Inter-Parliamentary Union
For democracy. For everyone.

153rd IPU Assembly

Arusha,
United Republic of Tanzania
5–9 October 2026

IPU 153rd ASSEMBLY Arusha, Tanzania 5 - 9 October 2026

Governing Council
Item 15(a)

CL/218/15(a)-R.1
Arusha, 9 October 2026

Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

CONTENTS

Page

- **Argentina:** Mr. Esteban Paulón
  Decision *1*
- **Colombia:** Mr. Alvaro Araujo Castro
  Decision *3*
- **Colombia:** Mr. Wadith Alberto Manzur Imbett
  Decision *6*
- **Democratic Republic of Congo:** Mr. Chérubin Okende Senga
  Decision *9*
- **Democratic Republic of Congo:** Twenty parliamentarians
  Decision *12*
- **Eritrea:** Eleven parliamentarians
  Decision *16*
- **Israel:** Mr. Ofer Casif
  Decision *19*
- **Mongolia:** Ms. Bolormaa Enkhbat
  Decision *22*
- **Myanmar:** Eighty-six parliamentarians
  Decision *25*
- **Nicaragua:** Two parliamentarians
  Decision..... *30*
- **Tunisia:** Ms. Abir Moussi
  Decision..... *33*

E

#IPU153

- **Tunisia:** Sixty-three parliamentarians
  Decision..... *36*

- **Türkiye:** Sixty-six parliamentarians
  Decision *40*

- **Türkiye:** Forty-one parliamentarians
  Decision *44*

- **Uganda:** Mr. Muwanga Kivumbi
  Decision *48*

- **Zimbabwe:** Mr. Takudzwa Ngariore
  Decision *51*

Argentina

Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 218th session (Arusha, 9 October 2026)

Esteban Paulón © IPU/Jiri Opocensky

ARG-26 – Esteban Paulón

Alleged human rights violations

✓ Threats, acts of intimidation

A. Summary of the case

According to information provided by the complainant, Esteban Paulón, a member of the National Congress of Argentina, has been the target of sustained smear campaigns, threats, intimidation and incitement to violence due to his political views and sexual orientation.

The complainant states that the individuals responsible are part of a communication network associated with the current government, and their ideological and partisan affiliations are well known. The denigrating messages are spread primarily through streaming platforms, which draw on social media interactions and live reactions, and are promoted by *La Derecha Diario*, an online newspaper owned by Javier Negre.

The complainant reports that Mr. Paulón filed a complaint (No. MPF01197123) with the Buenos Aires City Prosecutor's Office on 10 July 2025. Despite the

Case ARG-26

Argentina: Parliament affiliated to the IPU

Victim(s): Male opposition member of parliament

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

Submission of complaint(s): July 2026

Recent IPU decision: - - -

IPU mission(s): - - -

Recent Committee hearing(s): - - -

Recent follow-up:
- Communication(s) from the authorities: - - -
- Communication from the complainant: July 2026
- Communication to the authorities: Letter to the Presidents of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies (September 2026)
- Communication to the complainant: July 2026

extensive evidence submitted, none of the individuals behind the threats have been summoned to provide testimony.

The complainant has sent the IPU notarized copies of posts published on Instagram, X (formerly Twitter) and the *Derecha Diario* website (laderechadiario.com). Some of these posts accuse Mr. Paulón of being a "paedophile". According to the complaint, the posts aim to incite online and in-person violence against Mr. Paulón and the broader LGBTI+ community, given the particularly harmful social connotation of paedophilia accusations.

According to the complainant, the hostile environment created by these repeated public attacks instils fear and hinders Mr. Paulón's ability to carry out his parliamentary mandate. The complainant further states that, following Argentine President Javier Milei's remarks at the 2025 World Economic Forum in Davos, in which he referred to "woke ideology" as "a cancer that must be eradicated", online attacks against members of the LGBTI+ community are no longer limited to anonymous accounts but are coordinated by identifiable individuals with verified profiles who act with total impunity.

