stepping on a Prisoner's toes and (on another occasion) using force in the form of holding the Prisoner's arm	During a disciplinary hearing the employee acknowledged that it is not allowed to give prisoners orders by stepping on their toes, and that his doing so was a contributory reason why the situation developed into use of force. In view hereof the institution found no reason to impose a formal disciplinary caution on him. The prisoner received a discretionary compensation of DKK 500 for the unwarranted use of force	Male Born 1976 Danish citizen
2008 9 cases	1: Inmate being hit on his hands with handcuffs. Staff member suspended	Staff member dismissed by the Prison and Probation Service	Male Born 1984 Danish

	2: Inmate claimed use of violence during use of force caused by inmate's raising of hand	Case dismissed by police	Male Born 1984 Danish
	3: Inmate violently being forced to clean cell after urination. Staff member reported to the police. Acquitted by court	Prison and Probation Service found reason to transfer the staff member to another institution for operational reasons	Male Born 1966 Danish citizen
	4: Two inmates claimed sexual molestation. Police dismissed case	The Prison and Probation Service decided not to act	Women Born 1988 and 1990 Palestinian citizens
	5: Inmate being forced to wear handcuffs on back, causing bad shoulder. Claimed he was dragged by his legs out of car while handcuffed. Staff member suspended. Convicted by District Court, but acquitted by High Court	Prison and Probation Service found reason to dismiss staff member due to failure to observe the rules on use of force	Male Born 1980 Danish citizen
	6: Complaint of use of force when transferred between two local prisons. Claim for compensation	Department found no basis for criticism as the use of force by staff was found in accordance with the relevant conditions of the Sentence Enforcement Act. Compensation refused	Male Born 1984 Danish citizen
	7: Complaint of unlawful placement in security cell and unlawful use of force contrary to ECHR Article 3 in connection with placement	Department found no basis for criticising the use of force or the actual placement in security cell, which was found to accord with the Sentence Enforcement Act. Criticism of length of immobilisation. The inmate was awarded	Male Born 1971 Danish citizen

		compensation for that part of the complaint	
	8: Inmate indicated that he no longer wanted medication with "Androcur" (cyproterone acetate). He referred to the report of the Committee for the Prevention of Torture stating that forced medication of inmates was not allowed, and claimed that the institution therefore could not make it a condition for unescorted leave that he be medicated with "Androcur" and "Procren" (leuprolide acetate)	The Department found that it was not a case of forced medication, but that in relation to an assessment of substance abuse it would be a condition for unescorted leave that the inmate was medicated with both preparations	Male Born 1962 Danish
	9: Lawyer complained that his client had been transferred from an open to a closed prison and stated that this was a breach of ECHR Article 3. The lawyer also claimed compensation	The Department denied any breach of Article 3 as it found the transfer justified. For that reason, the claim for compensation was dismissed	Male Born 1985 Iraqi citizen
2009 6 cases	1: Inmate told lawyer about violence during body search – pushed towards door and in back several times. Lawyer complained to the police, but inmate did not want to report the incident. Case dismissed by police	The Prison and Probation Service found reason to investigate at disciplinary level. Case closed due to lack of evidence	Male Born 1966 Danish citizen
	2: Lawyer reported to the police that his client was a victim of violence. Police found no reason to investigate and closed the case	The Prison and Probation Service found no reason to act	Male Born 1974 Danish citizen
	3: Staff member accused of violence during use of	Staff member came back to work	Male Born 1986

	force. Suspended from work. Police dismissed the case due to lack of evidence that violence had occurred	– no disciplinary investigation necessary	Danish citizen
	4: Staff member accused of violence having hit an inmate twice in the face. Staff member suspended from work. Court found him guilty	The Prison and Probation Service found reason to dismiss him	Male Born 1988 Danish citizen
	5: Complaint of staff conduct in connection with food serving, racism and inappropriate language	The Department found no basis to sustain the complaint, but noted that the prison governor had indicated to the staff what management expected as regards the general staff contact and language	Male Born 1981 Danish citizen
	6: The inmate's lawyer complained in August 2009 of exclusion from association in such circumstances that it must be considered contrary to ECHR Article 3 in the lawyer's opinion	The Department found the relevant inmate's conditions during the deprivation of liberty not to be contrary to Article 3. The Department stated that measures as provided for in the rules on long-term exclusion from association were offered to the widest extent possible to compensate for the situation. The Ombudsman expressed no criticism in the particular case, but generally monitors the regime in the institution with particular attention	Male Born 1970 French citizen
2010 5 cases	1: Several staff members were reported to the police due to use of violence while putting an inmate into a security cell. The District Court found them not guilty due to	The Prison and Probation Service decided to point out to the staff members concerned the importance of complying with the rules of use of force and made it clear that if it	Male Born 1990 Ivorian citizen

