



Inter-Parliamentary Union
For democracy. For everyone.

Ukraine

Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 217th session (Istanbul, 19 April 2026)



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

UKR-03 – Artem 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

A. Summary of the case

Mr. Artem Dmytruk was elected to Parliament in 2019. He was expelled from the ruling Servant of the People party in 2021 after expressing disappointment at the lack of any genuine progress in fighting corruption and has since joined other parliamentary groups. According to the complainant, Mr. Dmytruk has been repeatedly targeted by the authorities of

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 2026

IPU mission(s): - - -

Recent Committee hearing: Hearing with the delegation of Ukraine at the 152nd IPU Assembly (Istanbul, April 2026)

Recent follow-up:

- Communication from the authorities: March 2026
- Communication from the complainant: April 2026
- Communication to the authorities: April 2026
- Communication to the complainant: April 2026

Ukraine for his views, including his vocal opposition to a bill banning all activities of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church (UOC).

On 24 February 2022, the day the invasion of Ukraine started, Mr. Dmytruk enlisted himself and many of his followers in a Ukrainian territorial defence battalion under the authority of the police. 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. 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. 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.

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 or extrajudicial killings by Ukrainian State agents after the outbreak of the armed conflict.¹ Two parliamentarians who had briefly disappeared at the same time resurfaced soon after and changed their stance as well.

The complainant reports that, in 2024, Mr. Dmytruk resumed his public criticism of the Government on account of mounting human rights violations, including the detention and prosecution of another parliamentarian, Mr. Oleksandr Dubinsky, and arrests and intimidation faced by members of his Church. Furthermore, he became a prominent critic of a bill² effectively banning all UOC activities. According to the complainant, by then Mr. Dmytruk had been facing intensified threats to cease his advocacy, especially after the then head of the Office of the President, Mr. Andriy Yermak, published a post on Telegram that was interpreted by his followers as an encouragement to use violence 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.³ 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.

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 in events dating back to 3 March 2022 and 29 October 2023, which led to the beginning of an extradition proceedings. The complainant adds that the General

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

² 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.

³ https://t.me/karas_evgen/9436

Prosecutor's note submitted as part of the arrest notice manipulates and obfuscates the facts, which prove that it was Mr. Dmytruk who was attacked on both occasions and who reported the events to the police. 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 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 a case under investigation. The complainant has shared that Mr. Dmytruk has been denied access to his online parliamentary portal and has been dismissed from his parliamentary committee, which effectively deprives him of the ability to exercise his mandate.

In October 2025, an IPU trial observer was able to attend Mr. Dmytruk's extradition trial at the Westminster Magistrates' Court. In her report, the observer concluded that, in Mr. Dmytruk's testimony as a witness at the trial, Mr. Dmytruk was "detailed and consistent". She also reported that experts appointed by the defence shared a medical report concluding that the evidence provided by Mr. Dmytruk is consistent with his account of torture and testimonies indicating that "Ukrainian judges and prosecutors are particularly vulnerable to political pressure and corruption". On 4 March 2026, the Court rejected the extradition request on the basis of the UK's obligations under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (right to respect for private and family life). Although the Court accepted that "past ill-treatment occurred", it was satisfied "that the assurances provided sufficiently mitigate any real risk of recurrence". However, the Court concluded that given "the cumulative and overall interference with [Mr. Dmytruk's rights] ..., surrender would be a disproportionate interference with private and family life". The Ukrainian authorities did not appeal the decision.⁴

By letter of 26 March 2026, the Chairman of the Verkhovna Rada submitted additional information to the IPU Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians regarding Mr. Dmytruk's remote access to online parliamentary platforms and shared the decision terminating his membership of the Law Enforcement Committee. During a hearing with the Ukrainian delegation at the 152nd Assembly in Istanbul (2026), a member of the delegation recalled that Mr. Dmytruk is suspected of committing acts of bodily harm but that, in the absence of a judgment, he is presumed innocent until proven guilty. The delegation member added that Mr. Dmytruk may return to Ukraine to resolve what he described as a personal legal matter without escalating it to a political dispute, and assured the IPU Committee that it would be welcome to visit Ukraine to better ascertain the situation.

B. Decision

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

1. *Thanks* the Ukrainian delegation for the information provided during a hearing with the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at the 152nd Assembly;
2. *Takes note with great interest* of the comprehensive report of the trial observer on the court hearings in Mr. Dmytruk's extradition case; and *welcomes* the judgment delivered by the Westminster Magistrates' Court on 4 March 2026 refusing to extradite Mr. Dmytruk to Ukraine on the basis of the obligations of the United Kingdom under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights;
3. *Notes with grave concern* the evidence presented in court by an expert appointed by Mr. Dmytruk's counsel, which appears to confirm the veracity of his account of the torture he suffered at the hands of SBU agents on the night of 4 March 2022; and *is deeply concerned* by the assertions of other experts heard during the trial regarding the risks to his rights and his physical integrity should he return to Ukraine;
4. *Remains concerned* by the allegations of death 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; *wishes* to receive information on the

⁴ [The Government of Ukraine -v- Artem Dmytruk - Courts and Tribunals Judiciary](#)

reasons for the seemingly unjustified dismissal of Mr. Dmytruk's numerous complaints to the Ukrainian police and Ministry of the Interior, as well as the reasons for the termination of his security detail in August 2024, even though he continued to receive mounting death threats and had requested additional protection for himself and his family; and *also wishes* to receive information on any action taken to investigate the alleged responsibility of Mr. Yevhen Karas, Mr. Andriy Serhiyovych and the other alleged perpetrators of these threats and acts of intimidation, and to hold those responsible to account;

5. *Urges* the parliamentary authorities to make reasonable arrangements to enable Mr. Dmytruk to exercise his right to fulfil his parliamentary mandate remotely without having to return to Ukraine in person, including by allowing his assistants to access the Verkhovna Rada;
6. *Wishes* to receive further information on the points mentioned above from the parliamentary authorities; and *trusts* that the Verkhovna Rada will seek the requested information from the relevant Ukrainian authorities, as appropriate;
7. *Takes note* of the assurance of the Ukrainian authorities that nothing prevents Mr. Dmytruk from returning to his country to resume his parliamentary duties and to seek a resolution to the legal proceedings brought against him; *acknowledges* that the ongoing international armed conflict creates exceptional challenges for the timely and effective administration of justice in legal proceedings in the country; *remains hopeful*, nevertheless, that, as soon as circumstances allow, Ukrainian authorities will ensure that the investigation and trial relating to Mr. Dmytruk proceed and conclude with full respect for his right to a fair trial, including by ensuring that he is provided with access to the case file, as requested by his counsel;
8. *Considers*, in the light of the concerns raised by the complainant, that the resolution of this case would be facilitated by a visit by members of the Committee to Ukraine to meet with the relevant authorities and obtain the necessary information on the procedural, legal and factual circumstances of the case; *is highly appreciative* of the openness of the Ukrainian delegation to receive such a visit as part of efforts to facilitate a satisfactory resolution of the case in line with universal democratic values; and *hopes* to receive proposed dates on which the Ukrainian parliamentary authorities could receive a visit by the Committee;
9. *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;
10. *Requests* the Committee to continue examining this case and to report back to it in due course.