B. Decision

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

1. *Notes* that this complaint is admissible, considering that it: (i) 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 revised Rules and Practices of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians); (ii) concerns an incumbent member of parliament at the time of the alleged facts; and (iii) concerns allegations of threats and acts of intimidation, which fall within the Committee's mandate;

2. *Recalls* 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; and *calls* on the Argentine parliamentary authorities to engage in constructive and continuous dialogue with the Committee in order to ensure a satisfactory resolution of this case;

3. *Notes* that Mr. Paulón may be particularly vulnerable as he is exposed to intersecting forms of discrimination owing to his status as both a member of the LGBTI+ community and an opposition member of parliament; *considers* that threats, intimidation and other forms of pressure directed at parliamentarians because they belong to historically marginalized groups not only affect the individuals concerned but may also have a chilling effect on the exercise of parliamentary functions and political participation more broadly; *considers* also that such actions, if left unpunished, risk undermining pluralism, weakening democratic debate and eroding the conditions necessary for the effective functioning of a democratic, inclusive and representative parliament;

4. *Expresses concern* that the repeated public attacks allegedly directed at Mr. Paulón and the reported absence of an effective response appear to have created a hostile and intimidating environment that has instilled fear and may have undermined his ability to carry out his parliamentary functions; *calls* on the relevant authorities to adopt urgent and effective measures to ensure Mr. Paulón's protection, to investigate all allegations promptly and thoroughly, to bring those responsible to justice and to guarantee that Mr. Paulón is able to exercise his parliamentary mandate free from threats, intimidation or any other form of wrongful interference;

5. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the National Congress of Argentina and the complainant;

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

Colombia

Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 218th session (Arusha, 9 October 2026)

Álvaro Araújo Castro © IPU 2015

COL-142 – Álvaro Araújo Castro

Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Lack of fair trial proceedings
- ✓ Excessive delays
- ✓ Right of appeal

A. Summary of the case

Mr. Álvaro Araújo Castro, former member of the Colombian Congress, was prosecuted on charges of aggravated criminal conspiracy and electoral fraud, accused of cooperating with paramilitary groups for electoral gain. Shortly after charges were brought, Mr. Araújo resigned from Congress. As a result, his case was initially transferred to the ordinary criminal justice system, where it was investigated by the Prosecutor's Office and brought before an ordinary criminal court, with the possibility of appeal.

Mr. Araújo maintains that the evidence against him was insufficient and that he became caught up in a broader institutional confrontation between the executive branch and the Supreme Court. He expected the ordinary criminal court to rule on his case in 2009 and to acquit him. However, on 1 September 2009, the Supreme Court of Justice decided that cases involving alleged links between parliamentarians and paramilitary groups should be investigated and tried exclusively by the Supreme Court. Mr. Araújo's case was therefore transferred back to the Supreme Court.

Case COL-142

Colombia: Parliament affiliated to the IPU

Victim(s): Male majority member of parliament

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

Submission of complaint(s): August 2009

Recent IPU decision: March 2021

IPU mission(s): October 2010

Recent Committee hearing(s): - - -

Recent follow-up:
- Communication from the authorities: Letter from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (October 2018); letter from the Secretary of the Criminal Chamber of the Supreme Court (September 2014)
- Communication from the complainant: August 2026
- Communication addressed to the authorities: Letter addressed to the President of the Colombian National Congress (September 2026)
- Communication addressed to the complainant: August 2026

On 18 March 2010, the Supreme Court found Mr. Araújo guilty and sentenced him to nine years and four months of imprisonment along with a fine of COP 3.7 billion. The Court concluded that he formed part of the hierarchical structure of paramilitary forces in his region and ordered that his possible involvement in crimes committed by those groups be further investigated.

In early February 2011, Mr. Araújo was conditionally released after serving three-fifths of his prison sentence.

Mr. Araújo submitted a petition to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights in 2011, alleging multiple violations of his rights to due process and a fair trial. His petition was declared admissible in 2021; the decision on the merits remains pending.

At the time of Mr. Araújo's conviction, the Colombian Constitution provided that members of Congress were tried and sentenced in single instance by the Supreme Court, without the possibility of appeal. In judgment C-545 of 2008, the Constitutional Court underlined the need to reform this system to ensure compliance with fair-trial guarantees. Pending legislative reform, the Supreme Court adjusted its internal procedures to separate investigative and adjudicative functions.

In judgment C-792 of 2014, the Constitutional Court reiterated the obligation to provide a right of appeal in criminal cases. Legislative Act No. 01 (2018) subsequently restructured the Supreme Court by creating separate chambers for investigation, first-instance proceedings and appeals. On 20 May 2020, in judgment SU-146, the Constitutional Court ruled that persons convicted in single instance between 30 January 2014 and 17 January 2018 could seek to appeal their convictions within a defined period. Mr. Araújo's 2010 conviction predates this window and therefore did not benefit from the remedial framework established by that ruling.