	lack of evidence	were to come to anybody's attention who had been the active person, it could have serious consequences	
	2: Staff member had tried to give an inmate a slap in the face, but he was too quick putting up his hand. The police dismissed the case, since no harm had been done	The staff member was given a disciplinary fine	Male Born 1991 Danish citizen
	3: Complaint of force/violence and language used by staff in connection with transport	The Department found it unjustified that staff members had used improper language and raised their voices unnecessarily. The Department found no proof that the inmate had been subjected to violence	Male Born 1987 Danish citizen
	4: The inmate's lawyer had made a complaint against Denmark to the UN Committee Against Torture based on a long list of issues concerning the inmate's asylum case. Part of the complaint is constituted by two temporary exclusions from association (4 1/2 hours and 3 days, and approx. 20 hours, respectively) and placement in observation cell for just under 4 hours in the Prison and Probation Service institution for asylum-seekers deprived of their liberty (Ellebæk Institution)	On 6 July 2010, the Department issued an opinion to the Human Rights Unit of the Ministry of Justice on the basis of the information of the complaint submitted to the UN and opinions from the Ellebæk Institution. The Ministry of Justice submitted comprehensive observations to the UN Committee Against Torture. By decision of 13 November 2012 the Committee found that no violation of the Convention had occurred.	Male Born 1963 Iraqi citizen
	5: A medically trained sister of an inmate	The Department, which found no basis for	Male Born 1961

	<p>complained that the medical treatment of her brother in a state prison constituted torture</p>	<p>interruption of enforcement or pardon, guided the sister about the possibility of complaining to the National Agency for Patients' Rights and Complaints. The sister's complaint was decided on 4 August 2011 by the Disciplinary Board of the National Health Service (<i>Sundhedsvæsenets Disciplinærnævn</i>). The complaint concerned the medical treatment of her brother (the inmate) from 8 December 2009 to 19 July 2010. The Disciplinary Board of the National Health Service criticised the record-keeping of two doctors. The Disciplinary Board also found that in two instances (22 February 2010 and 31 March 2010) one doctor had acted in a manner below the generally recognised professional standard as (1) the doctor should have followed up on a recommendation from a doctor on call to check the inmate's blood pressure, and (2) the doctor should have arranged for the inmate to have an ECG taken on the occasion of palpitations. The Disciplinary Board of the National Health Service found no basis for criticising the doctors for their other treatment of</p>	<p>Danish citizen</p>
--	---	--	-----------------------

		the inmate during the relevant period. The Department found no reason for further action	
2011 8 cases	1: Staff member hit a female inmate on her shoulder with his fist. He is suspended from work	Staff member was dismissed by the Prison and Probation Service	Female Born 1992 Danish citizen
	2: After being transferred to a psychiatric institution, an inmate whom the Prison and Probation Service had attempted to transfer to a psychiatric institution for many years and who had complained several times of inhumane treatment, etc. during his imprisonment of more than 20 years in the Prison and Probation Service institutions has instituted proceedings against the Department and the institutions in which he stayed, claiming breach of human rights	Case is still pending before the courts	Male Born 1971 Danish citizen
	3: Following the use of force, an inmate of a local prison died in hospital. The inmate's relatives found that the death is attributable to the actions of the prison staff	The criminal investigation of the case has been concluded by the police, who found that no criminal offence had been committed. The matter is currently under consideration by the Department, which will examine whether the applicable rules on the use of force have been observed. When the Department has concluded its examination, the case will be submitted to the	Male Born 1987 Danish

