



Inter-Parliamentary Union  
For democracy. For everyone.

DH/2026/179/R.1  
Geneva, 2–18 February 2026

# 179th session of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

## *Decisions adopted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians*

*Geneva, 2 to 18 February 2026*

### CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Africa</b>	
• <b>Guinea Bissau:</b> Marciano Indi et al <i>Decision</i> .....	1
• <b>Mauritania:</b> Biram Dah Abeid <i>Decision</i> .....	4
• <b>South Sudan:</b> Juol Nhomngek Daniel <i>Decision</i> .....	7
• <b>Uganda:</b> Francis Zaake et al. <i>Decision</i> .....	10
• <b>Uganda:</b> Allan Aloizious Ssewanyana et al. <i>Decision</i> .....	13
• <b>Uganda:</b> Betty Nambooze <i>Decision</i> .....	16
• <b>United Republic of Tanzania:</b> Tundu Lissu <i>Decision</i> .....	19
<b>Americas</b>	
• <b>Bolivia (Plurinational State of):</b> Ericka Chávez Aguilera <i>Decision</i> .....	22
• <b>Bolivia (Plurinational State of):</b> Andrés Richard Ribera Salas <i>Decision</i> .....	25
• <b>Peru:</b> Margot Palacios Huamán <i>Decision</i> .....	27

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Asia</b>	
• <b>Cambodia:</b> Chen Chang et al. <i>Decision</i> .....	30
• <b>Mongolia:</b> Zorig Sanjasuuren <i>Decision</i> .....	35
• <b>Pakistan:</b> Rana Sanallah <i>Decision</i> .....	38
• <b>Pakistan:</b> Muhammad Ali Wazir <i>Decision</i> .....	41
• <b>Philippines:</b> Francisca Castro et al. <i>Decision</i> .....	45
• <b>Sri Lanka:</b> Ramanathan Archchuna <i>Decision</i> .....	48
<b>EURO</b>	
• <b>Ukraine:</b> Artem Hennadiyovych Dmytruk <i>Decision</i> .....	51
<b>MENA</b>	
• <b>Bahrain:</b> Matar Ebrahim Matar <i>Decision</i> .....	55
• <b>Tunisia:</b> Abir Moussi <i>Decision</i> .....	57
• <b>Tunisia:</b> Seifedine Makhoul et al. <i>Decision</i> .....	60
• <b>Yemen:</b> Abdulkareem Jadban <i>Decision</i> .....	64

# Guinea-Bissau

*Decision adopted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at its 179th session (Geneva, 2 to 18 February 2026)*



© Domingos Simões Pereira, 24 February 2020 Martin BUREAU / AFP

GNB-13 – Marciano Indi  
GNB-14 – Domingos Simões Pereira  
GNB-15 – Agnelo Regalla  
GNB-16 – Bamba Banjai

## Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Abduction<sup>1</sup>
- ✓ Threats, acts of intimidation
- ✓ Lack of due process at the investigation stage
- ✓ Violation of freedom of opinion and expression
- ✓ Violation of freedom of assembly and association
- ✓ Violation of freedom of movement
- ✓ Arbitrary invalidation of the election of a parliamentarian
- ✓ Abusive revocation or suspension of the parliamentary mandate
- ✓ Failure to respect parliamentary immunity
- ✓ Other acts obstructing the exercise of the parliamentary mandate
- ✓ Impunity

## A. Summary of the case

The present case concerns the situation of four former members of the People's National Assembly of Guinea-Bissau, including its former Speaker, Mr. Domingos Simões Pereira, as well as Mr. Marciano Indi, Mr. Agnelo Regalla and Mr. Bamba Banjai, who have suffered human rights violations since 2020 for publicly criticizing the President of the Republic, Mr. Umaro Sissoco Embaló, and the Prime Minister, Mr. Nuno Gomes Nabiam.

On 23 May 2020, Mr. Marciano Indi, leader of the parliamentary group the United People's Alliance-Democratic Party of Guinea-Bissau (Alliance du Peuple Uni-Parti Démocratique de Guinée Bissau)

## Case GNB-COLL-01

**Guinea-Bissau:** Parliament affiliated to the IPU

**Victims:** Four opposition members of parliament

**Qualified complainant(s):** Section I.1(a) of the Committee Procedure (Annex I)

**Submission of complaint:** March 2024

**Recent IPU decision:** October 2024

**IPU mission(s):** - - -

**Recent Committee hearing:** Hearing with the delegation of Guinea-Bissau during the 149th IPU Assembly in Geneva (October 2024)

## Recent follow-up:

- Communication from the authorities: April 2024
- Communication from the complainant: February 2026
- Communication to the authorities: Letter to the Minister Director of Cabinet (October 2024)
- Communication to the complainant: February 2026

<sup>1</sup> This alleged violation concerns only the member of parliament Marciano Indi.

(APU-PDGB), was abducted and physically assaulted by individuals whom he identified as belonging to the National Guard, a security force that is under the authority and political auspices of the Ministry of the Interior. Shortly before his abduction, Mr. Indi had challenged the President's policies and calls to replace the opposition head of government. Mr. Indi was taken to the Ministry of the Interior, where he was held in a cell for several hours. His captors released him and he was escorted home by the former Speaker of Parliament. The complainant stated that Mr. Indi's abduction had been ordered by President Embaló.

Regarding Mr. Agnelo Regalla, he was shot outside his home on 7 May 2022 by uniformed armed men. He was seriously injured and was evacuated to Portugal for specialist medical treatment. The incident occurred the day after a press conference held at the headquarters of the main opposition party, the African Party for the Independence of Guinea and Cabo Verde (PAIGC), during which President Embaló's regime had been heavily criticized. The investigation opened by the judicial police was never completed.

On 3 February 2024, Mr. Bamba Banjai, a member of the majority parliamentary group, was arrested along with other supporters of his party by the Secretary of State for Public Order at Bissau airport while awaiting the arrival of their party's leader. According to the complainant, Mr. Banjai was taken to the Ministry of the Interior, where he was questioned and detained for several hours. On 27 February 2024, after spending several days in hiding due to serious death threats and attempts to re-arrest him, Mr. Banjai reportedly went to the Ministry of the Interior with his lawyer for questioning in connection with Mr. Banjai's criticism of the regime during a press conference. Mr. Banjai was then allegedly taken to the Presidential Palace, where he was questioned by President Embaló, who ordered his release.

With regard to Mr. Domingos Simões Pereira, he was subjected to several violations of his rights. He was first arbitrarily deprived of the exercise of his parliamentary mandate following the decision of President Embaló on 4 December 2023 to dissolve parliament following the legislative elections of 4 June 2023 – a dissolution considered unconstitutional (article 94 of the Constitution) – on the grounds of an alleged coup d'état, the existence of which the opposition denies.

During a hearing before the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at the 148th IPU Assembly in March 2024, the parliamentary delegation of Guinea-Bissau, led by Mr. Domingos Simões Pereira, explained that the cases under examination by the Committee were related to the November 2019 presidential elections, which had resulted in the disputed victory of President Embaló. After being declared the winner in February 2020, Mr. Embaló had ended the PAIGC-led government by appointing a new prime minister. In October 2021, a coup d'état had reportedly been foiled, as well as a second attempt in February 2022. In May 2022, the President had decided to dissolve the parliament resulting from the March 2019 legislative elections and scheduled new elections for December 2022. In the end, these were not held until June 2023.

The delegation said that the legislative elections in June 2023 represented a glimmer of hope and an opportunity for political parties to end to their differences. The PAIGC-led opposition came first, and despite differing political views, an understanding seemed to be developing between the opposition and the majority. It was for this reason, according to the complainant, that President Embaló decided to dissolve parliament, as he refused any cooperation with the opposition despite the understanding reached between the two parties.

In their letter of 3 April 2024, the executive authorities called into question three elements: (i) the unconstitutional nature of the dissolution of the Assembly could only be judged by the Supreme Court of Justice instead of the Constitutional Court; (ii) the events that led to the dissolution of parliament were the result of the denunciation by the members of parliament of a substantial payment to contractors; and (iii) the decision by the Speaker of the Assembly, Mr. Domingos Simões Pereira, to order the release of the two members of the government questioned in connection with this payment and his plan to release other detainees of the putsch of 1 February 2022. In the same letter of 3 April 2024, the executive authorities also denounced Mr. Pereira's mobilization of several members of his coalition to cause disorder in front of the Assembly building. Finally, as regards the human rights violations of the members of parliament included in this case, the executive authorities did not provide any relevant information.

On 31 July 2024, the Public Prosecutor issued a public notice ordering Mr. Pereira to report to his office by 15 August 2024 in connection with a corruption case dating back to 2015. The Prosecutor accused Mr. Pereira of fleeing from justice and the National Assembly of not lifting his parliamentary immunity. After several months in exile, Mr. Pereira returned to Guinea-Bissau where he convened an extraordinary session with the parliamentary parties on 20 September 2024, pursuant to Article 48 of Law 1/2010. Following this meeting, military forces allegedly again occupied the Assembly premises, denying access to Mr. Pereira and all the members of parliament who had taken part in the extraordinary session. Mr. Pereira was accused of a coup d'état and was replaced by the Second Deputy Speaker of the (dissolved) Assembly, who is a close associate of President Embaló.

During the presidential and legislative elections held on 23 November 2025, Mr. Pereira and his party, the PAIGC, were excluded on administrative grounds. On 26 November 2025, the eve of the announcement of the results, the military took control of the country, thus suspending the electoral process and staging a coup d'état before the results were published. Mr. Pereira was arrested on the same day and detained in connection with the coup d'état without formal charges, without access to justice, his lawyer or his family, and without any procedural safeguards.

On 30 January 2026, Mr. Pereira was released and transferred to his residence, where he remains under the constant surveillance of the army and is subject to restrictions on his freedom of movement. The complainant states that there is no legal procedure or judicial decision justifying these restrictions. In a statement issued on 30 January 2026, the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) called for the "full and effective release of Mr. Domingos Simões Pereira and the guarantee of the fundamental rights and freedoms of all citizens."

## **B. Decision**

The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

1. *Deplores* the lack of concrete measures taken by the authorities of Guinea-Bissau to identify those responsible for the serious violations committed against Mr. Marciano Indi, Mr. Agnelo Regalla and Mr. Bamba Banjai;
2. *Urges* the competent authorities to end impunity – fundamental to ensuring the rule of law – by conducting serious investigations into the violence committed against these former members of parliament and identifying the persons responsible for these crimes, so that they can be brought to justice;
3. *Deeply regrets* the new violations suffered by Mr. Pereira, in particular his arbitrary arrest and detention in connection with the coup d'état carried out on 26 November 2025, in the absence of formal charges, without access to justice, to his lawyer, or to his family, and without any procedural safeguards, as well as the arbitrary exclusion of him and his party from legislative elections;
4. *Notes* the release of Mr. Pereira and his transfer to his residence after having spent more than two months in detention without any legal justification; *regrets*, nevertheless, the restrictions imposed on Mr. Pereira, including his forced house arrest, the reasons and legal basis for which remain unclear; and *urges* the competent authorities to put an end to the violations of his rights by ordering his full release and lifting the restrictions on his freedom of movement;
5. *Condemns* the military coup carried out on the eve of the announcement of the results of the presidential and parliamentary elections in the country; *affirms* that any transfer of power must be achieved through the ballot box, in accordance with the will of the people expressed in free and fair elections in which all constituent parts of the country participate; and *calls on* the authorities to take all necessary measures to restore constitutional order in the country, guaranteeing the right to freedom of expression, assembly, association and movement for all;
6. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the parliamentary authorities, the complainant and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;
7. *Decides* to continue examining this case.

# Mauritania

*Decision adopted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at its 179th session (Geneva, 2 to 18 February 2026)*



Biram Dah Abeid, Mauritanian politician and advocate for the abolition of slavery, during a press conference in Dakar on 29 September 2016 © Seyllou / AFP

## MRT-03 – Biram Dah Abeid

### Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Arbitrary arrest and detentions
- ✓ Lack of due process at the investigation stage and lack of fair trial proceedings
- ✓ Violation of freedom of opinion and expression
- ✓ Failure to respect parliamentary immunity

### A. Summary of the case

Mr. Biram Dah Abeid, President of the party *Initiative de la résurgence du mouvement abolitionniste* (Initiative for the Resurgence of the Abolitionist Movement, IRA) was arrested at his home on 7 August 2018 and charged with “causing harm to others, inciting violence and threatening to use violence” on 13 August 2018, following a complaint filed by a journalist. Mr. Dah Abeid was held in custody without charge for a week, even though, under the Code of Criminal Procedure, the maximum period of custody in such a case cannot exceed 48 hours.

The militant campaigning of Mr. Dah Abeid – and of his party, the IRA – to combat slavery in Mauritania has reportedly been the root cause of the political and judicial harassment towards him, in an attempt to exclude him from the political scene. The complainant alleges that the charges against Mr. Dah Abeid were not supported by evidence and that it was the victim’s alliance with the Essawab political party with a view to the September 2018 legislative elections that had triggered the proceedings brought against him, the aim of which had been to invalidate his candidacy in the legislative elections and prevent him from conducting his campaign freely. Mr. Dah Abeid’s candidacy was nevertheless validated by the Independent National Electoral Commission (CENI), which had also confirmed his election while he was still being held in detention on 1 September 2018.

Despite being elected, Mr. Dah Abeid was kept in pretrial detention in violation of his parliamentary

### Case MRT-03

**Mauritania:** Parliament affiliated to the IPU

**Victim:** Opposition member of parliament

**Qualified complainant(s):** Section I.1(a) and (d) of the Committee Procedure (Annex I)

**Submission of complaint:** October 2018

**Recent IPU decision:** February 2024

**IPU mission(s):** - - -

**Recent Committee hearing:** Hearing with Mr. Dah Abeid at the 161st session of the Committee (January 2020)

### Recent follow-up:

- Communications from the authorities: Letters from the Minister of Justice (February, May and June 2019)
- Communication from the complainant: January 2026
- Communications to the authorities: Letters to the Speaker of the National Assembly (November 2025)
- Communication to the complainant: January 2026

immunity acquired following his election and in the absence of a trial. Responding to this point in particular, the Minister of Justice explained in his letters, received in May and June 2019, that the proceedings against Mr. Dah Abeid had been initiated even before he had stood as a candidate and become a member of the National Assembly. Thus, the parliamentary immunity claimed by Mr. Dah Abeid, and which he did not acquire until after his election was confirmed, could not be retroactive. The Minister of Justice further added that the National Assembly had not requested Mr. Dah Abeid's release and had not called on the authorities to drop the charges against him as provided for in Article 50 of the Mauritanian Constitution.

On 31 December 2018, the Criminal Court sentenced Mr. Dah Abeid to six months' imprisonment, four of which were to be suspended. He was therefore immediately released because the duration of his pretrial detention had covered the length of his sentence. On his release from prison, Mr. Dah Abeid was able to resume his duties as a member of parliament by taking his seat in the National Assembly on 7 January 2019.

Mr. Dah Abeid refutes the charges against him, claiming that his conviction was politically motivated, since the complaint against him was initially rejected by the Public Prosecutor of Nouakchott West, considering it to be unfounded. The journalist who accused Mr. Dah Abeid subsequently filed the same complaint with the Public Prosecutor of Nouakchott South, who decided to prosecute him. His lawyers described the proceedings against Mr. Dah Abeid as arbitrary, especially as in a case of this nature he should have been summoned to appear of his own will. The complainant also pointed out that the case was not based on any serious evidence and that it had been withdrawn by the same journalist who had filed it, on the day the member of parliament was sentenced. Mr. Dah Abeid appealed against the conviction in order to re-establish the truth in the case, but his appeal has not yet been heard.

In May 2023 Mr. Dah Abeid was re-elected as a member of the National Assembly. He was arrested on 23 May, a few days after his election, because of comments he had made during a press conference. Mr. Dah Abeid was released on 25 May 2023 after being detained for two days at the anti-terrorist police headquarters. The prosecuting authorities did not uphold any of the charges against him. The complainant added that the National Assembly had lifted Mr. Dah Abeid's parliamentary immunity on 20 February 2024 following a request by the Minister of Justice in connection with a complaint of defamation made against him by Mohamed Ould Mouloud, the president of the political party Union of the Forces of Progress (UFP). According to the complainant, the case is still being investigated, but Mr. Dah Abeid has not been officially charged with anything. The complainant states that the judiciary's delay in examining this complaint, and the appeal lodged in 2018, is deliberate and is part of a strategy of intimidation against Mr. Dah Abeid.

In the presidential election on 29 June 2024, Mr. Dah Abeid ran as the main opposition candidate and came in second place, results that he strongly contested and described as fraudulent.

In January 2026, the complainant reported that Mr. Dah Abeid was subjected to death threats as a result of his political activism and criticism of the government. Despite requests by Mr. Dah Abeid and his lawyers to open investigations to identify those responsible and put an end to their actions, the prosecuting authorities reportedly took no measures to ensure the deputy's safety.

The National Assembly, for its part, has never responded to the Committee's requests for information.

## **B. Decision**

The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

1. *Deplores*, once again, the silence of the parliamentary authorities since the investigation of this case in 2018;
2. *Expresses its concern* about the death threats received by Mr. Dah Abeid, which endanger his physical safety and hinder the exercise of his parliamentary mandate, and about the acts of intimidation the deputy has been subjected to;
3. *Calls upon* the Mauritanian authorities to launch a thorough inquiry immediately to identify those responsible for the death threats and put an end to their actions in order to prevent acts of

violence that could have very serious consequences; and *also calls upon* the parliamentary authorities to take the necessary measures to guarantee Mr. Dah Abeid's safety and provide him with a security detail as a member of the National Assembly;

4. *Deeply regrets* that the appeal lodged by Mr. Dah Abeid against his conviction in 2018 has been given no response to date, demonstrating a flagrant denial of justice; *reiterates its call* for the judiciary authorities to close this file in view of the above elements, including the initial rejection of the complaint by the Public Prosecutor of Nouakchott West, the withdrawal of the complaint made against Mr. Dah Abeid, and in light of all the procedural irregularities, including the continued pretrial detention of Mr. Dah Abeid without charge and with no access to his lawyers and the investigating judge's decision to refer his case to the criminal court;
5. *Recalls* that, as the guardian of human rights, the National Assembly has the duty to guarantee the safety and the rights of all its members, whatever their political affiliation, and also has the power to question the judiciary about the status of legal proceedings against a member of parliament; therefore *calls on* the parliamentary authorities to exercise their role in an effective manner and to engage in constructive dialogue with the Committee, with a view to finding a definitive resolution of this case;
6. *Invites* the parliamentary authorities to provide information about the lifting of Mr. Dah Abeid's parliamentary immunity in February 2024 in the context of the complaint filed against him for defamation, in order to understand the reasons behind this decision;
7. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the competent authorities, the complainant and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;
8. *Decides* to continue examining the case.

# South Sudan

*Decision adopted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at its 179th session (Geneva, 2 to 18 February 2026)*



© Daniel Juol Nhomngek

## SSD-01 – Daniel Juol Nhomngek

### Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Threats, acts of intimidation
- ✓ Violation of freedom of opinion and expression
- ✓ Abusive revocation or suspension of the parliamentary mandate
- ✓ Other acts obstructing the exercise of the parliamentary mandate

### A. Summary of the case

According to the complainant, Mr. Daniel Juol Nhomngek is a young member of parliament from the opposition who has regularly expressed views and opinions on matters of public interest such as the use of public funds and the fight against corruption in South Sudan. Among other issues, Mr. Juol Nhomngek has publicly denounced the alleged misappropriation and mismanagement of funds by the leadership of parliament, delays in the payment of members of parliament's benefits and other practices that appear to directly affect the ability of members of parliament to carry out their mandate properly.

Mr. Juol Nhomngek was suspended from parliament on 26 April 2023. He was not expected to be permitted to perform any parliamentary functions for the remaining duration of the legislative session that ended in June 2023. The suspension was finally lifted in August 2023. The complainant claims that the suspension was arbitrary and illegal considering, among other things, that the Speaker of Parliament had been both "judge and party" throughout the proceedings that had led to his suspension and that the applicable regulations had not been observed.