The complainant has consistently alleged that the Supreme Court lacked impartiality in his case. In support of this claim, he points to decisions whereby the Supreme Court reportedly discontinued proceedings against other parliamentarians who had acknowledged cooperation with paramilitary groups, while maintaining a stricter approach in his own case despite the absence, according to him, of direct admissions or comparable evidence. He further argues that evidentiary standards applied by the Supreme Court evolved in subsequent cases involving similar allegations, to his disadvantage.

The complainant also refers to the reputational damage sustained by the Supreme Court in recent years in connection with the so-called "cartel de la toga" corruption scandal, in which several senior judicial figures were investigated or convicted for attempting to influence judicial outcomes. A former President of the Supreme Court was convicted in March 2021 in this context, and former Supreme Court judge Leonidas Bustos Martínez has been investigated. Mr. Bustos was involved in presenting Mr. Araújo's case to the Supreme Court at the time. The complainant argues that these developments reinforce his long-standing concerns regarding judicial independence; however, no judicial finding has established that corruption directly affected the handling of Mr. Araújo's case.

In July 2026, Mr. Araújo made a new application to the criminal chamber of the Supreme Court seeking a review of his 2010 conviction, relying mainly on a judgment issued by the Inter-American Court of Human Rights on 3 June 2024 in *Saulo Arboleda Gómez v. Colombia*, which he argued confirmed Colombia's obligation to provide an effective mechanism for review of a first-instance criminal conviction. The application also reiterated broader due-process concerns arising from the Supreme Court's reassumption of jurisdiction over his case shortly before the ordinary trial court was due to deliver judgment. Mr. Araújo asked the Supreme Court to recognize his right to appeal and to provide for a comprehensive review of his conviction and the proceedings leading up to it by an independent and impartial judicial body.

B. Decision

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

1. *Reaffirms* its conclusion that Mr. Araújo's 2010 conviction resulted from proceedings that failed to meet basic fair-trial guarantees, including with regard to the evidence used and the right to appeal;

2. *Notes with interest* the application filed by Mr. Araújo in July 2026 before the criminal chamber of the Supreme Court seeking a review of his 2010 conviction and confirmation of his right to appeal; *considers* that those proceedings offer an important opportunity to address the long-standing fair-trial concerns identified in this case, including in light of the latest jurisprudence

from the Inter-American Court of Human Rights;

3. *Requests* the Secretary General to take the necessary steps for the IPU to submit an *amicus curiae* brief in the context of the proceedings before the Supreme Court, setting out the IPU's findings on the lack of fair-trial guarantees in Mr. Araújo's case and his inability to obtain an effective review of his conviction;

4. *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;

5. *Requests* the Committee to continue examining the case and to report back to it in due course.

Colombia

Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 218th session (Arusha, 9 October 2026)

© Wadith Alberto Manzur Imbett

COL-173 – Wadith Alberto Manzur Imbett

Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Arbitrary arrest and detention
- ✓ Lack of due process in proceedings against parliamentarians
- ✓ Undue invalidation, suspension, revocation or other acts obstructing the exercise of the parliamentary mandate
- ✓ Other violations

Case COL-173

Colombia: Parliament affiliated to the IPU

Victim(s): Male opposition member of parliament

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

Submission of complaint(s): August 2026

Recent IPU decision: - - -

IPU mission(s): - - -

Recent Committee hearing(s): - - -

Recent follow-up:
- Communication from the authorities: Message from the Colombian Senate (September 2026)
- Communication from the complainant: September 2026
- Communication to the authorities: Letter to the President of the Colombian National Congress (September 2026)
- Communication to the complainant: September 2026

A. Summary of the case

The complaint concerns Mr. Wadith Alberto Manzur Imbett, a member of the Colombian Conservative Party who held a seat in the House of Representatives representing Córdoba when he was elected to the Senate on 8 March 2026 for the 2026–2030 term. The complainant reports that the National Electoral Council formally declared Mr. Manzur's election on 13 July 2026. Three days after the election, on 11 March 2026, the special investigation chamber of the Supreme Court of Justice charged Mr. Manzur and five others with bribery in proceedings related to the National Unit for Disaster Risk Management (UNGRD) and ordered Mr. Manzur and another member of Congress to be placed in preventive detention. Mr. Manzur reportedly turned himself in to the authorities on 12 March 2026 and has remained in preventive detention since then.

