Palestine/Israel

Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 203rd session
(Geneva, 18 October 2018)

Ahmad Sa’adat, the leader of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, is escorted by Israeli border police to the Ofer military court in the West Bank, north of Jerusalem, 27 March 2006. AFP Photo / Menahem Kahana

PSE-05 - Ahmad Sa’adat

Alleged human rights violations:

✓ Arbitrary arrest and detention
✓ Inhumane conditions of detention
✓ Lack of fair trial proceedings

A. Summary of the case

On 14 March 2006, Mr. Sa’adat was abducted by the Israeli Defence Forces from Jericho Jail and transferred to Hadarim Prison in Israel, together with four other prisoners, after being accused by the Israeli authorities of involvement in the October 2001 murder of Mr. R. Zeevi, the Israeli Minister of Tourism. The Israeli authorities concluded one month later that Mr. Sa’adat had not been involved in the killing but went on to charge the other four suspects. Subsequently, 19 other charges were brought against Mr. Sa’adat, all arising from his leadership of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP), which Israel considers a terrorist organization. None of the charges allege direct involvement in crimes of violence. On 25 December 2008, Mr. Sa’adat was sentenced to 30 years in prison. While detained, Mr. Sa’adat reportedly did not receive the medical attention he required or visits from his family. In March and June 2009, he was placed in solitary confinement, prompting him in June 2009 to go on a nine-day hunger strike. He remained in solitary confinement for three years, until May 2012.

In April 2017, Mr. Sa’adat took part in a mass hunger strike by Palestinian detainees to protest against their detention conditions in Israeli prisons. He was reportedly moved at that time to solitary confinement in Ohlikdar Prison.

Case PSE-05

Palestine/Israel: The Palestinian Legislative Council and the Parliament of Israel are affiliated to the IPU

Victim: Majority member of the Palestinian Legislative Council

Qualified complainant(s): Section I (1)(b) of the Committee Procedure (Annex 1)

Submission of complaint: July 2006

Recent IPU decision: October 2017

IPU mission: - - -

Recent Committee hearing:
- Hearing with the head of the Fatah parliamentary group at the 139th IPU Assembly (October 2018)

Recent follow-up
- Communication from the authorities: Letters from the head of the Knesset delegation to the Inter-Parliamentary Union (January 2018 and September 2017)
- Communication from the complainant: October 2018
- Communication from the IPU to the authorities: September 2018
- Communication from the IPU to the complainant: October 2018
B. Decision

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

1. *Is extremely concerned* that, more than 12 years after his arrest, Mr. Sa’adat remains in detention as a result of a politically motivated trial; *reaffirms* in this regard its long-standing position that Mr. Sa’adat’s abduction and transfer to Israel were related not to the original murder charge but rather to his political activities as PFLP General Secretary;

2. *Calls again on* the Israeli authorities to release him without delay;

3. *Is eager* to receive, in light of previous concerns in this regard and concerns expressed by the UN Human Rights Council in March 2018 about the conditions of Palestinian prisoners in Israeli jails, updated information on Mr. Sa’adat’s current conditions of detention, in particular with respect to the frequency and type of visits he receives, and his access to medical care;

4. *Reiterates* its long-standing wish to be granted permission to visit Mr. Sa’adat; and *urges* the Israeli authorities to give serious consideration to this request;

5. *Regrets* that the Israeli delegation was unable to meet with the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at the 139th IPU Assembly; *requests* the Secretary General to continue his dialogue with the parliamentary authorities and to contact the competent government and administrative authorities, inviting them to provide the requested information, including their views on the proposed visit;

6. *Requests* the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it in due course.