The complainant alleges that Mr. Juol Nhomngek has been prevented from freely expressing his views on social media and from talking to the media, and that his suspension is a direct consequence of

### Case SSD-01

**South Sudan:** Parliament affiliated to the IPU

**Victim:** Opposition member of parliament

**Qualified complainant(s):** Section I.1(a) of the Committee Procedure (Annex I)

**Submission of complaint:** May 2023

**Recent IPU decision:** October 2023

**IPU Mission(s):** - - -

**Recent Committee hearing:** - - -

### Recent follow-up:

- Communication from the authorities: January 2026
- Communication from the complainant: December 2023
- Communication to the authorities: December 2025
- Communication to the complainant: January 2026

exercising his right to freedom of expression and of performing his parliamentary duties. The complainant also claims that the above-mentioned suspension was intended as a means of threatening or intimidating opposition members of parliament so that they would stop criticizing the Speaker and denouncing corruption in parliament.

In July 2023, Mr. Juol Nhomngek filed a case with the East African Court of Justice to challenge the decision to suspend him from parliament. These proceedings are ongoing.

According to information provided by the parliamentary authorities in November 2023, the Investigation Committee, composed of various members of political parties and chaired by an opposition member of parliament, was formed by the Assembly Business Committee of the Transitional National Legislative Assembly of South Sudan to investigate Mr. Juol Nhomngek in accordance with the applicable regulations. Mr. Juol Nhomngek was summoned three times to appear before the Investigation Committee to exercise his right of defence but refused to do so. The Speaker of Parliament had no influence over the work and meetings of the Investigation Committee and Mr. Juol Nhomngek's suspension was in accordance with the relevant rules and proceedings. In their letter dated 22 January 2026, the parliamentary authorities reiterated that the Transitional National Legislative Assembly followed strictly the applicable rules and regulations in the present case.

In December 2023, the complainant stated that the parliamentary Specialized Standing Committee on Members Affairs had recommended that Mr. Juol Nhomngek be "dismissed from parliament" as he "was not fit to be a member of parliament". The Specialized Standing Committee made this recommendation after Mr. Juol Nhomngek sent a letter to the Weldios University Management Board contesting the award of an honorary doctorate degree to the Speaker of Parliament by the said University. The Specialized Standing Committee was of the opinion that he had again defamed the Speaker. The complainant has not responded to the IPU Committee's repeated requests for updated information since then.

## **B. Decision**

### The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

1. *Thanks* the parliamentary authorities for their cooperation, their openness to dialogue and the extensive written information provided;
2. *Notes with interest* that, according to the information provided, the applicable rules and procedures were duly followed in the present case; *expresses concern*, however, that the application of the current rules appears to have resulted in concrete restrictions on Mr. Juol Nhomngek's exercise of his parliamentary mandate, the right to freedom of expression and parliamentary oversight functions;
3. *Recalls* that freedom of expression and the effective exercise of parliamentary oversight are essential components of the parliamentary mandate and constitute a cornerstone of democratic societies, in particular for opposition parliamentarians;
4. *Notes*, however, that the complainant has not provided any updated information since December 2023, despite repeated requests; *decides*, therefore, to close the case in accordance with Rule 25(b) of Annex I of the Committee's Rules and Practices;
5. *Recalls* that, in accordance with Rule 26 of Annex I of the Committee's Rules and Practices, the Committee reserves the right to reopen the case in the light of any new information provided by the complainant;
6. *Affirms* that the IPU stands ready to provide assistance upon request aimed at strengthening the capacities of the Transitional National Legislative Assembly to identify any underlying issues that gave rise to the current case and to rectify such issues, including, as appropriate, possible amendments to the existing legislative and regulatory framework relating to proceedings for the suspension or loss of parliamentary mandate, to the guarantees of due process in such proceedings, and to the safeguards for the role of opposition parliamentarians; and *invites* the competent authorities to provide further information on how the IPU could best provide such assistance;

7. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the parliamentary authorities and to the complainant.

# Uganda

*Decision adopted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at its 179th session (Geneva, 2 to 18 February 2026)*



© Francis Zaake

UGA-19 – Robert Kyagulanyi Ssentamu (aka Bobi Wine)

UGA-20 – Francis Zaake

UGA-21 – Kassiano Wadri

UGA-22 – Gerald Karuhanga

UGA-23 – Paul Mwiru

## Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Torture, ill-treatment and other acts of violence
- ✓ Arbitrary arrest and detention
- ✓ Lack of due process at the investigation stage
- ✓ Lack of fair trial proceedings
- ✓ Violation of freedom of opinion and expression
- ✓ Impunity

## A. Summary of the case

The complaint was initially received against the background of the by-election in Arua municipality in Uganda on 15 August 2018. Of the five members of parliament listed in the present case, only Mr. Francis Zaake was re-elected in 2021 and 2026.

The five individuals were violently arrested in the district of Arua on 14 August 2018, the eve of the by-election, along with 29 other people, after President Yoweri Museveni's convoy was reportedly pelted with stones. According to credible reports and information gathered on the ground by the IPU Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CHRP), the parliamentarians were tortured and ill-treated while in detention. All those arrested, including the five parliamentarians, were charged with treason, which in Uganda carries the death penalty. On 6 August 2019, the following additional charges were reportedly brought against them in relation to the same

## Case UGA-COLL-01

**Uganda:** Parliament affiliated to the IPU

**Victims:** Five male parliamentarians (four independent and one opposition parliamentarian)

**Qualified complainant(s):** Section I.1(a) and (d) of the Committee Procedure (Annex I)

**Submission of complaint:** August 2018

**Recent IPU decision:** March 2022

**IPU mission:** January 2020

**Recent Committee hearing:** Hearing with the Ugandan delegation to the 150th IPU Assembly (April 2025)

## Recent follow-up:

- Communication from the authorities: Letter from the Speaker of Parliament (January 2023)
- Communication from the complainants: January 2026
- Communication to the authorities: Letter to the Speaker of Parliament (December 2025)
- Communication to the complainants: January 2026

events: intent to annoy, alarm or ridicule the President, incitement to violence, disobedience of lawful orders, failure to prevent obstruction of traffic, confusion or disorder during a public meeting, and failure to give right of way to the President.

The complainants claim that due process guarantees have been violated from the outset, that the parliamentarians are victims of political repression, as there is no evidence to support the charges brought against them, and that no effective action has been taken to hold to account the security forces that mistreated them while arresting them.

The complainants further state that, at the time the complaint was first lodged, Mr. Kyagulanyi was a popular young parliamentarian, strongly supported, among others, by the four other parliamentarians in this case, and a well-known singer who enjoyed wide popularity among young people. Through his songs and parliamentary work between 2017 and 2021, he had been a vocal critic of President Museveni and his government. The complainants affirm that the authorities were doing everything possible to prevent Mr. Kyagulanyi from staging concerts and thus conveying his music and political message.

From 25 to 29 January 2020, a CHRP delegation conducted an on-site mission to Uganda. Despite its specific request, the delegation was not able to obtain concrete information on possible ongoing cases against police officers in connection with the allegations of torture against the five members of parliament. The delegation was told that no information could be disclosed as the matter was *sub judice*. Among other concerns, the delegation regretted that no progress seemed to have been made towards investigating these allegations and urged the relevant authorities to conduct a prompt, impartial and independent investigation, including, where appropriate, the filing of specific torture charges against the perpetrators and the application of the corresponding penalties under domestic law. It also urged parliament to use its oversight powers effectively to this end.

Mr. Francis Zaake was detained by the police and military again on Sunday evening, 19 April 2020 and released on 29 April 2020. According to information received, Mr. Zaake was severely tortured while in detention, denied access to his lawyer and family, food and independent medical attention. The complainants also informed the IPU that Mr. Zaake and other Ugandan members of parliament have been arrested and reportedly mistreated while in custody on several occasions, before being subsequently released.

At the hearing held during the 150th IPU Assembly in April 2025, the Ugandan delegation agreed with the Committee on the value of a visit to Uganda, reiterating that the formal request for such a visit had been submitted to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for consideration.

In February 2026, the complainants informed the Committee that the situation had not evolved since the last IPU public decision on this case, and that general elections were held in Uganda in January 2026 in an environment reportedly marked by widespread repression and intimidation of the political opposition, human rights defenders, journalists and individuals holding dissenting views. The Committee was also informed that Mr. Kyagulanyi, the main challenger to President Museveni in the election, was reportedly forced to flee his home on 16 January 2026, leaving his family behind following what he described as a night raid by police and military forces. His whereabouts have since been unknown.

## **B. Decision**

The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

1. *Regrets* the continued absence of a response from the Parliament to repeated formal correspondence concerning the various situations before the Committee; and *expresses serious concern* that, despite assurances of cooperation provided by the Ugandan delegation to the 150th IPU Assembly (April 2025), the mission requested by the Committee several years ago has still not been facilitated, thereby obstructing the Committee's work, preventing a full examination of the matters, and delaying a possible resolution;
2. *Reiterates* its previous long-standing concerns relating to the impunity that seemingly reigns in the cases at hand with regard to the allegations of torture committed against the members of parliament in 2018; *reaffirms* that impunity, by shielding those responsible from judicial action

and accountability, decisively encourages the perpetration of further serious human rights violations and that attacks against the life and personal integrity of members of parliament, when left unpunished, not only violate the fundamental rights of individual parliamentarians and of those who elected them, but also affect the integrity of parliament and its ability to fulfil its role as an institution; *urges*, once again, parliament to use its oversight powers effectively to ensure that the allegations of torture against the five members of parliament in 2018 are fully and effectively investigated, followed by whatever accountability steps are warranted as a result; and *requests* the parliamentary authorities to provide information on any relevant developments in this regard and on any action taken by parliament to this end;

3. *Invites* the newly elected parliament to engage in a constructive dialogue with the Committee and the IPU to advance towards a satisfactory settlement of this case; *affirms* that the IPU stands ready to provide assistance upon request aimed at strengthening the capacities of the Parliament of Uganda to identify any underlying issues that gave rise to the current case and to rectify such issues; and *invites* the competent authorities to provide further information on how the IPU could best provide such assistance;
4. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the Speaker of the Parliament of Uganda, the complainants and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;
5. *Decides* to continue examining this case.

# Uganda

*Decision adopted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at its 179th session (Geneva, 2 to 18 February 2026)*



© National Unity Platform



UGA-24 – Allan Aloizious Ssewanyana  
UGA-25 – Muhammad Ssegirinya

## Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Abduction
- ✓ Torture, ill-treatment and other acts of violence
- ✓ Arbitrary arrest and detention
- ✓ Inhumane conditions of detention
- ✓ Lack of due process at the investigation stage
- ✓ Lack of fair trial proceedings
- ✓ Failure to respect parliamentary immunity

## A. Summary of the case

On 7 September 2021, Mr. Muhammad Ssegirinya was arrested together with Mr. Allan Aloizious Ssewanyana by the Ugandan police on allegations that the two opposition parliamentarians were involved in the murder of two individuals and the attempted murder of a third person. They were charged with the offences of murder, terrorism, aiding and abetting terrorism and attempted murder, along with four other co-accused. All these crimes were purportedly committed on 23 August 2021 in Masaka District. The two members of parliament were subsequently remanded in custody and held in Kigo Government Prison.

On 30 September 2021, the two members of parliament were summoned to the Chief Magistrate's Court in Masaka and read additional charges. According to the complainant, they appeared frail and informed the court that they had been brutally tortured through physical beatings while in detention. On the occasions the members of parliament re-appeared in court to hear their cases, they showed physical, festering wounds and complained of torture and humiliation while in detention. The complainant also states that the members of parliament informed the presiding judge that they had been prevented from receiving medical attention by a doctor of their choice and that they had been

## Case UGA-COLL-02

**Uganda:** Parliament affiliated to the IPU

**Victims:** Two male opposition members of parliament

**Qualified complainant(s):** Section I.1(a) of the Committee Procedure (Annex I)

**Submission of complaint:** January 2022

**Recent IPU decision:** March 2023

**IPU mission(s):** - - -

**Recent Committee hearing:** Hearing with the Ugandan delegation to the 150th IPU Assembly (April 2025)

### Recent follow-up:

- Communication from the authorities: January 2023
- Communication from the complainant: January 2026
- Communication to the authorities: Letter to the Speaker of the Parliament (December 2025)
- Communication to the complainant: January 2026

banned from receiving any visitors, including family members, while in prison. According to the complainant, on 13 February 2023, the two members of parliament were granted bail and transferred to a hospital for urgent medical attention.

A trial observer mandated by the IPU travelled to Uganda on 11 February 2023 and on 6 March 2023 to observe the proceedings against the two members of parliament. The observer reported that, although the hearings had finally been adjourned on both occasions, the general court atmosphere was calm and that court workers were cooperative with the observer.

Mr. Ssegirinya was allowed to travel abroad for specialized medical treatment, after which he decided to return to his country. According to the complainant, Mr. Ssegirinya may have been intentionally infected with an incurable virus while in prison, which led to his death on 8 January 2025. On 17 March 2025, the International Crimes Division of the High Court of Uganda ruled that the charges against Mr. Ssegirinya automatically abated as a result of his death.

At the hearing held during the 150th IPU Assembly (April 2025), the Ugandan delegation asserted that the arrest of the two members of parliament had been carried out in accordance with the applicable laws and procedures and that the privileges of members of parliament under Ugandan law did not include immunity from criminal prosecution. Regarding action taken by parliament, the delegation reported that the Human Rights Committee of the Parliament of Uganda had conducted multiple visits to the two members of parliament in prison. The parliamentary committee also interviewed the prison authorities, the two parliamentarians concerned and other stakeholders. It subsequently produced a report that could be made available to the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CHRP) upon request. The situation of the two members of parliament had been discussed several times in parliament and the Speaker of Parliament had called for a speedy trial. While the criminal case against Mr. Ssewanyana is still pending, he remains free on bail and able to carry out his parliamentary duties. Regarding the allegations of torture and their possible connection to the death of Mr. Ssegirinya, the delegation stated that investigations carried out by the relevant national authorities had not found evidence to support these claims. The outcomes of such investigations could be made available to the CHRP as well. Finally, the delegation agreed with the CHRP on the value of visiting Uganda and reiterated that the formal request for such a visit had been submitted to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for consideration.

Parliamentary elections took place in Uganda in January 2026, and Mr. Ssewanyana was not re-elected. No formal response has been received from the Parliament to repeated requests for facilitation of the CHRP mission, and the parliamentary reports and outcomes of the State investigations referred to above have not been provided.

## **B. Decision**

The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

1. *Regrets* the continued absence of a response from the Parliament to repeated formal correspondence concerning the various situations before the Committee; and *expresses serious concern* that, despite assurances of cooperation provided by the Ugandan delegation to the 150th IPU Assembly (April 2025), the mission requested by the Committee several years ago has still not been facilitated, thereby obstructing the Committee's work, preventing a full examination of the matters, and delaying a possible resolution;
2. *Remains deeply disturbed* by the grave allegation that the death of Mr. Ssegirinya may have resulted directly from acts of torture; *recalls* that according to the information provided by the Ugandan delegation to the 150th IPU Assembly (April 2025), a number of reports issued by parliamentary bodies and relevant State agencies, setting out conclusions and findings concerning the treatment of both parliamentarians mentioned in the resent case during their detention, as well as the causes and circumstances surrounding the death of Mr. Ssegirinya are available and may be transmitted to the CHRP; and *requests once more* in this regard that Parliament provide copies of all reports in its possession, insofar as they contain verified information relevant to assessing the allegations of torture allegedly suffered by the two members of parliament, the factual circumstances and conditions surrounding the death of Mr. Ssegirinya, and any investigative or judicial measures undertaken to establish accountability;

3. *Reiterates* that the allegations in this case have to be seen in the context of the CHRP's concerns in other existing cases in Uganda about the lack of respect for the physical integrity of members of the opposition and the lack of accountability whenever they are subject to ill-treatment or torture;
4. *Reiterates its firm hope* that a CHRP delegation can finally travel to Uganda to meet with all relevant authorities exercising legislative, executive and judicial powers and any other institution, civil society organization or individual in a position to provide relevant information on the present case as well as on the other Ugandan cases before the Committee; *calls on* the parliamentary authorities, once again, to do their utmost to obtain a response from the executive authorities regarding such a mission as soon as possible; and *trusts* that the competent national authorities will cooperate fully to help the mission find swift satisfactory solutions to this and the other cases in accordance with applicable national and international human rights standards, and to obtain first-hand information on the status of the implementation of the CHRP's recommendations following its [mission](#) to Uganda in 2020;
5. *Remains concerned* at the seriousness of the charges against Mr. Ssewanyana, which carry particularly severe penalties under Ugandan law, including life imprisonment and the death penalty; *reiterates its wish* to mandate a new a trial observer to continue monitoring the upcoming court proceedings; and *wishes* to be kept informed of the dates of future hearings when available and of any other relevant judicial developments in the case;
6. *Invites* the newly elected parliament to engage in a constructive dialogue with the Committee and the IPU to advance towards a satisfactory settlement of this case; *affirms* that the IPU stands ready to provide assistance upon request aimed at strengthening the capacities of the Parliament of Uganda to identify any underlying issues that gave rise to the current case and to rectify such issues; and *invites* the competent authorities to provide further information on how the IPU could best provide such assistance;
7. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the Speaker of Parliament, the complainant and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;
8. *Decides* to continue examining this case.

# Uganda

*Decision adopted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at its 179th session (Geneva, 2 to 18 February 2026)*



© Betty Nambooze

## UGA-26 – Betty Nambooze

### Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Torture, ill-treatment and other acts of violence
- ✓ Threats, acts of intimidation
- ✓ Arbitrary arrest and detention
- ✓ Inhumane conditions of detention
- ✓ Lack of fair trial proceedings
- ✓ Other acts obstructing the exercise of the parliamentary mandate

### A. Summary of the case

The case concerns allegations of human rights violations, including, *inter alia*, ill-treatment and other acts of violence, arbitrary detention, inhumane conditions of detention and acts obstructing the exercise of the parliamentary mandate, affecting one woman opposition member of parliament in Uganda. According to the complainant, the member of parliament has been targeted because of her political opinions and her work as an opposition parliamentarian.

According to the information provided by the complainant, Ms. Betty Nambooze was beaten by a group of security operatives on 27 September 2017 while she was in parliament. The events took place against the backdrop of controversial debates in parliament about the Constitution Amendment Bill No. 2 of 2017.

The complainant reports that during a violent incident in parliament that day, a group of security operatives attacked Ms. Nambooze. They forced her body into uncomfortable contortions, including forcing her shoulders, arms and hands to touch each other behind her back while one of them applied strong pressure on her back using a knee. She was then arrested and transferred to the headquarters of the Special Investigations Unit of the Uganda police force located in Kireka, where she remained for seven hours without receiving medical attention, despite her deteriorating condition and her specific requests. None of her children, her husband or friends were permitted to see her, even though they were present at the police station.

### Case UGA-26

**Uganda:** Parliament affiliated to the IPU

**Victim:** A female opposition member of parliament

**Qualified complainant(s):** Section I.1(a) of the Committee Procedure (Annex I)

**Submission of complaint:** February 2023

**Recent IPU decision:** March 2023

**IPU mission(s):** - - -

**Recent Committee hearing:** Hearing with the Ugandan delegation to the 150th IPU Assembly (April 2025)

#### Recent follow-up:

- Communication(s) from the authorities: - - -
- Communication from the complainant: February 2026
- Communication to the authorities: Letter to the Speaker of the Parliament (December 2025)
- Communication to the complainant: February 2026

After Ms. Nambooze's release, towards midnight on 27 September 2017, she was driven in a police vehicle to Bugolobi Medical Centre where she was admitted for over a fortnight. Subsequent medical examinations revealed that, as a result of the beatings and contortions inflicted, three discs within her lower vertebrae had become compressed, thereby endangering her spinal cord. The complainant asserts that, in total violation of Ms. Nambooze's privacy and security, men and women forced themselves into the examination rooms and read through all reports and notes that were being written as she went through tests and treatment.