The complainant's main concern is not only the detention itself but its effect on Mr. Manzur's parliamentary mandate. While in custody, Mr. Manzur sought permission to be taken under escort to Congress solely to be sworn in as a senator, without seeking release or the ability to exercise his parliamentary functions. He also requested an alternative means of taking his oath of office without leaving custody. The Supreme Court declined his request to be escorted to the Senate building, and the Senate secretariat did not accept his swearing-in by an alternative means. Mr. Manzur therefore was not sworn in at the start of the new Congress on 20 July 2026. On 29 July 2026, a loss-of-investiture action was filed before the Council of State on the grounds that Mr. Manzur had not taken

office within the prescribed period.

On 29 September 2026, in response to a request by Mr. Manzur's defence to review the legality of the preventive detention measure imposed on 11 March 2026, the special first-instance chamber of the Supreme Court upheld the measure and denied him release. According to the information available, the chamber considered that the defence had not established grounds for removing the detention measure and that the fact that Mr. Manzur had not been placed in detention at an earlier stage of the proceedings did not prevent his situation from being reassessed as the proceedings advanced. Mr. Manzur therefore remains in preventive detention while the criminal proceedings against him continue.

The complainant alleges that the initial decision on preventive detention was made by the same special investigation chamber that had conducted the criminal investigation, while the special first-instance chamber that subsequently reviewed and upheld the legality of Mr. Manzur's detention was a separate entity. The complainant further contends that no timely and effective remedy protected Mr. Manzur's ability to preserve his Senate seat and that the difference in application of preventive detention to the defendants in the proceedings lacked a sufficient, individual justification. The complainant further contends that, in the absence of a criminal conviction, the combined effects of Mr. Manzur's detention and inability to take his oath of office risks producing an irreversible restriction of his political rights and parliamentary mandate.

B. Decision

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

1. *Thanks* the Colombian authorities for their prompt cooperation and the information provided; *appreciates* in particular the steps taken by the Senate authorities to clarify the applicable procedures and transmit communications from the Committee to the Supreme Court and the Council of State for their consideration;

2. *Notes* that the complaint concerning this case is admissible, considering that it: (i) 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 revised Rules and Practices of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians); (ii) concerns an incumbent member of parliament at the time of the alleged facts; and (iii) concerns allegations of arbitrary arrest and detention, lack of due process in proceedings against parliamentarians and undue invalidation, suspension, revocation or other acts obstructing the exercise of the parliamentary mandate, allegations that fall within the Committee's mandate;

3. *Notes with concern* that, although the criminal proceedings against Mr. Manzur and the preventive detention measure imposed on 11 March 2026 did not prevent him from standing for election to the Senate and being formally declared elected for the 2026–2030 term, he has nevertheless been unable to take the oath of office required to assume his parliamentary mandate*; is particularly concerned* that the situation may result in the definitive loss of his Senate seat despite the current absence of any criminal conviction;

4. *Notes* that Mr. Manzur sought permission to be escorted to Congress solely to be sworn in or to be sworn in by an alternative means without leaving detention; *wishes* to receive further clarification as to why neither option could be accommodated and whether other means are available for preserving his parliamentary mandate while complying with the preventive detention measure;

5. *Wishes* to be kept informed of the loss-of-investiture proceedings before the Council of State, including the assessment of whether Mr. Manzur's detention constitutes force majeure; *trusts* that the competent authorities will ensure that the application of procedural requirements does not result in Mr. Manzur losing a parliamentary seat to which he was elected before criminal proceedings against him had been finally determined;

6. *Takes note* of the decision issued on 29 September 2026 by the special first-instance chamber of the Supreme Court upholding the legality of the preventive detention measure and

consequently maintaining Mr. Manzur's detention; *notes* that the measure was initially imposed by the same chamber that conducted the investigation, whereas its subsequent review was carried out by the special first-instance chamber, a separate entity; *wishes* to receive a copy of the decision of 29 September 2026 and further information on the scope and grounds of the review, the legal and factual reasons for maintaining Mr. Manzur in preventive detention, any further remedies available to him and the expected timetable for the criminal proceedings;

7. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the relevant Colombian authorities, the complainant and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;

8. *Requests* the Committee to continue examining the case and to report back to it in due course.