		Parliamentary Ombudsman, who will also review the case and will assess the examination of the case by the Department	
	4: Staff member watched demonstration in front of prison, walked to one of the participants and covered the lens on the camera causing uproar. Identity of demonstrator is unknown. Incident was not reported to police	Staff member was given a disciplinary fine	Unidentified
	5: 2 staff members used unauthorized force (punching inmate in face and on body). Suspended, and received a prison sentence by court	Both staff members were dismissed by the Prison and Probation Service	Male Born 1977 Danish citizen
	6: Inmate complained that an officer had stepped on his toes and threatened him	The Department found no proof that the incident had taken place as described by the inmate. Complaint dismissed	Male Born 1976 Danish citizen
	7: Remand prisoner complained that she had been placed in a security cell twice and had been subjected to harassment and mental terror by staff	The Department agreed with the prison in the assessment that, in the one case where she was assessed as suicidal, it would have been sufficient to have placed her in an observation cell. The prison expressed its regrets. The inmate was advised of the possibility of applying for compensation, but she did not do so. The Department found no other reason to criticise the prison staff and	Female Born 1976 Danish citizen

		advised the inmate of the possibility of bringing a complaint of staff conduct before the court. The Department has heard nothing more about the matter	
	8: Remand prisoner complained of two instances of use of force, including a violent assault	In both cases, the Department found that the use of force had been justified and thus dismissed the allegation that violence had been committed in that connection. However, the Department expressed its regrets that the inmate was only advised of the possibility of bringing a complaint of staff conduct before the court in connection with the decision made by the Department. The Department has heard nothing more about the matter	Male Born 1975 Danish citizen
2012 10 cases	1: Staff member made it a condition for an inmate to use the phone that he did 25 pushups. A superior staff member present did not intervene	Both staff members were given a disciplinary fine by the Prison and Probation Service	Male Born 1992 Danish citizen
	2: In conflict with regulations, a staff member used a pepper spray instead of first using less radical methods	Staff member was given a disciplinary fine by the Prison and Probation Service	Male Born 1975 Danish citizen
	3: Staff member used unauthorized necklock. Staff member suspended. Court found him guilty of violence	Staff member dismissed by the Prison and Probation Service	Female Born 1994 Danish citizen
	4: Inmate complained of several instances of violence committed by	The Department refused to consider the case on account of the	Male Born 1976 Danish

	staff	investigation by the police as the inmate stated that the incidents had been reported to the police. The Department has heard nothing more about the matter	citizen
	5: Inmate's counsel complained that staff was racist and that his client had been attacked by staff giving blows and using a pepper spray	The complaints about discrimination, racism, other differential treatment, physical abuse and use of force have been brought before the City Court and the court has by decision stated that the complaints of the inmate were unfounded. The Court of Appeal has refused the inmate's appeal of this decision. The Department of Prisons and Probation has dealt with the inmate's complaint about being placed in a security cell in the remand prison and has stated that the placement was justified	Male Born 1962 Rwandian citizen
	6: Inmate's counsel complained that inmates must provide a urine sample over a hand basin, which was found degrading	The Department found that urine must be sampled in a room with a toilet and noted that the prison would now fit out such room	Male Born 1976 Danish citizen
	7: Inmate complained that he had been shouted at and that he had been threatened with being transferred to a closed prison	The Department found it proved that there had been no shouting or threats	Male Born 1972 Danish citizen
	8: The spokesman of a unit housing sexual offenders complained that staff members treated the inmates in a degrading manner because of the nature of their crime	The Department found that the inmates were being treated in accordance with the rules	Males Primarily Danish citizens