Ms. Nambooze travelled to India for surgery and treatment. The complainant claims that pleading with the government medical and administrative departments in charge to allow and enable her to travel took a total of one and a half months, during which time she was hospitalized in Kampala without receiving the specialized treatment required. Ms. Nambooze returned to Uganda in late November 2017. As she was preparing to travel back to India for a check-up in June 2018, and still in the process of healing, she was re-arrested on charges of "offensive communication" and manhandled again by security officers. According to the complainant, Ms. Nambooze remained immobile in a prison cell for nearly a week, unable to sit up or stand and in constant pain. She was then transferred to a hospital but, on the way, a police vehicle struck the ambulance. In the collision, her spine was further damaged, and her knee was severely injured. Doctors later determined that one of the metal screws implanted in her back had been dislodged and was pressing on a major nerve.

Ms. Nambooze was finally given bond and flown to India for another round of surgery in July 2018. She has also been allowed to receive regular treatment in the United States. According to the complainant, many years later she is still experiencing pain and still undergoing tough medical treatment. No action has been taken by the national authorities to identify and punish those responsible for the above-described events.

At the hearing held during the 150th IPU Assembly (April 2025), the Ugandan delegation stated that parliamentary reports exist regarding the 27 September 2017 events, which could be made available to the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CHRP) upon request. Finally, the delegation agreed with the CHRP on the value of it visiting Uganda and reiterated that the formal request for such a visit had been submitted to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for consideration.

Parliamentary elections took place in Uganda in January 2026, and Ms. Nambooze was re-elected. No formal response has been received from the Parliament to repeated requests for facilitation of the CHRP mission, and the parliamentary reports referred to above have not been provided.

## **B. Decision**

The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

1. *Regrets* the continued absence of a response from the Parliament to repeated formal correspondence concerning the various situations before the Committee; and *expresses serious concern* that, despite assurances of cooperation provided by the Ugandan delegation to the 150th IPU Assembly (April 2025), the mission requested by the Committee several years ago has still not been facilitated, thereby obstructing the Committee's work, preventing a full examination of the matters, and delaying a possible resolution;
2. *Recalls* that according to the information provided by the Ugandan delegation to the 150th IPU Assembly (April 2025), a number of reports prepared by parliamentary bodies on the events of 27 September 2017 are available and may be transmitted to the CHRP; and *requests once more* that the Parliament provide copies of all relevant reports in its possession, insofar as they contain information on the steps taken to identify and prosecute those responsible for the acts of violence committed against the member of parliament and the alleged ill-treatment in detention;
3. *Remains deeply concerned* at the alleged treatment suffered by Ms. Nambooze, all the more so given the apparent irreparable damage to her health and the perceived impunity surrounding it; *solemnly recalls* that all forms of violence against women parliamentarians constitute a serious affront to their dignity, contribute to the creation of an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment, and serve to perpetuate gender-based inequality and harmful stereotypes; and *is convinced* that such violence also has a chilling effect on their peers

and discourages other women from pursuing political engagement;

4. *Reiterates* that the allegations in this case have to be seen in the context of the CHRP's concerns in other existing cases in Uganda regarding the lack of respect for the physical integrity of members of the opposition and the lack of accountability whenever they are subject to ill-treatment or torture;
5. *Reiterates its firm hope* that a CHRP delegation can finally travel to Uganda to meet with all relevant authorities exercising legislative, executive and judicial powers and any other institution, civil society organization or individual in a position to provide relevant information on the present case as well as on the other Ugandan cases before the Committee; *calls on* the parliamentary authorities, once again, to do their utmost to obtain a response from the executive authorities regarding such a mission as soon as possible; and *trusts* that the competent national authorities will cooperate fully to help the mission find swift satisfactory solutions to this and the other cases in accordance with applicable national and international human rights standards, and to obtain first-hand information on the status of the implementation of the CHRP's recommendations following its [mission](#) to Uganda in 2020;
6. *Invites* the newly elected parliament to engage in a constructive dialogue with the Committee and the IPU to advance towards a satisfactory settlement of this case; *affirms* that the IPU stands ready to provide assistance upon request aimed at strengthening the capacities of the Parliament of Uganda to identify any underlying issues that gave rise to the current case and to rectify such issues; and *invites* the competent authorities to provide further information on how the IPU could best provide such assistance;
7. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the relevant authorities, the complainant and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;
8. *Decides* to continue examining this case.

# United Republic of Tanzania

*Decision adopted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at its 179th session (Geneva, 2 to 18 February 2026)*



Mr. Tundu Lissu reacts to supporters upon his return to the United Republic of Tanzania on 27 July 2020 after three years in exile following a failed attempt on his life. STR/AFP

## TZA-04 – Tundu Lissu

### Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Threats, acts of intimidation
- ✓ Arbitrary arrest and detention
- ✓ Lack of due process in proceedings against parliamentarians
- ✓ Violation of freedom of opinion and expression
- ✓ Violation of freedom of assembly and association
- ✓ Abusive revocation or suspension of the parliamentary mandate

### A. Summary of the case

According to the complainant, Mr. Tundu Lissu, a former opposition member of parliament belonging to the *Chama cha Demokrasia na Maendeleo* (CHADEMA – Party for Democracy and Progress) has been facing regular and serious acts of intimidation at the hands of the government in response to his vocal criticism.

On 7 September 2017, Mr. Lissu, at the time a member of the National Assembly, escaped an assassination attempt when attackers armed with AK-47s sprayed his vehicle with bullets outside his house in a normally heavily guarded government housing compound in Dodoma. Mr. Lissu was shot 16 times but survived. According to the IPU President and then Speaker of the National Assembly, Ms. Tulia Ackson, given the proximity of Mr. Lissu's house to hers, her domestic help, at home at the time of the crime, was able to assist in getting Mr. Lissu to hospital.

The complainant draws attention to several elements to suggest that the assassination attempt was carried out with government involvement. The authorities have yet to provide information indicating that a serious investigation was opened, let alone that it led to any progress towards holding those

### CASE TZA-04

**United Republic of Tanzania:** Parliament affiliated to the IPU

**Victim:** A former opposition member of parliament

**Qualified complainant(s):** Section I.1(a) of the Committee Procedure (Annex I)

**Submission of complaint:** November 2019

**Recent IPU decision:** November 2020

**IPU mission(s):** - - -

**Recent Committee hearing:** Hearing with the complainant at the 161st session of the Committee (January 2020)

#### Recent follow-up:

- Communication from the authorities: Letter from the Clerk of the National Assembly (September 2025)
- Communication from the complainant: September 2025
- Communication to the authorities: Letter to the Clerk of the National Assembly (September 2025)
- Communication to the complainant: January 2026

responsible to account. In September 2024, Mr. Lissu announced that he intended to take legal action against the government and telecommunications company Tigo over the failed assassination attempt in 2017, given that [new evidence](#) presented at a London tribunal reportedly revealed that Tigo had shared Mr. Lissu's mobile phone data – including his location – with the Tanzanian Government, with the tracking allegedly becoming 24/7 live monitoring in the week before the assassination attempt. The implication was that the company was assisting the government in its harassment of the politician. Tigo's owners have reportedly [distanced themselves](#) from these reports.

The complainant states that, in the years immediately following the failed assassination attempt, Mr. Lissu was arrested eight times and charged in court six times for sedition and related offences in connection with public statements critical of the Government.

The complainant also states that Mr. Lissu was wrongfully stripped of his parliamentary mandate in June 2019, largely on grounds related to his absence from the National Assembly, even though the authorities and the public knew that he was out of the country recovering from the shooting.

In early 2020, Mr. Lissu, after undergoing 24 surgical interventions in Kenya and Belgium, was declared sufficiently well enough to return home. However, according to the complainant, after he made public his intention to return home, death threats made by persons known to be connected to the country's intelligence and security apparatus started to appear on social media and in the press.

Mr. Lissu travelled back to the United Republic of Tanzania on 27 July 2020. According to the complainant, since his return and in the lead-up to the general election of 28 October 2020, Mr. Lissu received numerous threats to his life and person, including threats of arrest from government officials and of murder through poisoning, which have allegedly all gone unpunished. In August 2020, Mr. Lissu was officially nominated by CHADEMA as its presidential candidate in the general election of October 2020 and validated as a contender in the presidential elections by the National Electoral Commission. President Magufuli was re-elected, and the opposition won only two of 264 directly elected parliamentary seats in the October 2020 elections, down from 75 seats in 2015. Tanzania's two main opposition parties called for a re-run of the elections after alleging widespread fraud, which the authorities rejected.

In October 2020, the Clerk of the National Assembly responded to the IPU that the alleged death threats against Mr. Lissu since his return to the United Republic of Tanzania were before the courts and that the National Assembly had no mandate to interfere with matters that fell within the ambit of the law enforcement bodies, as doing so would be against *sub judice* rules. In addition, the Clerk stated that the complainant had made the allegations about renewed threats almost a year after Mr. Lissu had been stripped of his parliamentary seat in accordance with the Tanzanian Constitution and the Standing Orders of the National Assembly. In this context, the Clerk stated that parliament had no authority to involve itself in such allegations.

In 2025, Mr. Lissu's situation sharply worsened ahead of the 29 October 2025 general election. Shortly after being elected Chairperson of CHADEMA and confirmed as the party's presidential candidate, he was arrested in April 2025 and charged with treason on the basis of statements made at a public rally where he had called for electoral reforms and urged civil resistance if reforms were not implemented. Treason is a capital offence in the United Republic of Tanzania and does not allow bail, resulting in Mr. Lissu's continued detention. His trial has reportedly been repeatedly postponed and only formally started on 6 October 2025 and has allegedly been marked by due process concerns.

Incumbent President Samia Suluhu Hassan was declared the winner of the presidential election of 29 October 2025 having received 98% of the votes. Immediately after polling day, mass protests erupted across the United Republic of Tanzania against the perceived lack of free and fair elections. Security forces reportedly responded with a heavy crackdown, including the use of lethal force, curfews, mass arrests and an internet shutdown. Estimates of the death toll vary widely: opposition figures and civil-society groups speak of hundreds killed and thousands detained, often on serious charges such as treason. In response to the events, the Government announced that it had established a committee to investigate the deaths and alleged abuses during the post-election period.

## B. Decision

### The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

1. *Is deeply concerned* that the primary and very serious matter in this case, which relates to the time when Mr. Lissu was still a parliamentarian, remains the attempt on his life in 2017, which he survived by pure miracle, and the apparent lack of accountability for this crime; and *deeply regrets* in this regard that, despite multiple high-level exchanges and requests for information in the past eight years, the Tanzanian authorities have yet to provide any details on the steps taken to identify and hold to account the culprits of the assassination attempt;
2. *Recalls* the repeatedly made allegation that the crime was carried out with the support of the authorities; *points out* in this regard that the complainant has stated that Mr. Lissu had previously been the direct target of serious threats and intimidation by the government, that the armed guards normally present at the location where the shooting took place allegedly happened to be off duty that day, and that CCTV footage of the crime reportedly disappeared soon after; and *considers* that more recent statements made before a court in London could lend further credence to the allegations by the complainant in this regard;
3. *Urges*, therefore, once more, the relevant authorities to carry out diligent and effective investigations, as is their duty, into the assassination attempt, and to provide, as a matter of urgency, information on action taken to this end; *recognizes* that responsibility for the investigations falls first and foremost to the law enforcement and judicial authorities and that adhering to the democratic principles of the separation of powers and independence of the judiciary is crucial; *considers*, nevertheless, that the *sub judice* rule cannot be invoked as an obstacle to justice or accountability and that parliament is responsible for helping to ensure that all state institutions, including the judiciary, fully abide by the rule of law; *urges*, therefore, the newly elected National Assembly to take all necessary measures to this end; and *wishes* to be kept informed of any action taken by the new National Assembly for this purpose;
4. *Remains convinced* that an IPU on-site mission to the United Republic of Tanzania would offer a useful opportunity to discuss and clarify the important concern that has arisen in this case with the executive, parliamentary and judicial authorities, as well as with any third party able to help it to advance towards the satisfactory settlement of the case at hand; and *requests* the Secretary General to renew his consultations with the parliamentary authorities with a view to finally organizing the said mission as quickly as possible;
5. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the parliamentary and other relevant national authorities, the complainant and any interested third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information to assist it in its work;
6. *Decides* to continue examining this case.

# Bolivia

## (Plurinational State of)

*Decision adopted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at its 179th session (Geneva, 2 to 18 February 2026)*



Ms Ericka Chávez Aguilera, 2022 © Bolivian Chamber of Deputies

### BOL-85 – Ericka Chávez Aguilera

#### Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Torture, ill-treatment and other acts of violence

#### A. Summary of the case

According to the complainant, on Tuesday 23 May 2023, the Bolivian Minister of the Interior, Mr. Carlos Eduardo Del Castillo Del Carpio, was questioned in the chamber of the Plurinational Legislative Assembly of Bolivia about his alleged involvement in the arrest of the governor of the department of Santa Cruz, Mr. Luis Fernando Camacho. During the session, the minister reportedly failed to respond fully to questions from opposition parliamentarians, describing them as "radical, violent groups of thieves and thugs who have come to steal the money of the Bolivian people".

The complainant states that, following these remarks, opposition members of parliament rose to their feet and held up posters in support of the governor of Santa Cruz. In response, members of parliament of the majority party *Movimiento al Socialismo* (Movement towards Socialism) (MAS) began hitting and kicking them. Against this background, opposition member of parliament, Ms. Ericka Chávez Aguilera, was allegedly assaulted by two MAS members of parliament, Ms. María José Rodríguez Gálvez and substitute senator Ms. Yolanda Ponce Condo. According to the information provided by the complainant, Ms. Ponce Condo violently pushed member of parliament Ms. Chávez Aguilera, who fell to the ground and hit herself hard against the wooden steps of the chamber's rostrum. She then got up to try to help another opposition member of parliament who continued to be hit by MAS members of parliament. At this point, member of parliament Ms. María José Rodríguez Gálvez allegedly attacked Ms. Chávez Aguilera from behind,

#### Case BOL-85

**Bolivia:** Parliament affiliated to the IPU

**Victim:** Female opposition member of parliament

**Qualified complainant(s):** Section I.1(a) of the Committee Procedure (Annex I)

**Submission of complaint:** May 2023

**Recent IPU decision:** February 2024

**IPU mission(s):** - - -

**Recent Committee hearing:** - - -

#### Recent follow-up:

- Communication from the authorities: Letter from the President of the Legislative Assembly (September 2023)
- Communication from the complainant: January 2024
- Communication to the authorities: November 2025
- Communication to the complainant: January 2026

pulling her violently by the hair and pushing her to the ground.

According to information provided by the complainant, Ms. Chávez Aguilera experienced temporary difficulty walking as a direct result of the attack to which she was allegedly subjected during the parliamentary session. Following a forensic examination, a medical certificate was issued authorizing her to be temporarily absent from parliament. A copy of a temporary sick note dated 26 May 2023 was added to the file. The complainant states that no action or disciplinary measures were taken against Ms. Chávez Aguilera's attackers.

In a letter dated 12 September 2023, the parliamentary authorities stated that no complaint had been recorded in the archives of the secretariat of the Chamber of Deputies regarding the complainant's allegations. Nor had any record of sick leave in the member of parliament's name been found in the relevant records during May, June, July and August 2023. The authorities also provided a copy of a witness statement signed by Ms. Rodríguez Gálvez maintaining that Ms. Chávez Aguilera had assaulted Ms. Rodríguez Gálvez and not the other way round, as the complainant had stated.

In the decision adopted at its 173rd session (Geneva, 23 January to 7 February 2024), the Committee noted that the official statement indicating that the member of parliament, Ms. Chávez Aguilera, had not taken sick leave was signed by Ms. Rodríguez Gálvez in her capacity as First Secretary of the Chamber of Deputies, and requested further information on the circumstances in which the statement was drawn up, as well as assurances regarding the impartiality and credibility of the evidence. The Committee also requested information on any investigations and/or preventive measures initiated *ex officio* following the violent incidents in parliament on 23 May 2023, their outcomes, and full, unedited copies of the relevant video recordings. The Plurinational Legislative Assembly has not responded to these requests.

General elections took place in the Plurinational State of Bolivia in August and October 2025. Ms. Chávez Aguilera was not re-elected and her parliamentary mandate ended in November 2025. Since January 2024, the complainant has failed to respond to the Committee's repeated requests for updated information.

## **B. Decision**

The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

1. *Deeply regrets* the lack of response from the parliamentary authorities to the various requests for clarification made on several occasions; and *wishes to reiterate* that, in accordance with its Rules and Practices, the Committee endeavours to promote dialogue with national authorities, and in particular with parliaments, with a view to reaching a satisfactory settlement of the cases before it;
2. *Expresses concern* at the apparent absence of investigations and of corrective and non-repetition measures in response to the violent incidents that occurred in parliament on 23 May 2023; and *expresses its deep conviction* that differences must be resolved through dialogue and non-violent means, that the floor of parliament is a forum for democratic debate and not for violence, and that it is the responsibility of parliamentary authorities to ensure at all times that parliamentary debates take place in a peaceful, tolerant and secure atmosphere;
3. *Notes*, however, that the complainant has not provided any updated information since January 2024, despite repeated requests; *decides*, therefore, to close the case in accordance with Rule 25(b) of Annex I of the Committee's Rules and Practices;
4. *Recalls* that, in accordance with Rule 26 of Annex I of its Rules and Practices, the Committee reserves the right to reopen the case in the light of any new information provided by the complainant;
5. *Affirms* that the IPU stands ready, upon request, to provide assistance aimed at strengthening the capacities of the Plurinational Legislative Assembly to identify and address any underlying issues that may have given rise to the present case and to rectify such issues; and *invites* the competent authorities to provide further information on how the IPU could best provide such assistance;

6. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the parliamentary authorities and the complainant.

# Bolivia

## (Plurinational State of)

*Decision adopted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at its 179th session (Geneva, 2 to 18 February 2026)*



©Andrés Richard Ribera Salas

### BOL-86 – Andrés Richard Ribera Salas

#### Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Arbitrary arrest and detention
- ✓ Lack of due process in proceedings against parliamentarians

#### A. Summary of the case

According to the complainant, on 26 June 2024 military units commanded by senior officers of the Bolivian military deployed armed troops and armoured vehicles to Plaza Murillo in La Paz and approached the Government Palace with the alleged intention of removing the constitutional government. General Juan José Zúñiga reportedly stated publicly that a new cabinet would soon be appointed and that the action aimed to “restore democracy” and “free political prisoners”. The General was arrested shortly thereafter.

These events gave rise to criminal proceedings against the military commanders and others allegedly involved in preparing the action. The ensuing investigation included Mr. Andrés Richard Ribera Salas, an opposition member of parliament, as a suspect. According to the complainant, the accusation against Mr. Ribera Salas is based solely on WhatsApp messages exchanged on 26 June 2024 with an activist who informed him of the possibility of a coup. The complainant maintains that Mr. Ribera Salas had not communicated with this individual for forty days prior to the said date. The Prosecutor’s Office also cites as evidence a poster shared on Mr. Ribera Salas’ social media accounts promoting a civic mobilization scheduled for 28 June 2024, which the complainant states was unrelated to the 26 June events and had been planned well in advance.

Mr. Ribera Salas reportedly learned of his arrest warrant through a government video and filed a *habeas corpus* petition (*acción de libertad*), which was rejected. He travelled voluntarily to La Paz to clarify his legal situation but was arrested on 21 April 2025 upon arrival at El Alto International Airport and held for approximately 72 hours before being released. The complainant argues that this exceeded the 24-hour limit on detention established under Article 226 of the Code of Criminal

#### Case BOL-86

**Bolivia:** Parliament affiliated to the IPU

**Victim:** Male opposition member of parliament

**Qualified complainant(s):** Section I.1(a) of the Committee Procedure (Annex I)

**Submission of complaint:** May 2025

**Recent IPU decision:** - - -

**IPU mission(s):** - - -

**Recent Committee hearing:** - - -

#### Recent follow-up:

- Communication from the authorities: - - -
- Communication from the complainant: January 2026
- Communication to the authorities: December 2025
- Communication to the complainant: January 2026

Procedure and was incompatible with Article 152 of the Constitution, which prohibits preventive detention of parliamentarians except in cases of *flagrante delicto*.