Democratic Republic of the Congo

Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 218th session (Arusha, 9 October 2026)

Chérubin Okende Senga © Complainant

COD-158 – Chérubin Okende Senga

Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Murder
- ✓ Abduction

A. Summary of the case

On 13 July 2023, Mr. Chérubin Okende – opposition member of parliament, former Minister of Transport and spokesperson for Together for the Republic (*Ensemble pour la République*), a political party led by opposition candidate in the presidential elections Moïse Katumbi – was found murdered, according to the complainants, shot in the head, inside his vehicle which had been abandoned on a road near Kinshasa city centre.
Mr. Okende had reportedly disappeared the day before he was killed. Mr. Okende's death occurred within a particularly difficult context for political opponents in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), where the democratic space is shrinking, and violations are committed against those speaking out against the incumbent regime.

The same day, the Public Prosecutor's Office at Kinshasa-Gombe High Court, on the instruction of the Prosecutor General at the Court of Cassation, opened a murder investigation against persons unknown. Shortly after Mr. Okende's death, the contents of a confidential report attributed to the National Intelligence Agency (ANR) were published by *Radio France International* (RFI) and *Jeune Afrique* media on 31 August 2023. According to this report, military intelligence was responsible for his death. The journalist who accessed the contents of this report was imprisoned in September 2023 and then convicted of disseminating false information. He was released in March 2024 after serving a six-month prison sentence. The Congolese authorities have stated that the report was wrongly attributed to the ANR and that its contents were totally false.

On 29 February 2024, the Public Prosecutor announced that the cause of Mr. Okende's death was suicide, according to the analyses carried out and following the discovery of his personal diary in which he had written that he was "at the end of his tether". Mr. Okende's family strongly criticized the

Case COD-158

Democratic Republic of the Congo: Parliament affiliated to the IPU

Victim(s): Male opposition member of parliament

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

Submission of complaint(s): July 2023

Recent IPU decision: October 2025

IPU mission(s): - - -

Recent Committee hearing(s): Hearing with the DRC delegation at the 149th IPU Assembly in Geneva (October 2024)

Recent follow-up:
- Communication(s) from the authorities: - - -
- Communication from the complainant: July 2026
- Communication to the authorities: Letters to the Speaker of the National Assembly (July and September 2026)
- Communication to the complainant: July and September 2026

authorities' conclusion, and, in September 2024, the family's lawyer announced that the family had again filed a complaint with the Public Prosecutor asking for the investigation to be reopened. However, it appears that they have not had any response by the Congolese judiciary to this complaint.

At the Committee's request, meetings took place with the Congolese delegation during the 147th and 149th IPU assemblies in October 2023 and October 2024. During the first meeting, the Congolese delegation had confirmed the opening of a judicial investigation and that it had sought the assistance of international experts from Belgium, South Africa and the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO), who agreed to collaborate with the Congolese authorities in this case. The delegation stated that the report drawn up at the end of this judicial investigation would be published very shortly and that the National Assembly would send it to the Committee as soon as it was available. This investigation report has still not been made available to the Committee.

In October 2024, during its second meeting with the Committee, the delegation stated that Mr. Okende's family and lawyers had been given access to the whole case file, as they had brought proceedings in Belgian courts against Colonel-Major Christian Ndaywell. Concerning the evidence according to which Mr. Okende had supposedly committed suicide, the delegation explained that analyses and samples relating to the deceased's car and body had been carried out and that this evidence had been backed up by the conclusions of international experts who had been invited to work with the Congolese Public Prosecutor's Office in this investigation. The delegation stated that the teams from South Africa and MONUSCO had reportedly concluded that it was indeed a case of suicide, while the Belgian team had allegedly expressed doubts that it was a case of murder, but without concluding that Mr. Okende had committed suicide. The delegation emphasized that the media had wrongly reported on the case, which explained the differences between the investigation findings and the allegations of murder.

In July 2025, the complainant submitted part of the autopsy report, as well as photos taken of Mr. Okende's body when it was discovered inside his car and photos taken during the autopsy, carried out by a team of Congolese doctors and international experts. The forensic autopsy carried out on Mr. Okende revealed considerable blood loss from a serious head injury caused by a gunshot fired at point-blank range. According to the autopsy, the bullet entered above the right ear and travelled along an oblique axis from bottom to top and from right to left, causing destruction of the brain tissue and massive haemorrhaging, both internal and external. Death apparently resulted directly from this gunshot wound to the head, and from complications related to haemorrhagic shock. The autopsy report does not confirm the finding of suicide and does not identify the true cause of death; it simply describes a wound compatible with a gunshot at very close range, without establishing whether it was self-inflicted or caused by a third party.