	9: Inmate complained of torture and racist treatment	The Department found that no torture had been applied and that staff members had not been racist, but that the use of force had been necessary	Male Born 1949 Egyptian citizen
	10: Inmate complained that he had been asked to squat in connection with a search of his person, which he found degrading	The Department found no basis for criticising the request made of the inmate to squat in connection with a search in order to examine whether items were hidden between his buttocks	Male Born 1974 Danish citizen
2013 6 cases	1: It was questioned whether a staff member had used an unauthorized method of force	The Prison and Probation Service decided that the method used was correct in the situation. Case dismissed	Male Born 1989 Danish citizen
	2: Staff member slapped inmate. Staff member suspended. Court found him guilty of violence	Staff member dismissed by the Prison and Probation Service.	Male Born 1974 Danish citizen
	3: Staff member used necklock in an emergency situation to prevent inmate from harming himself seriously	Case dismissed	Male Born 1969 Danish citizen
	4: Inmates of a high-security unit complained of the rules of the unit, including searches, which they considered as means of mental torture	The Department found no basis for criticising the rules of the unit, and found that the inmates were being treated in accordance with the rules	Males Both Danish citizens and citizens from other countries
	5: Inmate complained of several instances of violence committed by staff.	The Department refused to consider the case on account of the investigation by the	Male Born 1959 Danish citizen

		police as the inmate stated that the incident had been reported to the police. The Department has heard nothing more about the matter.	
	6: The father of an inmate complained of an instance of use of force against his son in connection with a visit, including that the staff had used a stranglehold on the son	The prison found that the use of force had been justified and denied the use of a stranglehold on the son during the incident. The Department found that the use of force had been justified and found no proof that the stranglehold had taken place as described by the father	Male Born 1992 Danish citizen
2014 4 cases Until 01.06	1: Inmate's counsel complained of staff member who had used degrading language; and that his client had been threatened with being transferred to another prison	Before the Department had had the opportunity to take the case under consideration, the counsel withdrew the complaint	Male Born 1991 Serbian citizen
	2: Inmate complained that staff member had used force and degrading language	The Department found that the use of force had been justified but found that there may have been a communication error between the staff member and the inmate so that he had misunderstood what was said.	Male Born 1977 Romanian citizen
	3: Inmate complained that the staff member had used illegal force using a pepper spray. Inmate said that he had lost the sight in one eye. Staff member reported to the police	The Department found that the use of force had been justified. An ophthalmologist said that the incident had no impact on the inmate's eyes. The Department has heard nothing more about the matter	Male Born 1984 Danish citizen

	4: Inmate complained that he in connection with use of force felt that he was suffocating and that he had his t-shirt ripped off while there were female staff present	The Department found no proof that the inmate was suffocating. He was so violent that it was necessary to tear the shirt off even if there were female staff present	Male Born 1980 Danish citizen
--	--	--	-------------------------------------

FORSVARETS

FORSVARETS

FORSVARETS

MEDARBEJDERLINJEN

MEDARBEJDERLINJEN

Oplysning om ordninger og kontaklinjer

MEDARBEJDERLINJEN

Oplysning om ordninger og kontaklinjer

Oplysning om ordninger og kontaklinjer

Annex D

Denne folder giver dig et overblik over nogle af de ordninger og kontaklinjer, du som medarbejder i forsvaret kan henvende dig til.

Din henvendelse kan bl.a. dreje sig om kritiske forhold. For eksempel hændelser du finder uhenigtsmæssige, urimelige, ulovlige eller forslag til effektivisering. Din henvendelse kan også handle om, at du har brug for hjælp.

Du kan altid henvende dig til de listede ordninger, uden du behøver at orientere din chef eller leder om det. Du kan også henvende dig anonymt.

Tlf.: 2540 4040

Mail: medarbejderlinjen@mil.dk

Postadresse:

Medarbejderlinjen
Forsvarskommandoen
Danneskovs-Samsøes Alle 1
1434 København K



Forsvarets medarbejderlinje kan oplyse dig om, hvor du kan henvende dig, hvis du er i tvivl om hvilken ordning eller kontaklinje, du skal henvende dig til med dit problem.

Medarbejderlinjen er åben for personlig betjening inden for normal arbejdstid. Uden for normal arbejdstid kan du lægge besked på en telefonsvarer. Du kan desuden henvende dig via mail, post eller ved fremmøde.

Dit behov for at kontakte medarbejderlinjen kan opstå pludseligt og i en situation, hvor du ikke har denne folder til din rådighed. Derfor anbefaler vi, at du lægger det vedlagte kort i din tegnebog.



PSYKISK OG FYSISK ARBEJDSMILJØ

ORGANISATION AF RÅDGIVERE

TIL HÅNTERING AF KRÆNKENDE ADFÆRD

Rådgiver og vejleder ved personlige konflikter, mobning og stress.