The complainant affirms that Mr. Ribera Salas is being prosecuted as an accomplice to terrorism, to attacks against the President and other dignitaries, and to armed uprisings against the security and sovereignty of the State. Following his release, the judge imposed alternative measures including house arrest, monthly reporting obligations and restrictions on his movement and political activity. According to the complainant, these measures severely and arbitrarily interfered with Mr. Ribera Salas' ability to exercise his parliamentary mandate, including meeting constituents, engaging in political activities, exercising oversight functions, and expressing opinions.

The restrictive measures were upheld at an appeal hearing held on 2 June 2025. General elections took place in August and October 2025. Mr. Ribera Salas was not re-elected and his parliamentary mandate ended in November 2025. The criminal proceedings remain ongoing.

## **B. Decision**

The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

1. *Notes* that the complaint was submitted in due form by a qualified complainant under section I.1(a) of the Procedure for the examination and treatment of complaints (Annex I of the Rules and Practices of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians);
2. *Notes* that the complaint concerns an incumbent member of parliament at the time of the alleged violations;
3. *Notes* that the complaint concerns allegations of arbitrary arrest and detention and lack of due process in proceedings against parliamentarians, which are allegations that fall under the Committee's mandate;
4. *Considers*, therefore, that the complaint is admissible under section IV of the Procedure for the examination and treatment of complaints; and *declares* itself competent to examine the case;
5. *Regrets* the lack of response from the parliamentary authorities to its repeated requests for information and official observations regarding the allegations in the present case; and *recalls* in this regard that, in accordance with its Rules and Practices, the Committee does everything possible to promote dialogue with national authorities, and primarily with parliaments, with a view to reaching a satisfactory settlement in the cases before it;
6. *Reiterates its wish* to receive official comments on the allegations in the present case, particularly with regard to compliance with applicable parliamentary immunity rules and due process in the criminal proceedings initiated against Mr. Ribera Salas; and *invites* the parliamentary authorities to provide such information at their earliest convenience;
7. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the parliamentary authorities, the complainant and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;
8. *Decides* to continue examining the case.

# Peru

*Decision adopted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at its 179th session (Geneva, 2 to 18 February 2026)*



© Twitter @MargotPalaciosH

## PER-44 – Margot Palacios Huamán

### Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Violation of freedom of opinion and expression
- ✓ Violation of freedom of assembly and association
- ✓ Other acts obstructing the exercise of the parliamentary mandate

### A. Summary of the case

According to the complainant, Ms. Palacios has allegedly been the victim of threats, acts of intimidation, restrictions on freedom of opinion and expression, and restrictions on freedom of assembly and association as a consequence of her actions as an opposition parliamentarian.

The complainant reports that Ms. Palacios travelled to Europe from 6 to 15 February 2023. During the trip, she met with members of the Peruvian community abroad and with representatives of various international organizations. As a result of her criticism of the Government's actions, expressed publicly during her trip, she has allegedly been the victim of harassment, acts of intimidation and bullying by other members of Congress belonging to the governing party, the national media and other actors in Peruvian political life. The complainant considers that the systematic media presence of this multitude of actors, including on social media, is creating a hostile environment for Ms. Palacios, thus putting her safety at risk.

### Case PER-44

**Peru:** Parliament affiliated to the IPU

**Victim:** A female opposition member of parliament

**Qualified complainant(s):** Section I.1(a) of the Committee Procedure (Annex I)

**Submission of complaint:** February 2023; June 2024

**Recent IPU decision:** October 2023

**IPU mission(s):** - - -

**Recent Committee hearing:** - - -

### Recent follow-up:

- Communication(s) from the authorities: Letter from the Secretary General of Parliament (December 2025)
- Communication from the complainant: September 2025
- Communication to the authorities: Letter to the President of the Congress of the Republic (November 2025)
- Communication to the complainant: January 2026

The complainant included in the documentation sent to the IPU a number of press reports and social media posts in which various members of Congress belonging to the governing party accuse member of Congress Palacios of “generating rejection of the country abroad”, “spreading hatred”, and “distorting the reality of the country” among other accusations, and call for sanctions against her. The complainant asserts that Ms. Palacios did not file a complaint in Peru for the alleged human rights violations described in the complaint.

According to information contained in the complaint, the acts of harassment also took the form of specific acts of intimidation, such as filing a formal complaint against Ms. Palacios concerning her trip to Europe in official letter no. 823-2022-2023-PRCV/CR presented to the Ethics Committee of the Congress of the Republic. Another complaint against her and 48 other opposition members of parliament is reportedly being processed by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Accusations of the Congress of the Republic for alleged acts of “constitutional and criminal offences for failure to fulfil their duties of political oversight and to provide ongoing support to the President of the Republic, ministers of State and other senior officials”.

In a letter dated 25 April 2023 to the IPU Secretary General and signed by the Secretary General of Parliament, it was stated that the complaint filed against member of parliament Palacios with the Ethics Committee had been declared inadmissible and dismissed on 28 March 2023. However, the complaint against her and 48 other parliamentarians was “pending classification” by the Congress Subcommittee on Constitutional Accusations.

At the hearing held at the 147th IPU Assembly, the Peruvian delegation stated that, on 6 October 2023, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Accusations had approved by a majority the qualifying report declaring inadmissible the complaint filed against 49 members of parliament, including Ms. Palacios. The delegation provided copies of this subcommittee report confirming this statement.

In June 2024, the complainant reported that Ms. Palacios had been subjected to ongoing harassment due to her role as an opposition parliamentarian. Her resignation from the *Perú Libre* party and parliamentary group in May 2024, submitted on grounds of conscience, subsequently resulted in arbitrary actions and restrictions on the exercise of her parliamentary mandate, including the refusal to accept her resignation, her removal from committee assignments, and her expulsion from the party. The complainant argues that these measures impede her ability to join or form a new parliamentary group, thereby preventing her from engaging effectively in parliamentary proceedings, in contravention of constitutional and jurisprudential standards prohibiting the imperative mandate. The complainant also highlights delays and insufficient reasoning by the Board of Directors of Parliament and reports that Ms. Palacios has initiated a constitutional *amparo* action, which is still pending before the Constitutional Court.

In December 2025, the parliamentary authorities provided updated information on the proceedings followed in Parliament confirming that, on 7 April 2025, the Board of Directors had ultimately rejected Ms. Palacios’s request to reconsider the ratification of her expulsion from the *Perú Libre* parliamentary group. The original expulsion decision was therefore left in effect, although her subsequent request for a pronouncement on that decision remained pending.

## **B. Decision**

The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

1. *Recalls* that, in October 2023, the initial complaint concerning the situation of Ms. Palacios was declared inadmissible by the Committee under its Procedure for the examination and treatment of complaints, considering that the parliamentary procedures initiated appeared to have worked well, consequently guaranteeing the protection of Ms. Palacios's rights;
2. *Notes*, however, that recent and updated information was duly submitted by a qualified complainant under section I.1(a) of the Procedure; *notes also* that the new complaint concerns Ms. Palacios, a member of the Peruvian Parliament at the time of the alleged events; *notes further* that the new complaint relates to allegations of violations of freedom of opinion and expression, freedom of assembly and association, and other acts obstructing the exercise of the parliamentary mandate, which fall within the Committee’s mandate and appear to constitute a continuation of the allegations contained in the initial complaint;

3. *Considers*, therefore, that the new complaint is admissible under the provisions of section IV of the Procedure for the examination and treatment of complaints; *decides* to reopen the case under the provisions of section IX, paragraph 26, of the Procedure; and *declares* itself competent to examine it;
4. *Thanks* the Peruvian Parliament for the information provided in writing and for its continued cooperation with the Committee; and *notes with interest* that, in application of the relevant internal procedures, the Parliament has afforded Ms. Palacios the opportunity to present her defence in the context of the ongoing proceedings;
5. *Notes with concern*, however, that more than a year and a half after Ms. Palacios's expulsion from her political party, the exercise of her parliamentary functions remains subject to certain limitations, and that her requests for the protection of her rights before Congress have not yet been definitively resolved; *considers* in this regard that proceedings affecting the exercise of the parliamentary mandate must be resolved without undue delay, in order to safeguard the effective exercise of the mandate and the proper functioning of parliamentary democracy; *expresses the hope* that the parliamentary proceedings will advance expeditiously and in conformity with the applicable national legal framework, including the relevant constitutional provisions and national jurisprudence concerning the prohibition of the imperative mandate; and *wishes* to receive information on all measures taken by the Parliament in this respect;
6. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the President of the Congress of the Republic of Peru and the complainant;
7. *Decides* to continue examining this case.

## Cambodia

*Decision adopted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at its 179th session (Geneva, 2 to 18 February 2026)*



Lim Kimya in Phnom Penh on 26 October 2017. Photo by Tang Chhin Sothy / AFP

- |                              |                                 |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| KHM-48 - Mu Sochua (Ms.)     | KHM-76 - Ky Wandara             |
| KHM-49 - Keo Phirum          | KHM-78 - Lim Bun Sidareth       |
| KHM-50 - Ho Van              | KHM-79 - Lim Kimya              |
| KHM-51 - Long Ry             | KHM-80 - Long Botta             |
| KHM-52 - Nut Romdoul         | KHM-82 - Mao Monyvann           |
| KHM-53 - Men Sothavarin      | KHM-83 - Ngim Nheng             |
| KHM-56 - Kong Sophea         | KHM-84 - Ngor Kim Cheang        |
| KHM-57 - Nhay Chamroeun      | KHM-86 - Ou Chanrith            |
| KHM-58 - Sam Rainsy          | KHM-87 - Pin Ratana             |
| KHM-59- Um Sam Am            | KHM-90 - Sok Umsea              |
| KHM-60 - Kem Sokha           | KHM-91 - Son Chhay              |
| KHM-62 - Chea Poch           | KHM-92 - Suon Rida              |
| KHM-65 - Dam Sithik          | KHM-93 - Te Chanmony (Ms.)      |
| KHM-66 - Dang Chamreun       | KHM-94 - Tioulong Saumura (Ms.) |
| KHM-67 - Eng Chhai Eang      | KHM-95 - Tok Vanchan            |
| KHM-68 - Heng Danaro         | KHM-96 - Tuon Yokda             |
| KHM-69 - Ke Sovannroth (Ms.) | KHM-99 - Vann Narith            |
| KHM-72 - Khy Vanndeth        | KHM-101 - Yim Sovann            |
| KHM-73 - Kimsour Phirith     | KHM-102 - Yun Tharo             |

## Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Violation of freedom of opinion and expression
- ✓ Violation of freedom of assembly and association
- ✓ Abusive revocation of the parliamentary mandate
- ✓ Lack of due process at the investigation stage
- ✓ Lack of fair trial proceedings and excessive delays
- ✓ Failure to respect parliamentary immunity
- ✓ Violation of freedom of movement
- ✓ Threats, acts of intimidation
- ✓ Torture, ill-treatment and other acts of violence
- ✓ Impunity<sup>2</sup>
- ✓ Arbitrary arrest and detention<sup>3</sup>
- ✓ Inhumane conditions of detention<sup>4</sup>

### A. Summary of the case

On 16 November 2017, the Supreme Court dissolved the sole opposition party in Cambodia, the Cambodian National Rescue Party (CNRP). It also banned 118 CNRP members (including all 55 CNRP members of the National Assembly) from political life for five years with no possibility of appeal. Their parliamentary mandates were immediately revoked, and their seats reallocated to non-elected political parties allegedly aligned to the ruling party. The Supreme Court decision was based on charges of conspiracy with a foreign country to overthrow the legitimate government brought against the President of the CNRP, Mr. Kem Sokha. Seventeen former parliamentarians subsequently fled Cambodia and went into exile. The dissolution of the CNRP left the ruling Cambodian People's Party (CPP) – and Prime Minister Hun Sen – with no viable challengers in the February and July 2018 elections to the Senate and National Assembly.

The dissolution of the CNRP took place against the backdrop of long-standing and repeated threats and groundless criminal charges against its members of parliament. They had been repeatedly warned by the Prime Minister that their only choice was to join the ruling party or be prepared for the dissolution and ban of their party.

Mr. Kem Sokha, who became CNRP Acting President after its President, Mr. Sam Rainsy, went into exile in 2015, is accused of attempting to topple the Government based on a 2013 speech he made on television in which he called for peaceful political change in Cambodia, without at any point inciting violence or hatred or uttering defamatory words. On 3 March 2023, the Phnom Penh Municipal Court found Mr. Sokha guilty of treason, sentenced him to a 27-year prison sentence to be served in the form of house arrest, and indefinitely suspended his political rights to vote and to stand for election. Seventeen other parliamentarians, who have all been forced into exile abroad, had previously been sentenced in one or more of the following mass trials against CNRP members in recent years:

**Ruling of 14 June 2022 – plotting and incitement:** The case concerns 60 CNRP politicians and supporters, including 12 former CNRP leaders who were convicted *in absentia* on charges of plotting and incitement and were handed prison sentences of eight years. This case relates to Mr. Rainsy's failed attempt to return to Cambodia in November 2019 and the alleged plan to gather supporters both in the country and overseas to accompany him, as well as the establishment of the Cambodia National Rescue Movement abroad. The evidence mostly comprised Facebook posts expressing support for the former opposition party or democratic principles. No clear links were apparently made between the admitted evidence, each individual defendant and each element of the charges, and the judge reportedly failed to provide any reasoning in the decision.

### Case KHM-COLL-03

**Cambodia:** Parliament affiliated to the IPU

**Victims:** 38 former opposition parliamentarians (34 male and four female)

**Qualified complainant(s):** Section I.1(c) of the Committee Procedure (Annex I)

**Submission of complaint:** November 2011

**Recent IPU decision:** March 2023

**IPU mission(s):** February 2016

**Recent Committee hearing:** Hearings with the Cambodia delegation to the 146th IPU Assembly (March 2023)

#### Recent follow-up:

- Communication from the authorities: Letter from the Secretary General of the National Assembly (March 2023)
- Communication from the complainant: January 2026
- Communication to the authorities: Letter to the Secretary General of the National Assembly (December 2025)
- Communication to the complainant: January 2026

<sup>2</sup> Only concerns cases KHM-56 and KHM-57.

<sup>3</sup> Alleged violations which previously concerned the following former parliamentarians: KHM-48, KHM-49, KHM-50, KHM-51, KHM-52, KHM-53, KHM-59, KHM-60. Only currently applies to case KHM-60.

<sup>4</sup> Only concerns case KHM-60 in the context of solitary confinement.

**Ruling of 17 March 2022 – plotting, incitement and inciting military personnel to disobedience:**

The case concerns 21 senior CNRP leaders, including seven CNRP parliamentarians, as well as their supporters. The trial covered multiple issues, including the formation of the overseas Cambodia National Rescue Movement in 2018 and critical comments made by former CNRP officials about the COVID-19 pandemic. In court, several accused recanted their prior testimonies, alleging they were given under duress. The seven parliamentarians were found guilty of the charges and sentenced *in absentia* to 10 years in prison.

**Ruling of 1 March 2021 – plotting and incitement:** The case concerns 9 CNRP leaders, all CNRP parliamentarians, who were found guilty of carrying out an attack against Cambodian institutions or territorial integrity, with the Prosecution accusing the group of an attempted coup as it presented evidence of speeches about raising funds to support defecting soldiers. The members of parliament were sentenced *in absentia* to 20 to 25 years in prison and stripped of their right to vote, stand for election or be a public official, and were ordered to pay a sizeable fine.

With regard to these trials, the United Nations (UN) Special Rapporteur on the human rights situation in Cambodia, in his report of 18 August 2022 (A/HRC/51/66), stated that: “Mass trials, particularly of individuals from the main opposition party and those seen to be antithetical to the dominant power base, have caused great concern and stifled the possibility of political pluralism [...] Irregularities inherent in these trials include the lack of credible evidence, failings concerning respect for fair trial rights and due process guarantees, and the fact that several of the so-called accused are being tried *in absentia* in breach of human rights guarantees”.

Regarding the independence and transparency of the judiciary and prosecutors, the Special Rapporteur stated in the same report that, “This is a long-standing issue referred to decades ago in earlier UN resolutions on Cambodia. There is a more recent turn, however, in that some judicial and related personnel have close links with the political party in power; for instance, they might sit on various key committees of the party”.

On 7 October 2022, the Phnom Penh Court sentenced Mr. Son Chhay, a former member of the CNRP and now the Vice-President of the opposition Candlelight Party, in two cases to pay the CPP and the National Election Committee 3 billion riels and 17 million riels (US\$ 754,250) in damages, having found him guilty of defamation for saying that voting fraud had occurred during the June 2022 commune elections, allegations that were supported and substantiated by other entities at the national and international levels. In December 2022, the Appeal Court upheld the conviction and increased the damages he was ordered to pay (to approximately US\$1 million to the CPP and the National Election Commission). In February 2023, the Supreme Court upheld the defamation conviction on final appeal.

On 16 January 2023, Mr. Thach Setha, Vice-President of the Candlelight Party, was arrested over complaints of having written bad cheques, an accusation he denied and considers amounting to intimidation. He was convicted later in 2023 for forgery/bad cheques (18-month prison sentence) and incitement to social disorder and discrimination (three-year prison sentence). In August 2024, the Supreme Court of Cambodia upheld these convictions on final appeal.

On 19 October 2022, Mr. Rainsy was sentenced to life imprisonment, allegedly for trying to cede four Cambodian provinces to a foreign State. The conviction and sentence referred to Mr. Rainsy’s meeting in the United States in 2013 with the Montagnard Foundation, an organization that works to protect the rights of indigenous minorities in Viet Nam. Mr. Rainsy had promised to defend the rights of Cambodian indigenous people during the meeting. He has since dismissed the charges and sentence as bogus saying that he had not ceded territory to any country but only recognized the rights of the indigenous people called Khmer Leu in the north-east of Cambodia.

The CPP won 120 of the 125 seats in the National Assembly in the elections of 23 July 2023. The 2023 national elections had no credible opposition to the CPP. The Candlelight Party — a successor of the dissolved CNRP — was disqualified from registering for the election over a single absent document by the National Election Committee. The lack of a competitive election has seen the CPP and the then Prime Minister Hun Sen strengthen their grasp on power, especially with the transition in August 2023 to Hun Manet, the Prime Minister’s eldest son, as the new Prime Minister. Following the elections of July 2023, several UN human rights experts stated that “[a] range of serious human rights violations and severe restrictions on civic and political space affected the credibility of Cambodia’s national elections ...”

In his report of 5 August 2024 (A/HRC/57/82), the UN Special Rapporteur on the human rights situation in Cambodia stated that “while the country has made progress on some aspects of economic, social and cultural rights, a major challenge concerns the issue of civil and political rights, especially the constrained civic and political space.” The Special Rapporteur made the following recommendations to the Cambodian authorities with regard to elections and related space: (a) Cease the crackdown on opposition voices and take the necessary actions to ensure genuine multi-party elections; (b) Repeal the amendments to the Law on the Registration of Political Parties that allow for the arbitrary dissolution of political parties and the banning of party leaders from political activities without due process;... (f) End all forms of harassment, violence and intimidation against political opponents, land rights activists, labour activists, environmentalists, journalists and other human rights defenders, immediately release them from prison and drop all charges against them during and in post-election periods; and (g) Desist from interfering with the rights of all political parties to participate in elections. More recent reporting by the UN Special Rapporteur on the human rights situation in Cambodia, including the report submitted to the Human Rights Council in July 2025 (A/HRC/60/86), continues to highlight concerns about the constrained civic and political space, limitations on opposition activity and the use of legal measures affecting freedom of expression and political participation.

Mr. Lim Kimya, a former parliamentarian belonging to the CNRP, was fatally shot in Bangkok in Thailand on 7 January 2025. The attacker, Mr. Ekkalak Paenoi, fled to Cambodia but was arrested and extradited. The motive remains unclear, though several human rights organizations have called it a political assassination, while Cambodian authorities deny involvement.