The information supplied by the complainant confirms that the Congolese authorities sought the support of international experts from the United Nations Joint Human Rights Office, MONUSCO and the South African Police Service (SAPS) in conducting the autopsy and collecting evidence, including in relation to Mr. Okende's car. According to the report drawn up by Mr. Bandile Mlumbi, a lieutenant colonel employed by the SAPS on 4 August 2023, analysis of fingerprints and other evidence, such as bloodstain patterns found inside the vehicle, showed that the person driving the vehicle on the night of 12 to 13 July 2023 (night of the death) was none other than Mr. Okende. However, this analysis does not settle the issue of whether any other individuals were present in Mr. Okende's car on the night of his death.

With regard to the lodging of a complaint in Belgium, the complainant confirmed that Mr. Okende's family had referred the case to the Belgium courts on 7 November 2023 against Colonel-Major Christian Ndaywell, head of the Congolese military intelligence, whom they suspect of involvement in the death of the member of parliament. The complaint was lodged as a civil action with a Brussels investigating judge on charges of war crimes. As a Belgian national, Mr. Ndaywell is subject to Belgian justice, which can prosecute him under its universal jurisdiction in criminal matters. The case was referred to the Brussels Public Prosecutor's Office, which notified the federal Public Prosecutor's Office on 14 December 2023. The federal Public Prosecutor's Office is currently considering whether the case can be handled at the federal level.

In December 2025, the complainant stated that Mr. Ndaywell and several colonels from military

intelligence had been imprisoned in the DRC for reasons unrelated to Mr. Okende's death.

In July 2026, the complainant stated that there had been no developments in the case and that Mr. Okende's family still had not received any response to their requests.
The Committee invited the Congolese delegation to meet with its members to discuss the case during the 153rd IPU Assembly held in October 2026 in Arusha, United Republic of Tanzania. No response was received, however.

B. Decision

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

1. *Deplores* that its requests to the authorities for a meeting and written information have gone unanswered*; also deplores* the authorities' lack of transparency in this case, noting that, even though the judicial investigation was closed in 2024, the investigation report and autopsy report have yet to be made public or sent to the complainant and the Committee;

2. *Deeply regrets* that, three years after Mr. Okende's death, the truth has yet to be established owing to the lack of sufficient evidence supporting the Public Prosecutor's conclusion that he died by suicide, and that Mr. Okende's family is still awaiting answers in order to honour his memory;

3. *Fails to understand* the legal reasons preventing the Congolese Public Prosecutor from accepting the request of Mr. Okende's family to reopen the case, given the persisting doubts surrounding his death and the complaint lodged against Mr. Ndaywell in Belgium; *takes note* of the alleged imprisonment of Mr. Ndaywell in the DRC; and *wishes* to receive information from the authorities in that regard;

4. *Urges,* once more, the Congolese authorities to take all necessary steps to shed light on the circumstances of Mr. Okende's death and to show greater transparency by making the investigation and autopsy reports public and sending complete copies to the Committee and the complainant as soon as possible in order to establish the truth in this case;

5. *Strongly reaffirms* that the sudden death of Mr. Okende, an opposition member of parliament, is of an absolutely serious nature for reasons including the obscure circumstances of his death and his family's rejection of the conclusions of the Congolese courts; *stresses* that impunity encourages the repetition of acts of the same nature and undermines the credibility of justice; *urgently requests* the National Assembly, as the guardian of human rights, to join the civil action lodged by Mr. Okende's family and to support the family's requests to the Congolese Public Prosecutor to reopen the case;

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

Democratic Republic of the Congo

Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 218th session (Arusha, 9 October 2026)

An official from the Independent National Electoral Commission (CENI) registers voters at a polling station at the Institut Ndahura in Goma on 21 December 2023.
© ALEXIS HUGUET / AFP

COD-159 – Claude Nyamugabo Bazibuhe
COD-160 – Aruna Ndarabu Amurani
COD-161 – Frederic Fikiri Asani
COD-162 – Jean-Marie Kabengela Ilunga
COD-163 – Michel Omba Taluhata
COD-164 – Didier Nasibu Ibrahim
COD-165 – Pascal Manshimba
COD-166 – Jocelyne Mupeka Kindundu (Ms.)
COD-167 – Samy Badibanga Ntita
COD-168 – Nazem Nazembe
COD-169 – Matthieu Kitanga Luanga
COD-170 – José Ngbanyo Mbunga Detato
COD-171 – Yannick Lumbu Ngoy
COD-172 – Prosper Mastaki Kuliva
COD-173 – Gilbert Tutu Tedeza Kango
COD-174 – Freddy Tshibangu Kabula
COD-175 – Magguy Kiala Bolenga Boley (Ms.)
COD-176 – Robert Koloba Denge
COD-177 – Mamie Ngalula Kalala (Ms.)
COD-179 – Modero Nsimba Matondo