Henvendelse til KA rådgiver ved dit tjenestested. Eller tlf.: 4185 0599.

ARBEJDSPSYKOLOGERNE VED

FORSVARETS CENTER FOR ARBEJDSMILJØ

Rådgiver vedrørende alle typer af udfordringer omkring arbejdsmiljøet.

Henvendelse til lokal arbejdsmiljørepræsentant, eller e-mail: fca-myn@mil.dk

KONTAKTOFFICERSORDNINGEN

Vejleder og hjælper udsendte og deres pårørende før, under og efter en udsendelse.

Dit tjenestested kan oplyse dig om, hvem din kontaktofficer er.

MILITÆRÆGTERADMINISTRATIONEN

Overførsel af værnepligtige til militærnægertjeneste. Tlf.: 3266 5270. E-mail: fpt-mna@mil.dk

SOLDATERPORTALEN

Udsendte og pårørende kan holde kontakt på portalen. Endvidere oplyser portalen de seneste nyheder og informationer fra igangværende missioner. www.soldaterportalen.dk

KAMMERATSTØTTELINJEN

Støtter i forbindelse med fysiske og eller psykiske efterreaktioner efter en udsendelse.

Veteraner rådgiver veteraner.

Tlf.: 8060 8030. E-mail: social@80608030.dk

INNOVATION

Effektiviserings- og forbedringsforslag inden for alle områder.

Forslag fremsendes ad kommandovejen.

DISCIPLINARLOVEN

TELEFONISK HOTLINE VEDRØRENDE

MILITÆR DISCIPLINARLOV

Rådgiver chefer i anvendelse af militær disciplinarlov. FPT Hotline Tlf.: 3266 5960.

FORSVARETS

MEDARBEJDERLINJE

Oplysning om ordninger og kontaklinjer

Mail:

medarbejderlinjen@mil.dk

Postadresse:

Medarbejderlinjen
Forsvarskommandoen
Danneskiold-Samsøes Alle 1
1434 København K

2540 4040

Tryk kortet ud



FORSVARET

SOCIALRÅDGIVER, PSYKOLOG, JOB OG UDDANNELSESRÅDGIVNING

En indgang – ét nummer: 7216 3400.

(Veterancenter)

Åbningstider: Mandag - tirsdag kl. 8-16 og onsdag - fredag kl. 8-15.

SOCIALRÅDGIVNING

Støtter og rådgiver i forbindelse med tjeneste i INTOPS – både før, under og efter udsendelse. Herunder f.eks. tilskadekomst, arbejdsskade, forsikring, erstatning, langvarig sygdom. Udenfor åbningstid: DØGNTLEFONEN på samme telefonnummer 7216 3400.

PSYKOLOGSTØTTE

Psykologfaglig støtte i forbindelse med tjeneste i INTOPS – både før, under og efter udsendelse. Psykologernes netrådgivning: www.forsvaret.dk/veteran

JOB- OG UDDANNELSESRÅDGIVNING

Støtter og vejleder i forbindelse med job og uddannelse, herunder civilundervisning og rehabiliteringsforløb.

BRUD PÅ MILITÆR SIKKERHED, STRAFBARE FORHOLD, MISBRUG AF OFFENTLIGE MIDLER MM.

FORSVARETS EFTERRETNINGSTJENESTE

Anmeldelse af brud på den militære sikkerhed - såsom tyveri eller mistænkelig adfærd mv. - inden for områderne personel, materiel, dokumenter, elektronisk databehandling, operationer, etablissementer mv.

Tlf.: 3332 5566. FIIN mail: FE-MYNN

E-mail: fe@fe-mail.dk

FORSVARETS AUDITØR KORPS

Anmeldelse af strafbare forhold. Tlf.: 7226 5000. Uden for normal arbejdstid: Tlf.: 2210 0286.

E-mail: fauk-myn@mil.dk

FORSVARSMINISTERIETS INTERNE REVISION

Anmeldelse af anvendelse af forsvarets materiel mv. til privat brug. F.eks. misbrug af offentlige midler og tyveri fra forsvaret.

Tlf.: 7244 4750, FIIN mail: FIR-MYNN

E-mail: fir@mil.dk