## B. Decision

The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

1. *Reaffirms* that the ability of former opposition parliamentarians in exile to return safely to Cambodia and participate freely in political life is a central issue in this long-standing case and a key condition for restoring political pluralism and trust in the democratic process;
2. *Deeply regrets* that, despite repeated exchanges and the Committee’s consistent calls, no tangible progress appears to have been made towards enabling the exiled former parliamentarians to return to Cambodia as free individuals and to contribute openly to the country’s political life;
3. *Calls on* the Cambodian authorities to actively explore all legal, judicial and political avenues available to remove the obstacles preventing the return of the affected former parliamentarians, including those arising from convictions and sentences handed down *in absentia*, and to take concrete steps to facilitate their safe return;
4. *Recalls* in this regard its serious concerns regarding the broader pattern of measures taken against the political opposition in recent years, including:
  - (a) the dissolution of the CNRP and the resulting revocation of parliamentary mandates;
  - (b) the convictions and severe sentences imposed on opposition leaders and former parliamentarians, including Mr. Kem Sokha and Mr. Sam Rainsy, and the more recent convictions against Mr. Son Chhay and Mr. Thach Setha;
  - (c) the mass trial verdicts of 2021 and 2022, which continue to have far-reaching consequences for basic human rights and political participation;
5. *Notes with concern* that these developments continue to affect the overall political environment, including the prospects for inclusive, genuinely competitive elections and meaningful political dialogue involving opposition voices both inside and outside Cambodia;
6. *Expresses grave concern* at the killing of former parliamentarian Mr. Lim Kimya in January 2025; *notes* that the circumstances and possible motives remain contested; and *requests* the Cambodian authorities to provide detailed information on the status of the investigation, including any findings regarding motive and accountability;

7. *Reiterates* that a visit by an IPU delegation to Cambodia would provide a valuable opportunity to engage constructively on all the aforesaid issues; and *calls on* the authorities to provide the necessary clarity and dates so that such a mission can take place without further delay;
8. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the parliamentary authorities, the complainant and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;
9. *Decides* to continue examining this case.

# Mongolia

*Decision adopted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at its 179th session (Geneva, 2 to 18 February 2026)*



© Zorig Foundation

## MNG-01 – Zorig Sanjasuuren

### Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Murder
- ✓ Impunity

### A. Summary of the case

Mr. Zorig Sanjasuuren (“Mr. Zorig”) was assassinated on 2 October 1998. Regarded by many as the father of the democratic movement in Mongolia in the 1990s, Mr. Zorig was a member of parliament and acting Minister of Infrastructure at the time and was being considered as a candidate for the position of Prime Minister on the day he was killed.

Between 2015 and 2017, three suspects were identified, arrested, expeditiously tried and sentenced based on classified evidence, during trials held behind closed doors. Several reports indicated that the suspects were allegedly tortured to force them to make false confessions and framed by the intelligence services. The murder of Mr. Zorig is widely believed to have been a political assassination that was covered up. The investigation into the mastermind(s) of his murder is still open and has not yet yielded any results.

Despite the government declassification order of several files relating to the Zorig case in December 2017, the lack of transparency is still prevalent, as the court verdicts have remained inaccessible.

Since the submission of the complaint 20 years ago, the Committee has undertaken three fact-finding missions to Mongolia at crucial phases in the case. In June 2019, the Committee returned to Mongolia following the invitation of the parliamentary authorities and was updated on the important developments in the case, in particular the release of a video in March 2019 showing the torture and ill-treatment of two of the convicts, Ms. Chimgee and Mr. Sodnomdarjaa, as well as the establishment

### Case MNG-01

**Mongolia:** Parliament affiliated to the IPU

**Victim:** Member of the majority

**Qualified complainant(s):** Section I.1(a) of the Committee Procedure (Annex I)

**Submission of complaints:** October 2000, March 2001, September 2015

**Recent IPU decision:** February 2024

**IPU Missions:** August 2001, [September 2015](#), [September 2017](#), [June 2019](#)

**Recent Committee hearing:** Hearing with the Mongolian delegation to the 141st IPU Assembly (October 2019)

### Recent follow-up:

- Communication from the authorities: Letter from the Deputy Speaker of the State Great Hural (February 2025)
- Communication from the complainants: January 2026
- Communication addressed to the authorities: Letter addressed to the Chairman of the State Great Hural (January 2026)
- Communication addressed to the complainants: January 2026

of a parliamentary *ad hoc* committee on the case of Mr. Zorig. The two convicts in question were transferred to the prison hospital as a result of the video and a criminal case was opened against intelligence and law enforcement officials allegedly responsible for torturing them. Nevertheless, they remained in detention at that time.

On 22 July 2020, the Ulaanbaatar Court of First Instance concluded that Ms. Chimgee and Mr. Sodnomdarjaa had been tortured during the investigation into this crime. It convicted the former Chief of the General Intelligence Agency, Mr. Bat Khurts, as well as other intelligence officers, to prison terms ranging from one to three years for their involvement in the torture. However, on 30 October 2020, the appeals court dismissed the verdict and ordered a retrial of the case, arguing that the first-instance court had made a wrongful interpretation of the Criminal Code and violated two articles of the Code on Criminal Procedure. In their letter of 23 February 2021, the parliamentary authorities stated that Mr. Khurts and the other defendants in the torture case had been released on bail on 23 November 2020 due to the annulment of the case by the appeals court. However, on 31 March 2021, the Supreme Court of Mongolia convicted Mr. Khurts of torture in relation to the Zorig case and sentenced him to one and a half years in prison. Similarly, the former deputy prosecutor, Mr. Erdenebat, was reportedly sentenced to one year in prison by the Supreme Court for his responsibility for the acts of torture.

According to the complainants, on 10 March 2021, the Mongolian Government allegedly issued a decree to declassify the video showing that in 2015 Ms. Chimgee was allegedly drugged, undressed by investigators and had her fingerprints taken. The Minister of Justice reportedly tweeted that the “Government Cabinet meeting of 31 March 2021 decreed that all recordings (without specifying which ones) related to the Zorig case will be declassified”.

On 14 May 2021, the Supreme Court of Mongolia ordered the release on bail of Ms. Chimgee and Mr. Sodnomdarjaa and returned the case of Mr. Zorig for further investigation. However, the court has not officially abandoned legal proceedings against Ms. Chimgee and Mr. Sodnomdarjaa, given that the Zorig case is subject to further investigation.

In her letter of 5 February 2025, the then Deputy Speaker of the State Great Hural, Ms. Bulgantuya Khurelbaatar stated that the General Intelligence Agency and the National Police Agency had issued decrees establishing a joint working group to conduct an investigation under the supervision of the Prosecutor's Office. In that same letter of February 2025, the parliamentary authorities also indicated that the former Speaker of the State Great Hural had established a parliamentary working group to oversee the ongoing investigation and work toward the restoration of the rights of the individuals who were wrongfully charged with the murder of Mr. Zorig. The parliamentary authorities have yet to provide updated information about the progress of these working groups.

## **B. Decision**

The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

1. *Thanks* the former Deputy Speaker of the State Great Hural for the information provided in her letter of 5 February 2025;
2. *Welcomes* the establishment of the joint working group by the General Intelligence Agency and the National Police Agency to investigate the case, as well as the establishment of the parliamentary working group tasked with overseeing the ongoing investigation, which illustrates the authorities' commitment to establishing the truth in the case of Mr. Zorig and determining the identity of his assassins;
3. *Regrets*, however, the lack of official information from the Mongolian parliamentary authorities about these two entities since their establishment in 2024, despite its repeated requests; and *calls* on the State Great Hural to provide detailed information about the mandate of these two working groups, their composition and the work they have achieved so far, including whether they have been granted a full and unhindered access to all declassified files in the Zorig case;
4. *Sincerely hopes* that the Mongolian judicial authorities will abandon once and for all, the legal proceedings against Ms. Chimgee and Mr. Sodnomdarjaa in light of their torture and mistreatment and the conviction by the Supreme Court of Mongolia of several high-level

individuals responsible for their torture and miscarriage of justice; and *firmly believes* that with the earlier acquittal of these two individuals, the authorities now have the opportunity and responsibility to follow potentially plausible leads to identify the true masterminds of Mr. Zorig's murder;

5. *Reaffirms* that the resolution of the Zorig case would be a landmark achievement for the Mongolian authorities in upholding human rights and that transparency is an important step in the pursuit of justice in this case, which can only be achieved when the identity of the masterminds responsible for murdering Mr. Zorig is established; *renews its call*, therefore, for the authorities to ensure a robust and effective investigation into establishing the identity of those accountable for this crime and to allow unhindered access to all relevant documents; and *reiterates its wish* to be kept regularly apprised of all significant developments, including with regard to any progress made;
6. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the relevant authorities, including the Minister of Justice, the complainants and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;
7. *Decides* to continue examining this case.

# Pakistan

*Decision adopted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at its 179th session (Geneva, 2 to 18 February 2026)*



Security officials of the Anti-Narcotics Force (ANF) escort arrested senior leader of the Pakistan Muslim League-Nawaz (PML-N), Mr. Rana Sanallah (left), to court in Lahore on 2 July 2019. | ARIF ALI/AFP

## PAK-24 – Rana Sanallah

### Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Threats, acts of intimidation
- ✓ Arbitrary arrest and detention
- ✓ Lack of due process at the investigation stage
- ✓ Violation of freedom of movement
- ✓ Impunity

### A. Summary of the case

Mr. Rana Sanallah was elected to the National Assembly of Pakistan in 2018 from the Pakistan Muslim League-Nawaz (PML-N). At the time, the party was in opposition to the Government of Prime Minister Imran Khan and his Pakistan Tehreek-e-Insaf, or PTI (Pakistan Movement for Justice) party. As a senior leader of his party, Mr. Sanallah was a vocal critic of the PTI-led Government.

On 1 July 2019, Mr. Sanallah was arrested by an Anti-Narcotics Force (ANF) squad while he was on his way to a meeting with fellow members of parliament from PML-N. He was taken to a police station, where he was detained for 16 hours without any charges being brought against him. The next day, he was brought before a judge and presented with 15 kg of heroin that had allegedly been recovered from a suitcase in his car, which Mr. Sanallah denied. He remained in pretrial detention for six months and was eventually released on bail by the Lahore High Court on 24 December 2019.

### Case PAK-24

**Pakistan:** Parliament affiliated to the IPU

**Victim:** Opposition member of the National Assembly of Pakistan\*

**Qualified complainant(s):** Section I.1(a) of the Committee Procedure (Annex I)

**Submission of complaint:** 28 January 2020

**Recent IPU decision:** February 2021

**IPU Mission(s):** - - -

**Recent Committee hearing:** Hearing with a member of the delegation of Pakistan to the 151st IPU Assembly (October 2025).

### Recent follow-up:

- Communication(s) from the authorities: October 2020
- Communication from the complainant: November 2021
- Communication to the authorities: Letter to the Speaker of the National Assembly (November 2025)
- Communication to the complainant: February 2026

\* [The victim was a member of the opposition at the time of the initial facts of the case.](#) For the purposes of this report, the term “opposition” relates to members of parliament from political groups or parties that have limited decision-making power and are opposed to the ruling power

According to the complainant, Mr. Sanaullah's arrest took place amid a wave of purges of former officials linked to former Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif, including members of the Sharif family and the PML-N leadership. The complainant claims that the trial that ensued was politically motivated and that Mr. Sanaullah was framed by the Anti-Narcotics Force at the instigation of the Prime Minister.

In its decision on bail, the Lahore High Court made reference to details pertaining to the merits of the case, casting doubt on allegations put forward by the prosecution and finding flaws in the evidence produced by the investigation, which it described as "biased and riddled with deception". The court decision recognized that it could not ignore the fact that Mr. Sanaullah was a prominent leader of an opposition party, highlighting that "political victimization [of the opposition in Pakistan] is an open secret". Since then, Mr. Sanaullah faced a corruption charge as well as an order to freeze his assets. In addition, the complainant reports that Mr. Sanaullah was placed on the "Exit Control List", precluding him from travelling abroad.

Mr. Sanaullah has demanded a parliamentary investigation into what he describes as a politically motivated intimidation campaign in an attempt to frame him and discredit the PML-N party. The complainant also mentions that Mr. Sanaullah also repeatedly requested that incriminating video recordings and other pieces of evidence that the executive authorities declared to hold against him be made public or presented in a court of law, a request which was repeatedly denied despite the insistence of Mr. Sanaullah's counsel that it was his right to obtain them.

Following a political crisis that culminated in a vote of no confidence against Prime Minister Imran Khan in April 2022, the Government was replaced by a PML-N-led coalition with Mr. Shehbaz Sharif as Prime Minister. Following this reversal, Mr. Sanaullah was appointed Interior Minister. In his new capacity, Mr. Sanaullah intervened to annul orders for freezing the assets of numerous people targeted by the previous administration, based on the argument that these cases were politically motivated.

The press reported that on 7 November 2022, the Lahore High Court accepted the plea to lift the asset freezes against Mr. Sanaullah and dismiss ongoing investigations in the corruption case. On 10 December 2022, Mr. Sanaullah was acquitted from all charges in the narcotics case by the Special Court of Lahore after a plea by an Anti-Narcotics Force Assistant Director, who confirmed that the charges against him were baseless.<sup>5</sup>

Mr. Sanaullah was not re-elected in the February 2024 elections. However, he remains a prominent member of the PML-N party and frequently takes position on behalf of the Government, including regarding the prosecution of Mr. Imran Khan, who remains in Adiala jail since his arrest on 9 May 2023 (see case PAK-COLL-01).

## B. Decision

The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

1. *Regrets* that no recent information has been forthcoming from the authorities of Pakistan concerning this case;
2. *Remains concerned* about the allegations that Mr. Sanaullah was arbitrarily arrested and maintained in pretrial detention for a period of six months; and *is perturbed* by the admission of the Assistant Director of the Anti-Narcotics Force that the serious charges brought against Mr. Sanaullah in 2019 were in fact baseless, despite the repeated claims made by the ANF regarding evidence proving his guilt, giving credence to the allegation of the complainant that Mr. Sanaullah was framed by the authorities;
3. *Takes note* of the verdict of the Special Court of Lahore on 10 December 2022 acquitting Mr. Sanaullah of all charges against him; and *notes with satisfaction* that the proceedings against him were terminated as a result of the lack of evidence for his guilt, as requested by its decision of February 2021;

---

<sup>5</sup> ["Lahore court acquits Rana Sanaullah in narcotics case", \*Dawn\*, 10 December 2022](#)

4. *Strongly regrets* that Mr. Sanaullah was subjected to threats, acts of intimidation and arbitrarily detained for charges that are reportedly politically motivated and not based on substantial evidence while he remained a member of the opposition, as was acknowledged by the Lahore High Court in its ruling of 24 December 2019;
5. *Remains deeply concerned* by the apparent impunity in this case; *reaffirms* its view that impunity presents a serious threat both to members of parliament and to those they represent and that, accordingly, physical attacks against members of parliament, if left unpunished, not only violate the fundamental rights of individual parliamentarians, but also affect the ability of parliament to fulfil its role as an institution; and *emphasizes* that parliament has a duty to ensure that every effort is made to hold the culprits accountable;
6. *Notes*, nevertheless, that the complainant has not provided any updated information in spite of repeated requests and the complainant's ability to do so; and therefore *decides* to close the case in accordance with section IX, paragraph 25(b) of Annex I of its Procedure for the examination and treatment of complaints; *recalls*, however, that the Committee reserves the right to re-open this case should any new information be subsequently provided by the complainant to show that Mr. Sanaullah is being subjected to further human rights violations linked to the previous exercise of his parliamentary mandate;
7. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the relevant authorities and the complainant.

# Pakistan

*Decision adopted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at its 179th session (Geneva, 2 to 18 February 2026)*



Police officials arrested Pashtun human rights activist and former National Assembly member Ali Wazir (centre) after a rally against enforced disappearances in Pakistan in Islamabad in August 2023. | Ghulam Rasool / AFP

## PAK-25 – Muhammad Ali Wazir

### Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Torture, ill-treatment and other acts of violence
- ✓ Arbitrary arrest and detention
- ✓ Inhumane conditions of detention
- ✓ Lack of due process at the investigation stage
- ✓ Lack of fair trial proceedings
- ✓ Excessive delays
- ✓ Right of appeal
- ✓ Violation of freedom of opinion and expression
- ✓ Violation of freedom of assembly and association
- ✓ Failure to respect parliamentary immunity
- ✓ Impunity

### A. Summary of the case

Mr. Muhammad Ali Wazir was elected to the National Assembly of Pakistan in 2018. He is a co-founder of the Pashtun Tahaffuz (Protection) Movement (PTM), established in 2014 to defend the rights of the Pashtun people. His criticism of the military leadership over their responsibility for extrajudicial killings, enforced disappearances and other human rights violations against civilians in Khyber Pakhunkhwa and other areas predominantly inhabited by Pashtuns earned him enemies among influential members of the military leadership. Mr. Wazir has been arrested multiple times, together with other PTM leaders for attending PTM gatherings and making critical statements against the military. Additionally, he has spoken out against the Taliban armed group, exposing himself and his family to deadly attacks.

The complainant reports that Mr. Ali Wazir was initially arrested on 16 December 2020 in connection with a rally commemorating the 2014 Peshawar school massacre and was charged with violating a number of provisions of the Pakistan Penal Code and the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA). The charges against him include preparing a criminal conspiracy and making derogatory remarks against the armed forces and other State institutions in his speeches. He has also been accused of sedition and spreading “hate

### Case PAK-25

**Pakistan:** Parliament affiliated to the IPU

**Victim:** Independent member of the National Assembly of Pakistan

**Qualified complainant(s):** Section I.1(d) of the Committee Procedure (Annex I)

**Submission of complaint:** November 2021

**Recent IPU decision:** March 2023

**IPU Mission(s):** - - -

**Recent Committee hearing:** Hearing with a member of the delegation of Pakistan to the 151st IPU Assembly (October 2025)

### Recent follow-up:

- Communication from the authorities: November 2021
- Communication from the complainant: January 2025
- Communication to the authorities: Letter addressed to the Speaker of the National Assembly (December 2025)
- Communication to the complainant: January 2025

speech” against these institutions. However, the complainant rejects the charges as baseless and politically motivated. The complainant contends that the accusations against Mr. Ali Wazir are intended to interfere with his parliamentary mandate and his advocacy for the rights of the Pashtun people, in violation of his rights to freedom of expression and to peaceful assembly.

According to the complainant, although Mr. Wazir was freed on bail by the Supreme Court of Pakistan on 30 November 2021, his release from prison was forestalled in connection with a separate charge emanating from another jurisdiction. Since then, Mr. Wazir was presented with new charges on five occasions, which prevented him from leaving prison and regaining his seat in parliament even when accorded bail and despite the fact that the Anti-Terrorism Court (ATC) acquitted him in October 2022. Furthermore, although the National Assembly Speaker issued an order summoning Mr. Wazir to the parliamentary budget session on 21 June 2022, Mr. Wazir was not able to attend the session in the end as he was reportedly beaten by State agents when he was undergoing a health check in the hospital, which led him to demand to be returned to prison instead. The complainant has reported that the prolonged detention of Mr. Ali Wazir on remand violated his parliamentary mandate and put his life at risk, as he suffers from hypertension, diabetes and other ailments.

Following the mobilization of numerous actors, including members of the Senate of Pakistan, to pressure the authorities to respect Mr. Wazir’s rights, he was eventually released on bail on 14 February 2023, after spending 26 months in prison. However, following his release, Mr. Wazir was re-arrested multiple times, including after the end of the parliamentary term on 10 August 2023. The complainant reports that on 20 August 2023, Mr. Wazir was arrested once again as part of a violent crackdown that followed a large rally convened by the PTM in front of the Supreme Court, in Islamabad. According to the complainant, the arrest was made on suspicion of rebellion and attacking State institutions in violation of the ATA. The complainant further reports that Mr. Wazir was tortured during this incarceration and that his tormentors openly taunted him by declaring “if we kill you, who will hold us accountable?”

According to the complainant, Mr. Wazir was released on bail on 11 September 2023, only to be re-arrested minutes after his release. He was eventually released on 18 September 2023, but this was followed by another brief detention in November 2023. Mr. Wazir was again arrested on 3 August 2024. Initially, he was charged with provoking a road accident, but the authorities later brought charges under the ATA, repeating the same allegations that led to his detention in 2023. According to Mr. Wazir’s lawyer, after being freed on bail in September 2024 and later acquitted in these cases, Mr. Wazir was kept in indefinite detention under Section 3 of the Maintenance of Public Order (1960), which allows authorities to order the detention of people suspected of acting in a way that threatens public order for a period of 90 days. He was later charged with allegations of “spreading hate” in speeches and through online platforms, but the ATC later quashed the charges and referred the case to the National Cyber Crime Investigation Agency (NCCIA). Mr. Wazir has remained in different jails ever since 3 August 2024 pending the result of the inquiry, as all writs of habeas corpus and bail petitions were dismissed without justification. The complainant also alleged that Mr. Ali Wazir is being held in poor conditions, citing overcrowded cells, inhumane physical inspections and the denial of appropriate medical care given Mr. Wazir’s chronic heart disease and other ailments.