Case COD-COLL-05

Democratic Republic of the Congo: Parliament affiliated to the IPU

Victim(s): 20 opposition members of parliament (17 men and 3 women)

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

Submission of the complaint(s): May, June, July and August 2024; July 2025; January 2026

Recent IPU decision: October 2025

IPU mission(s): - - -

Recent Committee hearing(s): Hearing with the complainants at the 151st IPU Assembly in Geneva (October 2025)

Recent follow-up:
- Communication from the authorities: - - -
- Communication from the complainants: September 2025
- Communication to the authorities: July 2026
- Communication to the complainants: September 2025

Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Lack of due process in proceedings against parliamentarians
- ✓ Lack of fair trial proceedings
- ✓ Right of appeal
- ✓ Undue invalidation, suspension, revocation or other acts obstructing the exercise of the parliamentary mandate
- ✓ Arbitrary invalidation of the election of a parliamentarian

- ✓ Threats, acts of intimidation[1]
- ✓ Arbitrary arrest and detention
- ✓ Inhumane conditions of detention
- ✓ Violation of freedom of movement
- ✓ Failure to respect parliamentary immunity

A. Summary of the case

On 20 December 2023, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) held general elections against a backdrop of disruption, malfunctioning, violence and accusations of attempted fraud. A number of voices among the opposition and observers condemned the deplorable conditions in which the elections took place.

On 13 January 2024, the Independent National Electoral Commission (*Commission électorale nationale indépendante* – CENI) published the provisional results of the legislative elections. Prior to the publication of these results, the CENI had issued a decision invalidating 82 candidates for electoral fraud and other unlawful acts. Following the announcement of the provisional results and in view of the numerous incidents that occurred during the elections, more than 1,000 appeals were lodged with the Constitutional Court to rule on the electoral dispute.

It is against this background that this collective complaint was filed, initially involving the situation of 15 members of parliament who are among a group of members of parliament who were not declared elected by the CENI on 13 January 2024. Following appeals lodged with the Constitutional Court, the latter validated their election in its ruling of 12 March 2024. The National Assembly was notified of their definitive election, and the 15 members of parliament were able to sit and exercise their parliamentary mandate. However, on 22 April 2024, the same Constitutional Court that had ruled on the definitive election of these members of parliament issued a new ruling following a procedure "rectifying a material error", during which the complainants were not informed of the appeals lodged nor invited to be heard. The ruling of 22 April 2024 invalidated the mandates of the 15 members of parliament in favour of other individuals, some of whom had not even been candidates in the legislative elections. The Court thus overturned its prior decision, which was supposedly not subject to appeal under Article 168 of the Constitution and Article 74(2) of the Electoral Law amended on 29 June 2022. In the operative part of this new ruling, the Court failed to explain how it reached a conclusion that was opposite to the one it had reached in March 2024.

Furthermore, according to the complainants, the ruling of 22 April 2024 was handed down outside the legal time limit of two months available to the Court to rule on electoral disputes. According to Article 74 of Law No. 22/029 of 29 June 2022, "the time limit for examining disputes relating to legislative, provincial, urban, municipal and local elections is two months from the date on which the matter is referred to the competent courts". Article 74 *quinquies* of the same law specifies that "material errors shall have no impact on the ruling, except in cases of proven inaccuracy of the figures mentioned in the contested decision, or transcription errors". The law of 29 June 2022 was adopted by the National Assembly in order to remedy the electoral disputes observed during the 2019 legislative elections. However, despite the proactive measures taken by the Congolese legislature, the Constitutional Court appears to have violated this law.

This case also concerns the situation of Ms. Magguy Kiala Bolenga Boley and Ms. Mamie Ngalula Kalala, whose candidacies were reportedly rejected by the CENI in favour of male candidates. Ms. Boley was replaced by a candidate belonging to the majority in her single-seat constituency, even though she had obtained more votes than him. She is said to have lodged two appeals with the Constitutional Court and, although the transcript of the voting results attests to her victory, the Court declared her applications admissible but unfounded.