The complainant reports that since then, the security situation in his native province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa worsened even further. In 2024, Pakistan held highly contested elections that pitted traditional parties close to the military authorities against opposition candidates, who obtained more seats than any party in government. The complainant adds that several PTM-member candidates were attacked, and none were re-elected to the federal Parliament. Amidst the highly polarized climate that followed the elections, the PTM was banned on 25 October 2024 over reportedly unsubstantiated security concerns, and a substantial number of its activists were charged under the Anti-Terrorism Act of 1997. The ban was imposed just days before the Pashtun National Jirga (or assembly) held in Jamrud, Khyber district, from 11 to 13 October 2024. The PTM decried the arbitrary nature of the ban, pointing out the lack of evidence of any violent actions on its part, while the authorities appeared either unable or unwilling to stem the flow of actual terror attacks. Amnesty International, along with many other organizations, called on the Pakistani authorities to lift the ban and to stop criminalizing dissent.<sup>6</sup>

On 5 February 2026, the Peshawar High Court upheld the ban, rejecting the petitions filed by PTM leader Manzoor Ahmad Pashteen. During the proceedings, the counsel of the organization stressed that the PTM had consistently opposed violence and that the ban violated Article 8 of the Constitution. He

---

<sup>6</sup> [www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2024/10/pakistan-authorities-must-immediately-revoke-ban-on-pashtun-tahaffuz-movement/](https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2024/10/pakistan-authorities-must-immediately-revoke-ban-on-pashtun-tahaffuz-movement/)

also told the court that the decision proscribing the PTM and its leaders was adopted without prior consultation and without disclosing cabinet decisions or providing grounds for the ban. He said that despite repeated requests, the government refused to share any information regarding the basis for the proscription.

## B. Decision

### The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

1. *Regrets* that no recent information has been forthcoming from the authorities of Pakistan concerning this case; and *recalls*, in this regard, that the Committee, in accordance with its Rules and Practices, does everything possible to promote dialogue with the authorities of the country concerned, and primarily with its parliament, with a view to reaching a satisfactory settlement in the cases before it;
2. *Deplores* that, despite past efforts made by Pakistani parliamentarians that led to the release of their colleague from prison in 2023, Mr. Wazir has been arbitrarily detained for over a year and continues to be submitted to multiple allegedly unfair trial proceedings based on repeated charges relating to alleged actions he took during his parliamentary mandate;
3. *Urges* the Pakistani authorities to release Mr. Wazir on bail without delay and to ensure that his rights to a fair trial and to freedom of expression are protected; *recalls* that international human rights standards reflected in General Comment No. 35 of the United Nations Human Rights Committee specify that pretrial detention “shall be the exception rather than the rule”, should not be general practice, and should never apply automatically to all those charged with a certain crime; *reiterates its wish* to be kept informed of the dates of the trial, and of any other relevant judicial developments in the case in preparation for a trial observation mission to Pakistan; and *also wishes* to receive information on the precise legal and factual grounds that justify the ban and suppression of the “Pashtun Tahaffuz Movement”, the human rights organization co-founded by Mr. Wazir;
3. *Is deeply concerned* by reports that Mr. Wazir has been held in inhumane conditions despite the fact that he suffers from poor health; and *wishes* to receive detailed information on the detention conditions of Mr. Wazir;
4. *Is appalled* by the threats reportedly made by the torturers of Mr. Wazir, which point to a climate of complete impunity for human rights violations against parliamentarians who criticize the military authorities; *recalls* that impunity, by shielding those responsible from judicial action and accountability, decisively encourages the perpetration of further human rights violations, and that violations against members of parliament, when left unpunished, not only violate the fundamental rights of individual parliamentarians and of those who elected them, but also affect the integrity of parliament and its ability to fulfil its role as an institution; *is alarmed* that all of the latest cases concerning Pakistan before the IPU Committee are marked by a persistent pattern of impunity, a reality that has also been confirmed by the United Nations Human Rights Committee in its latest concluding observations on the human rights situation in Pakistan; *firmly believes* that such cases will continue to emerge unless the underlying factors behind this pattern of impunity are addressed and perpetrators of violations are held to account; and *calls on* the parliamentary authorities to exercise their oversight function to ensure that the perpetrators of violations committed against Mr. Wazir, including the authors of the attacks against him in June 2022 and August 2023, are identified and brought to justice;
5. *Calls on* the Parliament of Pakistan to use its powers to carry out a full review of its legislation, including the Pakistan Penal Code and the Anti-Terrorism Act, and to abolish or amend it in line with Pakistan’s international human rights obligations, including the obligation to criminalize torture and mistreatment; *calls on* the authorities to make use of the expertise of the United Nations special procedures, including the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression, to ensure that existing legislation is amended so as to comply with applicable international human rights standards; and *wishes* to receive information on all actions taken to this effect;

6. *Affirms* that the IPU stands ready to provide assistance upon request aimed at building the capacities of parliament and other public institutions to identify any underlying issues that have given rise to the current case and to rectify such issues, including with regard to the legislation and procedures implemented in the case; and *requests* the competent authorities to provide further information on how the IPU could best provide such assistance;
7. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the parliamentary authorities and other relevant national authorities, the complainant and any interested third parties likely to be in a position to supply relevant information to assist the Committee in its work;
8. *Decides* to continue examining the case.

# Philippines

*Decision adopted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at its 179th session (Geneva, 2 to 18 February 2026)*



Official portrait of Ms. France Castro, 2019 © Wikipedia

PHL-10 – Francisca Castro (Ms.)  
PHL-13 – Sarah Jane I. Elago (Ms.)

## Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Arbitrary arrest and detention
- ✓ Lack of due process at the investigation stage
- ✓ Violation of freedom of expression and opinion
- ✓ Violation of freedom of assembly and association
- ✓ Violation of freedom of movement
- ✓ Failure to respect parliamentary immunity

## A. Summary of the case

Ms. Francisca (“France”) Castro and Ms. Sarah Jane I. Elago are both opposition members of the House of Representatives.

The complainants state that in the course of their parliamentary mandates, they have both faced regular harassment due to their opposition to the policies of the then President, Mr. Rodrigo R. Duterte. This alleged intimidation includes being subjected to charges that have no legal or factual merit and that run counter to the individuals’ right to a fair trial and to their rights to freedom of expression, assembly and movement.

In this regard, the complainants state that Ms. Castro, who stood accused with 17 others, mostly teachers and advocates for the Lumad indigenous community in

## Case PHL-COLL-02

**Philippines:** Parliament affiliated to the IPU

**Victims:** Opposition members of parliament (two women)

**Qualified complainant(s):** Section I.1(a) of the Committee Procedure (Annex I)

**Submission of complaint:** December 2019

**Recent IPU decision:** October 2024

**IPU mission(s):** - - -

**Recent Committee hearing:** - - -

### Recent follow-up:

- Communication from the authorities: Report from the Legislative Research Service of the House of Representatives (October 2024)
- Communication from the complainants: January 2026
- Communication to the authorities: Letter to the President of the Senate (December 2025)
- Communication to the complainants: January 2026

Davao del Norte in the Philippines, as well as four pastors, was briefly arrested and detained on 28 and 29 November 2018. The charges were, first, kidnapping, and then “other acts of child abuse” in connection with the evacuation of 14 Lumad children who were attending the Salugpongan Ta’ Tanu Igkanogon Community Learning Center in conflict-ridden Mindanao, where the armed forces, along with the paramilitary group Alamara, were fighting against the communist insurgency. It seems that the authorities are claiming that the learning centre operated as a front for the communist insurgency. The prosecution insisted that the crime of “other acts of child abuse” had been committed by the accused, as they accompanied the minors without the assistance and presence of the government law enforcement agency concerned or the written permission and consent of the minors' parents. The complainants stated that Ms. Castro and the other accused rescued the 14 minors from harassment and after the paramilitary group Alamara, in cooperation with the military, forced the teachers and students to leave. In this regard, the teachers led the students on foot on a challenging path from Sitio Dulyan to Sitio Butay where they were collected by Ms. Castro and other members of the National Solidarity Mission. The children’s parents reportedly denied that their children had been kidnapped by the accused and said that they had had to leave because the threats were no longer bearable. The complainants also state that the school is situated in a very remote and poor part of the country, that it served as a boarding school so that the children did not have to walk hours to go to and from school, and that the parents had all signed a special consent form to the school giving it something akin to parental authority. They also say that the school follows the regular curriculum and was in no way working with the rebel National People’s Army. Moreover, the parents of the students, who were mostly poor peasants, as well as indigenous leaders in the area, have been pressured by the authorities to cooperate with the criminal proceedings.

On 4 July 2024, the judge in the case acquitted the four pastors but convicted the other 14 to prison terms ranging from four years, nine months and 11 days to six years, eight months and one day. In reaching his conclusion, the judge stated that the accused committed acts detrimental to the safety and well-being of the minor Lumad students “by keeping them in their company and transporting them on foot in the evening for three hours on a dark and unsecured road without assistance and presence of law enforcement, government agency or even a written consent of the minors’ parents, exposing the minors to hazard”. The complainants submit that the judge has erred on both the facts that underpinned the charge against the accused and the applicable legal provisions. On 27 November 2025, the Court of Appeal upheld the findings of guilt against the principled accused, including Ms. Castro. On 5 January 2026, Ms. Castro filed a Motion for Reconsideration with the Court of Appeal. Should that fail, her defence counsel will take the matter up with the Supreme Court.

The complainant states that Ms. Castro continues to be subjected to attacks, red-tagging and political harassment, and even threats. On 11 October 2023, the following remarks were made on national television, and subsequently disseminated on social media, by former President Duterte, whose daughter is the incumbent Vice-President of the Philippines: “I didn’t tell them [France Castro and others] face-to-face, I didn’t tell them that ‘you know, we’re enemies, I want to kill you but I want to kill you softly’”. He then reportedly told his daughter, the Vice-President: “But your first target with the intelligence fund, is you, you, France, you communists whom I want to kill. Tell her already”. According to the complainants, the former President issued these threats due to Ms. Castro’s denunciation of the Vice-President’s alleged unauthorized receipt and use in 2022 of 125 million pesos of confidential funds. Upon the insistent opposition of Ms. Castro and others to the new grant of confidential funds, the House of Representatives scrapped the Vice-President’s request. The leadership of the House of Representatives has called former President Duterte out for threatening harm to Ms. Castro. The leaders of all political parties in the House of Representatives issued a statement on 14 October 2023 saying that, “we, leaders of all political parties in the House of Representatives, take utmost exception to the remarks made by former President Rodrigo R. Duterte”. On 24 October 2023, Ms. Castro filed a criminal complaint against former President Duterte for serious threats in relation to the Cybercrime Act or Republic Act No. 10175. In her criminal complaint, Ms. Castro, among others, said that President Duterte’s remarks with regard to her were factually baseless and clearly malicious, but that she could not dismiss them as “figurative, joking, or otherwise benign”. On 9 January 2024, the Quezon City Office of the City Prosecutor dismissed the complaint for “want of sufficient evidence”. Ms. Castro filed a petition for review with the Department of Justice on 5 February 2024.

During her earlier term as member of parliament, Ms. Elago was directly and indirectly labelled in social media posts by the police and army as a terrorist. Red-tagging in the Philippines is understood to refer to the malicious blacklisting of individuals or organizations critical or not fully supportive of the actions of a sitting government in the country. These individuals and organizations are “tagged” as

either communist or terrorist, or both, regardless of their actual political beliefs or affiliations. On 7 December 2020, Ms. Elago filed a complaint to the Office of the Ombudsperson with regard to the conduct of six senior army and government officials. The matter is still pending.

## **B. Decision**

The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

1. *Is deeply concerned* that the conviction of Ms. Castro and several others was confirmed on appeal and that they remain sentenced to hefty prison terms for their involvement in what appears to be a legitimate rescue operation; *understands* in this regard that it was inevitable for the operation to be carried out in challenging circumstances and that all efforts were made to reduce the risk to the children who were brought to safety; and *trusts* that the court of appeal will give due consideration to the Motion for Reconsideration which is before it;
2. *Remains convinced* that the criminal case against Ms. Castro and others also has to be seen in the context of the difficult environment for critical political opponents and human rights defenders in the Philippines to carry out their work without fear of reprisals; *remains deeply concerned* in this regard that the threats that the former President of the Philippines made on air against the life of Ms. Castro have so far gone unpunished; *trusts* that the Department of Justice is reconsidering the decision of the Prosecutor's Office and will take the necessary follow-up action that Ms. Castro's complaint warrants; and *wishes* to receive more information on this point;
3. *Remains concerned* that Ms. Elago's complaint regarding her alleged red-tagging does not appear to have advanced before the Ombudsperson, with no sign of it being actively examined; *recalls* the legal principle that justice delayed is justice denied; again *calls on* the Ombudsperson to take the necessary action to examine the complaint along with any steps its findings may warrant; and *wishes* to be kept informed in this regard;
4. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the parliamentary authorities, the Department of Justice, the Ombudsperson, the complainants and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;
5. *Decides* to continue examining this case.

# Sri Lanka

*Decision adopted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at its 179th session (Geneva, 2 to 18 February 2026)*



Ramanathan Archchuna © Parliament of Sri Lanka

## LKA-79 – Ramanathan Archchuna

### Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Threats, acts of intimidation
- ✓ Lack of due process in proceedings against parliamentarians
- ✓ Violation of freedom of opinion and expression
- ✓ Violation of freedom of assembly and association
- ✓ Violation of freedom of movement
- ✓ Undue invalidation, suspension, revocation or other acts obstructing the exercise of the parliamentary mandate

### A. Summary of the case

According to the complainant, from the first sitting of Parliament after his election in November 2024, Dr. Archchuna was prevented from speaking for 77 consecutive sitting days, despite repeated attempts to raise issues affecting Tamil-speaking communities. His motions and interventions were reportedly blocked or ruled out of order without justification.

On 19 March 2025, the Speaker allegedly imposed a total ban on Dr. Archchuna's right to speak in Parliament for more than two months, which the complainant states was in retaliation for his efforts to draw attention to structural discrimination and other issues concerning the Tamil minority.

Following a speech delivered on 5 May 2025 concerning "323 suspicious containers" purportedly containing war-era material, Dr. Archchuna was summoned by the Criminal Investigation Department (CID) on 12 June 2025 to provide a statement regarding his parliamentary speech. The complainant asserts that this constitutes a direct challenge to constitutional protections and parliamentary privilege. Documentation on this CID summons has been provided.

### Case LKA-79

**Sri Lanka:** Parliament affiliated to the IPU

**Victim:** An independent member of parliament

**Qualified complainant(s):** Section I.1(a) of the Committee Procedure (Annex I)

**Submission of complaint:** October 2025

**Recent IPU decision:** - - -

**IPU mission(s):** - - -

**Recent Committee hearing:** - - -

### Recent follow-up:

- Communication from the authorities: - - -
- Communication from the complainant: January 2026
- Communication to the authorities: November 2025
- Communication to the complainant: January 2026

According to the complainant, on 13 September 2025, Dr. Archchuna was denied visa facilitation by the Sri Lankan Embassy in Switzerland, preventing him from attending a session of the United Nations Human Rights Council. The complainant further states that Dr. Archchuna's legal secretary, Ms. Kowshalya Narenthiran, an attorney at law who was reportedly prepared to accompany him and submit documentation to UN mechanisms, was likewise denied a visa.

The complainant alleges that since assuming office, Dr. Archchuna's assigned security detail has been withdrawn, despite repeated requests for protection and despite escalating threats to his life. Requests for security reinforcement addressed to the Minister of Public Security through the Office of the Speaker were reportedly left unanswered or unresolved. The complainant states that Dr. Archchuna and his legal secretary were physically assaulted on 12 February 2025 by two known individuals, and that although the suspects were initially arrested following Dr. Archchuna's complaint, a case was filed against him for alleged misconduct, in what the complainant characterizes as retaliatory or politically influenced action. The complainant also reports frequent death threats, harassment and intimidation from political actors, law enforcement officials and unidentified individuals, creating an environment of extreme personal vulnerability.

The complainant asserts that unsubstantiated allegations were raised in Parliament accusing Dr. Archchuna of misconduct, including alleged derogatory speech and communal incitement, which he has vigorously denied. These allegations reportedly resulted in restrictions on the broadcasting of his parliamentary speeches without any formal inquiry. The complainant states that decisions by parliamentary authorities, including the Speaker and the Secretary-General, have repeatedly obstructed his attempts to raise matters of parliamentary privilege despite formal written submissions.

According to the complainant, the cumulative effect of these measures – restrictions on speech, denial of access to parliamentary procedures, withdrawal of security, threats to life, legal harassment, and limitations on international engagement – has severely impaired Dr. Archchuna's ability to carry out his parliamentary mandate freely, securely and effectively.

## **B. Decision**

The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

1. *Notes* that the complaint was submitted in due form by a qualified complainant under section I.1(a) of the Procedure for the examination and treatment of complaints (Annex I of the Rules and Practices of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians);
2. *Also notes* that the complaint concerns an incumbent member of parliament at the time of the alleged violations;
3. *Further notes* that the complaint concerns allegations of threats, acts of intimidation, lack of due process in legal proceedings, violations of freedom of opinion and expression, freedom of assembly and association and freedom of movement, and specific acts obstructing the exercise of the parliamentary mandate, allegations which fall within the Committee's mandate;
4. *Considers*, therefore, that the complaint is admissible under section IV of the Procedure for the examination and treatment of complaints; and *declares* itself competent to examine the case;
5. *Is concerned* about the allegation that Dr. Archchuna faced unjustified draconian restrictions to his right to speak in parliament and the allegation that, contrary to parliamentary privilege, one of his speeches led him to be questioned by law enforcement; and *wishes* to receive the official views on these allegations and to know what measures have been taken to ensure that Dr. Archchuna can fully exercise his parliamentary mandate and his right to freedom of expression without hindrance or fear of reprisals;
6. *Is deeply concerned* about Dr. Archchuna's security and the allegation that his security detail was withdrawn despite the serious threats against him; *urges* the authorities to address this matter without delay and to put in place the security arrangement that Dr. Archchuna's situation warrants; *wishes* to receive concrete official information on this point, along with information on steps taken to investigate the death threats against him; and *also wishes* to receive the official views on the alleged assault against Dr. Archchuna and his legal secretary on 12 February 2025

and the subsequent action that was allegedly taken against him rather than the attackers;

7. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the parliamentary authorities, the complainant and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;
8. *Decides* to continue examining the case.

# Ukraine

*Decision adopted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at its 179th session (Geneva, 2 to 18 February 2026)*



Mr. Artem Dmytruk serves as a subdeacon of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. © Amsterdam & Partners

## UKR-03 – Artem Hennadiyovych Dmytruk

### Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Enforced disappearance
- ✓ Torture, ill-treatment and other acts of violence
- ✓ Threats, acts of intimidation
- ✓ Arbitrary arrest and detention
- ✓ Lack of due process in proceedings against parliamentarians
- ✓ Violation of freedom of opinion and expression
- ✓ Violation of freedom of movement
- ✓ Undue invalidation, suspension, revocation or other acts obstructing the exercise of the parliamentary mandate
- ✓ Impunity
- ✓ Other violations: discrimination

### Case UKR-03

**Ukraine:** Parliament affiliated to the IPU

**Victim:** Independent member of parliament

**Qualified complainant(s):** Section I.1(a) of the Committee Procedure (Annex I)

**Submission of complaint:** September 2024

**Recent IPU decision:** February 2025

**IPU mission(s):** - - -

**Recent Committee hearing:** - - -

#### Recent follow-up:

- Communication from the authorities: December 2024
- Communication from the complainant: October 2025
- Communication to the authorities: January 2026
- Communication to the complainant: October 2025

## A. Summary of the case

Mr. Artem Hennadiyovych Dmytruk was elected to the Verkhovna Rada (the Parliament of Ukraine) in 2019. Although he was at one point a member of the ruling Servant of the People faction, he was expelled from the party in 2021 after expressing disappointment at the lack of any genuine progress in fighting corruption. According to the complainant, before his expulsion, Mr. Dmytruk was summoned by President Zelensky and urged to cease his criticism. Mr. Dmytruk is well known for his independent views, as well as his outspoken defence of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church (UOC) and the rights of its adherents. According to the complainant, Mr. Dmytruk has been repeatedly targeted by the authorities of Ukraine for his views, including his vocal opposition to a bill banning all UOC activities.

The complainant reports that, in January 2022, Mr. Dmytruk received mounting threats over his criticism of alleged illegal land transfers in Odesa that earned him some enemies. On 24 February 2022, the day the invasion of Ukraine started, Mr. Dmytruk enlisted himself and many of his followers in a territorial defence battalion under the authority of the police.<sup>7</sup> According to the complainant, on 3 March 2022, as part of his territorial defence work, Mr. Dmytruk was manning a checkpoint with his fellow battalion members and police officers during curfew, when he was approached and threatened by agents of the Security Service of Ukraine (SBU), leading to a heated exchange at a local police station. According to the complainant, Mr. Dmytruk was attacked by one of the agents later that night, but he managed to disarm him by using proportionate force and confiscated the agent's weapon with the intention of submitting it to the local SBU head, whom he knew. However, the complainant submits that, when Mr. Dmytruk called the local SBU head the next morning, he was met with a threat, being told that he was a "dead man".

The complainant reports that, on the evening of 4 March 2022, Mr. Dmytruk and two of his assistants were abducted by a detachment of heavily armed SBU agents and taken to the local SBU office, where they were held incommunicado and subjected to torture.<sup>8</sup> According to the complainant, Mr. Dmytruk's teeth, nose, fingers and toes were broken, his eyes sustained damage and his spine was deformed. The complainant adds that Mr. Dmytruk was repeatedly beaten until he lost consciousness, only to be revived and tortured again. The complainant adds that Mr. Dmytruk was forced to record a video where he renounced his views and pledged to cooperate with the SBU, under threat of further violence. The three men were released later that day. Although the complainant has provided photographic evidence of the signs of violence inflicted on Mr. Dmytruk, the complainant insists that the pictures were not reported to the police, as the SBU had threatened that if Mr. Dmytruk reported the acts of torture or sought medical treatment he would be tortured again. The Ukrainian Prosecutor's Office later confirmed that Mr. Dmytruk was questioned between 10:10 p.m. on 4 March 2022 and 12:05 a.m. on 5 March 2022.

According to a report by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), 91 individuals were subjected to enforced disappearance, torture and/or extrajudicial killings by Ukrainian State agents in the days after the outbreak of the full-scale war.<sup>9</sup> Two parliamentarians who had briefly disappeared in the same period resurfaced soon after.

The complainant further reports that Mr. Dmytruk did not resume his activities on social media until 17 March 2022, after the SBU forced him to give a sign of life to his followers to assuage their concerns about his silence, demanding that he resume his social media activity under threat of them "finishing what they had started". Mr. Dmytruk complied and later resumed his parliamentary duties, but his vocal stance was notably subdued. The complainant reports that the SBU's actions aimed to break Mr. Dmytruk's spirit, limiting his ability to express his beliefs and to continue to fulfil his duties.

However, the complainant reports that, in 2024, Mr. Dmytruk resumed his public criticism of the government on account of mounting human rights violations, including the prolonged detention and prosecution of his colleague Mr. Oleksandr Dubinsky, and the arrests and intimidation faced by members of his Church. Furthermore, he became a prominent critic of Bill 8371,<sup>10</sup> which was adopted at its second reading on 20 August 2024, effectively banning all UOC activities. According to the

---

<sup>7</sup> <https://bitly.cx/vuKUH>

<sup>8</sup> <https://bitly.cx/eZVy>

<sup>9</sup> [Report on the human rights situation in Ukraine, 1 August 2022 - 31 January 2023, UNHCR](#)

<sup>10</sup> Bill 8371 was adopted on 20 August 2024 as the Law on the Protection of the Constitutional Order in the Field of Activities of Religious Organizations, informally known as the Law on the Prohibition of the Russian Orthodox Church in Ukraine.

complainant, by then Mr. Dmytruk had been facing intensified threats to cease his advocacy. The complainant adds that on 18 August 2024, the head of the Office of the President, Mr. Andriy Yermak, made a Telegram post that was interpreted by his followers as an encouragement to use violence against Mr. Dmytruk, after which there was a marked increase in threats against Mr. Dmytruk. Since then, numerous prominent Ukrainian social media figures and radicals have offered bounties for his death, including Mr. Yevhen Karas and Mr. Andriy Serhiyovych.<sup>11</sup>

The complainant stresses that the pleas for protection and the complaints filed with the police by Mr. Dmytruk were summarily dismissed and that the security detail previously assigned to him was in fact withdrawn without explanation. Mr. Dmytruk was left with no choice but to leave the country on 24 August 2024, which caused a public uproar, as Ukrainian men are banned from leaving the country.

The complainant adds that, on 25 August 2024, Mr. Dmytruk was charged with inflicting minor bodily harm on an SBU agent and criminal intent to steal a weapon on 3 March 2022. He was also charged with hooliganism and actual bodily harm in another altercation that had occurred as part of his work for the parliamentary Committee on Law Enforcement dating back to 29 October 2023. According to the complainant, the timing of these charges close to the final reading of Bill 8371 in parliament demonstrates their political nature. The complainant adds that the General Prosecutor's note submitted as part of the arrest notice manipulates and obfuscates facts that prove that it was Mr. Dmytruk who was attacked on both occasions and reported the events to the police.

The complainant further submits that Mr. Dmytruk sought asylum in the United Kingdom. On 5 September 2024, the Ukrainian authorities requested the extradition of Mr. Dmytruk on charges of hooliganism and bodily harm, which led to his arrest in the United Kingdom and the beginning of an extradition process. The complainant states that Mr. Dmytruk was freed on bail shortly thereafter. According to the complainant, the extradition of Mr. Dmytruk to Ukraine would violate the non-refoulement principle, as Ukrainian authorities cannot guarantee he would not be tortured or killed.

On 31 December 2024, the Ukrainian parliamentary authorities responded to the IPU's request for information by stating that parliament had not adopted any decisions concerning Mr. Dmytruk and that they could not comment on the merits of the case as it was under investigation.

The complainant further reports that Mr. Dmytruk has been denied access to his online parliamentary portal and has been summarily dismissed from his parliamentary committee, which effectively deprives him from the ability to exercise his mandate. In addition, the complainant reports that Mr. Dmytruk's counsel in Ukraine is being denied access to the case material of the suspended trial.

In October 2025, an IPU trial observer, Ms. H el ene Massin-Trachez, was able to attend several hearings of the extradition trial of Mr. Dmytruk at the Westminster Magistrates Court, and produced an initial report. In her report, the observer concluded that while being heard as a witness, Mr. Dmytruk was "detailed and consistent" in his account. She recalled that, according to the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights, evidence relating to allegations of torture must conform to the standard of proof "beyond reasonable doubt". She also reported that an expert appointed by Mr. Dmytruk's counsel shared a medical report concluding that, under the criteria for the documentation of torture laid out in the Istanbul Protocol, the evidence provided by Mr. Dmytruk is consistent with his account of torture. The report also mentions declarations of several other experts with working knowledge of the judicial system in Ukraine who concluded that "Ukrainian judges and prosecutors are particularly vulnerable to political pressure and corruption". The observer also expressed surprise that the asylum application has been suspended pending a decision in the extradition process, rather than the reverse. A verdict on extradition proceedings is expected to be adopted on 4 March 2026.

## B. Decision

The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

1. *Thanks* the IPU trial observer for her work, in particular her analysis and continued readiness to attend and report on the legal proceedings at hand; *takes note with great interest* of her comprehensive report on the court hearings in Mr. Dmytruk's extradition case; and *expresses*

---

<sup>11</sup> [https://t.me/karas\\_evgen/9436](https://t.me/karas_evgen/9436)

*its gratitude* for the access granted by the authorities of the United Kingdom to the trial observer;

2. *Is alarmed* by the evidence presented in court by an expert appointed by Mr. Dmytruk's counsel that appears to confirm the veracity of his account of the torture he sustained at the hands of SBU agents on the night of 4 March 2022; and *is deeply concerned* by the assertion of other experts heard during the trial regarding the risks to his rights and his physical integrity if he was extradited to Ukraine;
3. *Remains concerned* by the allegations of threats, acts of intimidation and other violations that interfered with the exercise of Mr. Dmytruk's parliamentary mandate and compelled him to seek asylum in the United Kingdom;
4. *Reiterates its firm belief* that nothing prevents the Ukrainian parliamentary authorities from providing their official views on the allegations of torture, threats, acts of intimidation and lack of due process in proceedings against one of their parliamentarians, which are matters that fall within the purview of the Verkhovna Rada's oversight function; *wishes* to receive information on the reason for the seemingly unjustified dismissal of Mr. Dmytruk's numerous complaints to the Ukrainian police and Ministry of the Interior as well as the reason for the termination of his security detail, even though he continued receiving mounting death threats and had requested additional protection for himself and his family; and *also wishes* to receive information on any action taken to hold Mr. Yevhen Karas, Mr. Andriy Serhiyovych and the other authors of these threats and intimidation to account;
5. *Remains troubled* by allegations that Mr. Dmytruk has been prevented access to his parliamentary online portal and that he has been expelled from the Committee on Law Enforcement, which seriously limits his ability to exercise his parliamentary mandate while he is awaiting a decision on his asylum request abroad; and *urges* the parliamentary authorities to ensure that Mr. Dmytruk regains his right to fulfil his parliamentary mandate as far as is feasible remotely;
6. *Regrets* that the parliamentary authorities of Ukraine chose to refrain from sharing their views on these allegations with the IPU and have not submitted updated information in this case, despite repeated requests; *wishes* to receive information on the points mentioned above from the parliamentary authorities without delay; and *trusts* that the Verkhovna Rada will seek the information requested from the relevant Ukrainian authorities as appropriate;
7. *Urges* once again all relevant Ukrainian authorities to ensure that Mr. Dmytruk's rights to a fair trial are respected in full, including by ensuring that he is provided with access to the case files as requested by his counsel; and *further urges* the Ukrainian authorities to ensure that all allegations of human rights violations are promptly investigated and that Mr. Dmytruk is provided with an effective remedy for all violations identified in the present case;
8. *Renews its hope* that the authorities of Ukraine and, likewise, those of the United Kingdom while Mr. Dmytruk chooses to remain within the latter's jurisdiction, will do their utmost to ensure that his rights under the human rights treaties to which the two countries are party will be respected in full, including with regard to the United Kingdom the principle of non-refoulement as enshrined in article 3 of the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, which stipulates that no State Party shall extradite a person to another State where there are substantial grounds for believing that he would be in danger of being subjected to torture;
9. *Decides* to send a trial observer to the legal proceedings relevant to this case with a view to collecting information and reporting on how Mr. Dmytruk's human rights are respected in the case at hand;
10. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the Ukrainian parliamentary authorities, the relevant authorities of the United Kingdom, the complainant and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;
11. *Decides* to continue examining the case.

# Bahrain

*Decision adopted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at its 179th session (Geneva, 2 to 18 February 2026)*



Matar Ebrahim Matar © Courtesy photo (Mr. Matar)

## BHR-03 – Matar Ebrahim Matar

### Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Torture, ill-treatment and other acts of violence
- ✓ Arbitrary arrest and detention
- ✓ Lack of fair-trial proceedings

### A. Summary of the case

Mr. Matar Ebrahim Matar was a member of the currently banned opposition Al-Wefaq party and the Council of Representatives (the lower house of parliament) until his resignation in protest against the government crackdown on demonstrations in February 2011. His resignation became effective at the end of March that year. The complainant alleges that he was arbitrarily arrested during the state of emergency in May 2011, held incommunicado, ill-treated and prosecuted in connection with his participation in demonstrations of the Arab Spring. Mr. Matar was released in August 2011. He was acquitted in February 2012 and has remained abroad since then.

In March 2021, the IPU Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians received a report from the Military Prosecution of the Kingdom of Bahrain, which dismissed the allegations of arbitrary arrest, torture and ill-treatment, based on the testimony of the individuals who carried out the arrest, which conflicted with Mr. Matar's account. The report also highlighted that the charges against Mr. Matar were misdemeanour charges, namely spreading false news and organizing unsanctioned demonstrations, which did not require the presence of a lawyer under Bahraini law. The report stressed, however, that Mr. Matar had later been able to meet with his lawyer and receive visits from his family prior to his release.

The United Nations Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association singled out the situation of Bahrain in his report (A/HRC/23/39), where he states that: "Peaceful assemblies have been prohibited or repressed because the message conveyed do not please the authorities." (para. 61). The report also states that the Special Rapporteur "is particularly

### Case BHR-03

**Bahrain:** Parliament affiliated to the IPU

**Victim:** A male opposition member of parliament

**Qualified complainant(s):** Section I.1(a), (b) and (d) of the Committee Procedure (Annex 1)

**Submission of complaint(s):** May 2011

**Recent IPU decision:** February 2019

**IPU Mission(s):** - - -

**Recent Committee hearing:** Hearing of the Bahraini parliamentary delegation, led by the First Deputy Speaker of the Shura Council, Mr. Jamal Fakhro, during the 146th IPU Assembly (March 2023)

### Recent follow-up:

- Communication from the authorities: Letters from the Speaker of the Council of Representatives (January 2025)
- Communication from the complainant: August 2015
- Communication to the authorities: Letter to the Speaker of the Council of Representatives (December 2025)

troubled by the imposition of blanket bans in many States” (para. 63), citing Bahrain along with another country, “typically in the interests of national security, public safety or public order. He firmly believes that such blanket bans, are intrinsically disproportionate and discriminatory measures as they impact on all citizens willing to exercise their right to freedom of peacefully assembly.” (para. 63).

In June 2011, the King of Bahrain set up an Independent Commission of Inquiry. Its report criticized the authorities’ handling of the protests and recommended that they take a wide-ranging series of steps to address the concerns which had arisen. The parliamentary authorities are of the view that these steps have since been implemented – which is contested by the complainant – and have repeatedly objected to the Committee’s jurisdiction over the case at hand.

In July 2018, the UN Human Rights Committee reviewed Bahrain’s compliance with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. In its concluding observations, the Committee did not find signs of progress on the issues that emerged in 2011, most of which had remained a cause for concern. In November 2025, the UN Committee against Torture issued its concluding observations, in which it expressed its concerns regarding the reported lack of accountability for reports of acts of torture and ill-treatment, including in unofficial places of detention.

General elections were held in Bahrain on 12 November 2022, with a second round taking place in some constituencies on 19 November 2022. The former members of opposition parties that were previously represented in parliament were banned from taking part in the elections as their parties had been dissolved by court decisions in the years following the 2011 demonstrations.

In January 2025, the parliamentary authorities reiterated that all actions undertaken by relevant authorities in this case were in strict compliance with the laws of the Kingdom of Bahrain.

## **B. Decision**

The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

1. *Thanks* the Speaker of the Council of Representatives for his letter of 12 January 2025 and for the continuous engagement of the Bahraini parliamentary authorities with the Committee;
2. *Remains concerned* about the allegations that Mr. Matar was arbitrarily arrested and maintained in pretrial detention for a period of three months; and *is deeply concerned* by the allegation that Mr. Matar was subjected to torture and ill-treatment during his detention;
3. *Notes*, nevertheless, that the complainant has not provided any updated information in spite of repeated requests and the complainant’s ability to do so; and therefore *decides* to close the case in accordance with section IX, paragraph 25(b) of its Procedure for the examination and treatment of complaints (Annex I); and *recalls*, however, that the Committee reserves the right to re-open this case should any new information be subsequently provided by the complainant to show that Mr. Matar is being subjected to further human rights violations linked to the previous exercise of his parliamentary mandate;
4. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the relevant authorities and the complainant.

# Tunisia

*Decision adopted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at its 179th session (Geneva, 2 to 18 February 2026)*



Abir Moussi (centre), President of the Parti destourien libre (Free Destourian Party) (PDL), at the Tunisian Assembly headquarters in the capital Tunis on 26 January 2021. FETHI BELAID/AFP

## TUN-06 – Abir Moussi

### Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Threats, acts of intimidation
- ✓ Arbitrary arrest and detention
- ✓ Lack of due process at the investigation stage and lack of fair trial proceedings
- ✓ Violation of freedom of opinion and expression
- ✓ Violation of freedom of assembly and association
- ✓ Violation of freedom of movement
- ✓ Abusive revocation or suspension of the parliamentary mandate
- ✓ Failure to respect parliamentary immunity
- ✓ Other acts obstructing the exercise of the parliamentary mandate
- ✓ Impunity

### A. Summary of the case

Ms. Abir Moussi, former member of the Assembly of People's Representatives of Tunisia, was the victim in 2019 and 2021 of acts of verbal and physical violence and sexist, degrading insults, directly linked to the exercise of her parliamentary mandate. The abuse suffered by Ms. Moussi is allegedly based on the one hand, on the fact that she is the leader of an opposition political party and, on the other, on her gender. Ms. Moussi also received serious death threats, which she reported to the police, who provided her with security when she was still a member of parliament.

Although the complainant's allegations were supported by videos and excerpts from social media posts that helped identify the alleged perpetrators, including two former members of parliament, Mr. Seifedine Makhoulouf and Mr. Sahbi Smara, these two members were sentenced only on 26 March 2025 to one year and to six months in prison, respectively. The complainant lodged an appeal against the judgment, arguing that the gravity of the offences warranted a more severe sentence.

### Case TUN-06

**Tunisia:** Parliament affiliated to the IPU

**Victim:** Former female opposition member of parliament

**Qualified complainant(s):** Section I.1(a) of the Committee Procedure (Annex I)

**Submission of complaint:** October 2020

**Recent IPU decision:** April 2025

**IPU mission(s):** - - -

**Recent Committee hearing:** Hearing with the Tunisian delegation at the 149th IPU Assembly (October 2024)

#### Recent follow-up:

- Communications from the authorities: Letter from Speaker of the Assembly of People's Representatives (May 2024)
- Communication from the complainant: December 2025
- Communications to the authorities: Letter to the Speaker of the Assembly of People's Representatives (December 2025)
- Communication to the complainant: December 2025

In addition to the verbal and physical violence to which she was subjected, Ms. Moussi was also stripped of her parliamentary mandate on 30 March 2022 when the President of the Republic decided to dissolve the Tunisian parliament. Since that date, the violations of Ms. Moussi's rights to freedom of expression and to demonstration have continued to increase.

On 3 October 2023, a few days after expressing her interest in the presidential elections, Ms. Moussi was arrested while attempting to lodge an appeal against the presidential decrees on the organization and conduct of local elections scheduled for December 2023, citing a lack of transparency in the electoral process. On 5 October 2023, the investigating judge ordered that she be remanded in custody on charges of “attempting to change the form of government”, “inciting violence on Tunisian territory” and “aggression with the aim of provoking disorder”, as stipulated in article 72 of the Tunisian Criminal Code, and of “processing personal data without consent of the person concerned” and “interfering with freedom of labour”, as stipulated in articles 27 and 87 of the Data Protection Act and article 136 of the Tunisian Criminal Code, respectively.

On 30 January 2024, the investigating judge allegedly decided to drop the proceedings relating to article 72 but continued to remand Ms. Moussi in custody on the basis of the two other charges. On 24 December 2024, the indictment division of the Tunis Court of Appeal closed the investigation and referred Ms. Moussi to the criminal division to be tried. The criminal division of the court of first instance found her guilty in this case on 12 December 2025 and sentenced her to 12 years in prison.

Ms. Moussi is also the subject of two complaints filed in 2022 and 2023 by the *Instance supérieure indépendante pour les élections*, ISIE (Independent High Authority for Elections), accusing her of having criticized both the process for organizing the legislative elections of 2024 and the functioning of the electoral body. In respect of the ISIE 2022 complaint, on 6 August 2024 Ms. Moussi received a two-year non-suspended prison sentence under article 24 of Decree-Law No. 54. On 22 November 2024, the appeal court reduced the prison sentence to 16 months. The case was brought before the Court of Cassation to contest this ruling. Ms. Moussi's conviction appears arbitrary, as it is based on the legitimate exercise of her right to freedom of expression.

In respect of the second ISIE complaint, the Court of Cassation allegedly rejected Ms. Moussi's cassation appeal on 30 January 2025, and the case was therefore referred to the criminal division of the court of first instance. The trial was supposed to take place on 25 March 2025, but the former member of parliament and her lawyers boycotted the hearing, denouncing numerous judicial irregularities. On 12 June 2025, Ms. Moussi was sentenced to two years in prison. The appeal process in this case is ongoing.

The complainant also stated that Ms. Moussi's detention conditions are deplorable, with limited access to medical care and constant supervision, including during her meetings with her lawyers. On 12 February 2025, Ms. Moussi started a hunger strike to protest against her detention conditions, resulting in a brief hospital stay.

In their letter to the IPU received on 20 December 2023, the parliamentary authorities stated that they did not have official information on the judicial cases in progress, as these proceedings fell within the remit of the judicial authorities, in accordance with the principle of the separation of powers. The parliamentary authorities also refuted the allegations that the proceedings brought against Ms. Moussi were political in nature, stating that these allegations were unfounded, without, however, providing any arguments to that effect.

At the Committee's request, it met with the Tunisian parliamentary delegation twice in 2024, during the 148th and 149th IPU Assemblies. During these two meetings, the Tunisian delegation did not provide any substantial information on the situation of Ms. Moussi, her conditions of detention or the status of her legal proceedings, citing the same arguments about the separation of powers. The IPU's request to send a mission has remained unanswered by the authorities.

In November 2024, the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention issued an opinion in which it concluded that Ms. Moussi's detention was arbitrary, since it resulted from the exercise of her political rights and freedoms, and that the charges against her were not supported by any factual or legal evidence. Like the IPU, the Working Group called for Ms. Moussi's immediate release.

## B. Decision

### The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

1. *Deeply regrets* the continued lack of concrete information from the Tunisian authorities on the case of Ms. Abir Moussi;
2. *Deplores* the new sentence of 12 years in prison imposed on Ms. Moussi for having criticized the presidential decrees on the organization and conduct of local elections scheduled for December 2023; *notes with concern* that this is Ms. Moussi's third conviction within the span of two years; and *firmly recalls* that the right to freedom of expression is one of the pillars of democracy and encompasses not only speech, opinions and statements that are favourably received or considered as being inoffensive, but also those that may offend, shock, or disturb;
3. *Still fails to understand* how mere criticism could give rise to accusations of an attack aimed at altering the form of government and to such severe sentences; and *reaffirms* that the acts of which Ms. Moussi is accused fall within the scope of her right to freedom of expression;
4. *Notes* the opinion issued in 2024 by the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention concerning the situation of Ms. Moussi, in which it concluded that her detention was arbitrary and called upon the authorities to release her immediately; *concurrs* with these findings and *urges* the Tunisian authorities to release Ms. Moussi and discontinue all proceedings against her;
5. *Stresses* once more that, while respecting the independence of the judiciary and the principle of separation of powers, the parliamentary authorities have both the duty and the authority to exercise their oversight role by monitoring the case of Ms. Moussi as a former member of parliament, and ensuring that her right to a fair trial is respected;
6. *Reiterates* its request to the Tunisian authorities to welcome a mission from the Committee in order to promote constructive dialogue between the parties and facilitate the definitive resolution of Ms. Moussi's case, as well as those of several former Tunisian members of parliament;
7. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the Speaker of the Assembly of People's Representatives, the complainant and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;
8. *Decides* to continue examining this case.

## Tunisia

*Decision adopted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at its 179th session (Geneva, 2 to 18 February 2026)*



Tunisian security forces guard the entrance to the national parliament in Tunis, Tunisia, on 1 October 2021. © Anadolu Agency via AFP

- |                                       |                                |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| TUN-07 – Seifedine Makhlouf           | TUN-39 – Noomane El Euch       |
| TUN-08 – Maher Zid                    | TUN-40 – Abdelhamid Marzouki   |
| TUN-09 – Maher Medhioub               | TUN-41 – Ayachi Zammal         |
| TUN-10 – Yosri Dali                   | TUN-42 – Samir Dilou           |
| TUN-11 – Fethi Ayadi                  | TUN-43 – Habib Ben Sid'hom     |
| TUN-12 – Awatef Ftirch (Ms.)          | TUN-44 – Mabrouk Khachnaoui    |
| TUN-13 – Omar Ghribi                  | TUN-45 – Bechir Khelifi        |
| TUN-14 – Faiza Bouhlel (Ms.)          | TUN-46 – Nouha Aissaoui (Ms.)  |
| TUN-15 – Samira Smii (Ms.)            | TUN-47 – Latifa Habachi (Ms.)  |
| TUN-16 – Mahbouba Ben Dhifallah (Ms.) | TUN-48 – Ferida Laabidi (Ms.)  |
| TUN-17 – Mohamed Zrig                 | TUN-49 – Mohamed Affas         |
| TUN-18 – Issam Bargougui              | TUN-50 – Abdellatif Aloui      |
| TUN-19 – Samira Chaouachi (Ms.)       | TUN-51 – Mehdi Ben Gharbia     |
| TUN-20 – Belgacem Hassan              | TUN-52 – Rached Khiari         |
| TUN-21 – Kenza Ajela (Ms.)            | TUN-54 – Moussa Ben Ahmed      |
| TUN-22 – Emna Ben Hmayed (Ms.)        | TUN-55 – Oussama Khelifi       |
| TUN-23 – Bechr Chebbi                 | TUN-56 – Ghazi Karoui          |
| TUN-24 – Monjia Boughanmi (Ms.)       | TUN-57 – Mohamed Fateh Khelifi |
| TUN-25 – Wafa Attia (Ms.)             | TUN-58 – Ziad El Hachemi       |
| TUN-26 – Jamila Jouini (Ms.)          | TUN-59 – Sofiane Makhloufi     |
| TUN-27 – Mohamed Lazher Rama          | TUN-60 – Majdi Karbai          |
| TUN-28 – Nidhal Saoudi                | TUN-61 – Anouar Ben Chahed     |
| TUN-29 – Neji Jmal                    | TUN-62 – Yassine Ayari         |
| TUN-30 – Zeinab Brahmi (Ms.)          | TUN-63 – Ghazi Chaouachi       |
| TUN-31 – Mohamed Al Azhar             | TUN-64 – Ahmed Mechergui       |
| TUN-32 – Noureddine Bhiri             | TUN-65 – Mohamed Ben Salem     |
| TUN-33 – Rached Ghannouchi            | TUN-66 – Lazhar Akremi         |
| TUN-34 – Tarek Fetiti                 | TUN-67 – Ali Laraiedh          |
| TUN-35 – Imed Khemiri                 | TUN-68 – Ahmed Ameri           |
| TUN-36 – Walid Jalled                 | TUN-69 – Sayed Ferjani         |
| TUN-37 – Safi Said                    | TUN-70 – Sahbi Atig            |
| TUN-38 – Iyadh Elloumi                |                                |

## Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Threats, acts of intimidation
- ✓ Arbitrary arrest and detention
- ✓ Lack of due process at the investigation stage and lack of fair trial proceedings
- ✓ Violation of freedom of opinion and expression
- ✓ Violation of freedom of assembly and association
- ✓ Violation of freedom of movement
- ✓ Abusive revocation or suspension of the parliamentary mandate
- ✓ Failure to respect parliamentary immunity
- ✓ Other acts obstructing the exercise of the parliamentary mandate

### A. Summary of the case<sup>12</sup>

This case concerns 63 former members of the Assembly of People's Representatives of Tunisia who, according to the complainants, are victims of arbitrary prosecutions after expressing their opposition to the exceptional measures adopted by President Kaïs Saïed since 25 July 2021.

More generally, the suspension of parliament in 2021 by President Saïed had an impact on the 217 members of parliament elected in 2019, who were deprived of their parliamentary immunity, allowances, medical insurance and freedom of movement, including to receive medical treatment. These violations have intensified since the dissolution of the Assembly by the President of the Republic on 30 March 2022.

According to the complainants, the Public Prosecutor ordered an investigation into the 120 former members of parliament for an attempted coup d'état and conspiracy against justice, after they took part in an online plenary session shortly before the official dissolution of the Assembly. Proceedings against these members of parliament are still ongoing, and the executive authorities confirmed in a letter dated 11 October 2022 that the individuals concerned were under investigation.

Moreover, according to the complainants, the dissolution of parliament had additional consequences for some members of parliament elected in 2019 from the *Ennahda* and *Al Karama* blocs, who were directly targeted because of their opposition to President Saïed.

Mr. Nourredine Bhiri, who had initially been arrested and detained on 31 December 2021 before being released on 8 March 2022, was again arrested on 13 February 2023 by officers from the national terrorist crimes investigation unit. On 18 October 2024, Mr. Bhiri was sentenced to 10 years in prison on charges of endangering State security, inciting civil disorder and calling for insurrection. The charges against him relate to a post on social media that was attributed to him, although Mr. Bhiri and his defence team dispute the existence of this post, claiming that it has never been proven.

On 3 July 2024, Mr. Makhlof was arrested in Algeria for the irregular crossing of Algerian borders and was sentenced to three months in prison. While in detention, Mr. Makhlof applied for asylum with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in Algeria on 18 July 2024. On 13 January 2026, the Tunisian authorities sentenced him in absentia to five years in prison in connection with the case of conspiracy against State security. While awaiting a response from UNHCR to his asylum application, Mr. Makhlof was returned by the Algerian authorities on 18 January 2026 to Tunisia, where he is serving his sentence.

On 3 August 2022, Mr. Rached Khiari was placed in detention for defamation against President Saïed on

### Case TUN-COLL-01

**Tunisia:** Parliament affiliated to the IPU

**Victims:** 63 members of the opposition (49 men and 14 women)

**Qualified complainant(s):** Sections I.1(a) and (b) of the Committee Procedure (Annex I)

**Submission of complaints:** August, September and October 2021

**Recent IPU decision:** April 2025

**IPU mission(s):** - - -

**Recent Committee hearing:** Hearing of the parliamentary authorities at the 149th IPU Assembly (October 2024)

#### Recent follow-up:

- Communication from the authorities: Letter from the Speaker of the Assembly of People's Representatives (May 2024)
- Communication from the complainants: December 2025
- Communications to the authorities: Letter to the Speaker of the Assembly of People's representatives (December 2025)
- Communication to the complainants: December 2025

<sup>12</sup> For the purposes of this decision, the term "opposition" refers to members of parliament belonging to political groups or parties with limited decision-making power who are opposed to the ruling power.

social media, a charge brought by the Ministry of Education that resulted in a trial by the military courts. On 3 February 2025, he was sentenced to a one-year prison term for harm caused to others via social media. On 22 November 2025, Mr. Khiari was released after serving his sentence.

Similarly, Mr. Mehdi Ben Gharbia was placed in detention on 20 October 2021 on money laundering charges, even though the legal period of six months had expired. In its Opinion No. 50/2023 of 26 September 2023 concerning the case of Mr. Ben Gharbia, the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention considered that Mr. Ben Gharbia's detention was arbitrary, based on the information provided by the complainants. The Working Group also called on the Tunisian authorities, who have not sent their official observations to the United Nations mechanism, to release Mr. Ben Gharbia immediately and pay him compensation for the damage suffered. Between January and November 2025, Mr. Ben Gharbia was sentenced to a cumulative total of 16 years of prison for financial and administrative corruption.

As for Mr. Rached Ghannouchi, he has been charged in several cases that the complainants maintain are politically motivated. On 15 May 2023, he was sentenced by Tunisia's anti-terrorism court to a one-year prison term for public statements he had made in 2022. On 5 February 2025, Mr. Ghannouchi was sentenced to 22 years in the Instalingo case. In February 2026, he was sentenced to 20 years of prison in connection with the case of conspiracy against State security.

In their letter of 28 January 2022, the executive authorities stated that all members of parliament whose mandates had been suspended enjoyed freedom of movement and travel, apart from those subject to a legal ruling prohibiting them from leaving the country. In a letter dated 11 October 2022, the executive authorities confirmed that all requests for the release of Mr. Ben Gharbia had been rejected.

In May and June 2023, the complainants referred eight new complaints to the Committee concerning the cases of eight former Tunisian members of parliament who were subject to arbitrary prosecutions because of their opposition to the measures taken by the President of the Republic. These include Mr. Sayed Ferjani and Mr. Ahmed Mechergui, who were allegedly arrested on 27 February and 19 April 2023, respectively, in connection with the investigation against Mr. Ghannouchi in the Instalingo case. On 5 February 2025, Mr. Sayed Ferjani was sentenced to 13 years' imprisonment.

Similarly, Mr. Ahmed Ameri and Mr. Mohamed Ben Salem were reportedly arrested in March 2023 for organizing an illegal border crossing and illegally holding currency. On 11 March 2025, they were sentenced to two- and three-years' imprisonment respectively. Mr. Lazhar Akremi and Mr. Ghazi Chaouachi were reportedly arrested in February 2023 in connection with a plot against State security. In April 2025, Mr. Akremi was initially sentenced to eight years in prison. However, on 28 November 2025, the appeals court acquitted him, while upholding a 20-year prison sentence against Mr. Chaouachi.

Mr. Ali Laraiiedh, the former Prime Minister, was arrested on 19 December 2022 on vague terrorism charges. The complainants state that he is being held in detention without having appeared before a judge. He was sentenced in May 2025 to 34 years in prison in connection with the so-called case of networks for transporting Tunisian fighters to conflict zones abroad, for purposes described as terrorism by the authorities. Finally, former member of parliament Mr. Sahbi Atig was allegedly arrested on 6 May 2023 and prosecuted for corruption and money laundering. In June 2025, he was sentenced to 15 years in prison for offences related to money laundering, the unlawful possession of currency, and false testimony. His sentence was upheld on appeal. According to the complainants, the aim of all these cases is to silence former members of parliament who publicly criticized the Head of State.

In their letter to the IPU received on 20 December 2023, the parliamentary authorities stated that they did not have official information on the judicial cases in progress, as these proceedings fell within the remit of the judicial authorities, in accordance with the principle of the separation of powers. The parliamentary authorities also refuted the allegations that the proceedings brought against the former members of parliament were political in nature, stating that these allegations were unfounded, without, however, providing any arguments in this regard.

At the Committee's request, a meeting was held between the latter and the Tunisian parliamentary delegation twice in 2024, during the 148th and 149th IPU Assemblies. During these two meetings, the Tunisian delegation did not provide any substantial information on the situation of the former members of parliament, their conditions of detention or the status of the legal proceedings, citing the same

arguments about the separation of powers. The IPU's request to send a mission has remained unanswered by the Tunisian authorities.

Shortly before the start of the trial of those accused of plotting to undermine State security, the United Nations High Commissioner called on the Tunisian authorities to cease all forms of persecution against opponents and activists.

## **B. Decision**

The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

1. *Deeply regrets* the continued lack of concrete information from the Tunisian authorities on the situation of the former members of parliament included in this case;
2. *Deplores* the continued detention of numerous former Tunisian members of parliament in connection with cases whose circumstances and underlying facts remain unclear to date; and *also deplors* the severe prison sentences imposed on them on the basis of vague allegations of undermining State security, following proceedings marred by serious judicial irregularities;
3. *Urges* the Tunisian authorities, once again, to immediately release any former members of parliament detained for expressing opposition to the exceptional measures adopted by the President of the Republic, and to drop the charges against them; and *calls upon* the Tunisian authorities, once again, in particular the Ministry of Justice, to provide detailed information on the situation of the former members of parliament involved in this case;
4. *Takes note* of the release of Mr. Rached Khiari after serving his sentence and the acquittal of Mr. Lazhar Akremi; *stresses*, nevertheless, that these two former members of parliament were prosecuted for exercising their right to freedom of expression and should not have been prosecuted on such serious charges; and *wishes* to receive updated information on their situation from the Tunisian authorities;
5. *Emphasizes* once again that, while respecting the independence of the judiciary and the principle of the separation of powers, parliamentary authorities have both the duty and the authority to exercise their oversight role by monitoring the situations of the individuals cited in this case as former members of the Assembly of People's Representatives, and ensuring that their right to a fair trial is respected;
6. *Reiterates* its request to the Tunisian authorities to welcome a mission from the Committee in order to promote constructive dialogue between the parties and facilitate the definitive resolution of all cases involving the former Tunisian members of parliament;
7. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the Speaker of the Assembly of People's Representatives, the complainants and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;
8. *Decides* to continue examining this case.

# Yemen

*Decision adopted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at its 179th session (Geneva, 2 to 18 February 2026)*



Source: AFP/Getty Image

## YEM-08 – Abdulkareem Jadban

### Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Murder
- ✓ Impunity

### A. Summary of the case

Mr. Abdulkareem Jadban, a member of the House of Representatives of Yemen and a Houthi representative at the National Dialogue Conference – an inclusive, UN-backed negotiation process designed to facilitate the transition of the country after the 2011 uprising – was shot dead on 22 November 2013 by two armed men on a motorcycle as he was leaving Al-Shawqani mosque in Sana'a. According to the complainant, members of the Houthi group have claimed that Mr. Jadban's assassination was politically motivated because of his stance and affiliation.

Mr. Jadban's assassination occurred during a period of intense political unrest and fragmentation in Yemen after the Arab Spring and before the full-blown civil war. Various armed groups and rival political currents were active in Sana'a and northern Yemen at that time, and political assassinations reflected that instability.

The Yemeni government, Parliament and most political parties reportedly condemned the assassination. Former President Abd Rabbuh Mansour Hadi announced that a panel of inquiry would be set up to investigate the assassination and bring the culprits to justice. The Minister for Human Rights, Secretary General of the House of Representatives and its Deputy Speaker at the time all referred to the panel of inquiry as well. No updated information, however, has been forthcoming on the outcome of the panel's investigations.

In his letter of 10 December 2023, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. Sultan Al-Barkani, stated that the parliamentary authorities<sup>13</sup> had provided all the information available on the

### Case YEM-08

**Yemen:** Parliament affiliated to the IPU

**Victim:** An independent member of parliament

**Complainant(s):** Section I.1(d) of the Committee Procedure (Annex 1)

**Submission of complaint(s):** December 2013

**Recent IPU decision:** January 2017

**IPU Mission(s):** - - -

**Recent Committee hearing:** Hearing with the Yemeni delegation during the 141st IPU Assembly (October 2019)

#### Recent follow-up:

- Communication from the authorities: Letter from the Speaker of the House of Representatives (December 2023)
- Communication from the complainant: The complainant is inactive
- Letter addressed to the authorities: Letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives (November 2025)
- Communication to the complainant: March 2017

<sup>13</sup> The IPU recognizes the Parliament based in Seiyun, in the region of Hadhramaut, which is aligned with the internationally recognized government of the Presidential Leadership Council, as representing all parliamentarians elected in 2003.

case, recalling that after Mr. Jadban's assassination in 2013, the House of Representatives had condemned the crime and called on government agencies to swiftly investigate it, reveal the perpetrators and bring them to justice. However, in his letter, the Speaker also added that with the Houthis' takeover of Sana'a on 21 September 2014 and their de facto control of all State agencies, including investigative and judicial agencies, the investigation and the legitimate authorities' efforts to establish the truth in the case of Mr. Jadban had been disrupted.

## **B. Decision**

The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

1. *Remains deeply concerned* that 13 years after Mr. Jadban's assassination, no suspects have been named in his killing and the perpetrators of this crime remain at large with no concrete information on their identities or any realistic prospects of bringing them to justice;
2. *Expresses the hope* that, despite the formidable challenges to law and order in the country, the Yemeni authorities will ultimately prevail to ensure accountability for Mr. Jadban's assassination;
3. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision only to the legitimate authorities of Yemen, the complainants and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information about the case;
4. *Decides* to continue examining this case.

\*

\* \*