As for Mr. Pascal Manshimba and Mr. Robert Koloba, they were declared elected by the CENI, but their election was invalidated by the Constitutional Court in favour of other candidates from the majority. In its ruling of 12 March 2024, the Court accused Mr. Manshimba of electoral fraud, an allegation that he refutes. As for Mr. Koloba, after a challenge that he claims was not brought to his

[1] This and the alleged violations that follow only concern Mr. Modero Nsimba Matondo; the rest concern all other members of parliament included in this case.

attention, his election was invalidated by the same Court ruling of 12 March 2024 in favour of another candidate whose list allegedly obtained more votes.

During the 149th IPU Assembly in October 2024, the Committee met with the Congolese parliamentary authorities and the complainants concerned in this case. The Committee noted that the complainants had exhausted all possible avenues of appeal in the DRC. As for the parliamentary authorities, they stated that the rulings of the Constitutional Court could be overturned in electoral disputes in the event of a material error and that this was the context in which the Court adopted its second ruling in April 2024. The parliamentary authorities were invited by the Committee to provide written information but have not sent any such information to date.

In January 2026, the Committee received a new complaint concerning Mr. Modero Nsimba Matondo, whose parliamentary mandate was invalidated under the same circumstances as the 15 other former members of parliament whose election was initially validated by the Constitutional Court only to be invalidated by the same Court not long after. The complainant also stated that on 18 March 2024, Mr. Matondo was summoned to a hearing before the Office of Military Intelligence regarding a recording attributed to him, which contained discussions of several sensitive issues, including the death of the late member of parliament Mr. Chérubin Okende. This recording, which had initially been kept private, was published on social media during the hearing. Following its publication, Mr. Matondo was accused of spreading false information, a punishable offence under Articles 199bis and 199ter of Book II of the Congolese Criminal Code.

Although he was not responsible for the recording's publication, Mr. Matondo was nonetheless detained at the Office of Military Intelligence in violation of his parliamentary immunity. After three days in detention, he was brought before the Court of Cassation, where he was tried under an accelerated procedure. He was immediately placed in detention to await judgment, in terrible conditions owing to extreme overpopulation and unsanitary facilities at the prison, insufficient food and insufficient access to health care. Mr. Matondo remained in detention for five months, then was placed under house arrest for five more months, all without receiving a final judgment.

Considering that life in the DRC had become impossible because of threats and intimidation targeting him, Mr. Matondo decided to go into exile.

B. Decision

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

1. *Notes* that the complaint concerning Mr. Matondo is admissible, considering that it: (i) 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 revised Rules and Practices of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians); (ii) concerns a member of parliament whose election was denied the CENI but validated by the Constitutional Court; and (iii) concerns allegations of lack of due process in proceedings against parliamentarians, lack of right of appeal, undue invalidation and other acts obstructing the exercise of the parliamentary mandate, threats and acts of intimidation, arbitrary arrest and detention, inhumane conditions of detention, violation of freedom of movement and failure to respect parliamentary immunity, allegations that fall within the Committee's mandate;

2. *Deplores* the silence of the parliamentary authorities regarding this case and the lack of concrete measures taken to implement related decisions of the Committee;

3. *Is concerned* by the legal proceedings undertaken against Mr. Matondo and his detention for expressing his opinion on the death of Mr. Chérubin Okende in a private recording that was published without his knowledge; *recalls* that, at the time Mr. Matondo was taken into custody, his election to parliament had been validated by the Constitutional Court and he was thus protected by parliamentary immunity;

4. *Fails to understand* how an opinion expressed in private about a public matter could justify legal proceedings against Mr. Matondo for spreading false information; and *wishes* to receive information from the authorities as to the factual basis for the accusations against him;

5. *Regrets* that Mr. Matondo, like the other former parliamentarians concerned in this case, has lost the ability to exercise his parliamentary mandate due to inconsistency and lack of transparency in the functioning of the CENI and the Constitutional Court; *deplores* the repeated reoccurrence of complaints of this nature; and *calls on* the authorities to take the necessary steps towards appropriate legislative and constitutional reforms that will put an end to these recurring violations and improve the regulatory mechanisms for resolving electoral disputes;

6. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the parliamentary authorities, the complainants and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;

7. *Requests* the Committee to continue examining the case and to report back to it in due course.

Eritrea

Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 218th session (Arusha, 9 October 2026)

Aster Fissehatsion and Mahmoud Ahmed Sheriffo
© Ibrahim (Ibu) Mahmoud Ahmed

Mahmoud Ahmed Sheriffo with his son Ibu (1988) © Family of Aster Fissehatsion and Mahmoud Sheriffo.

ERI-01 – Ogbe Abraha
ERI-02 – Aster Fissehatsion
ERI-03 – Berhane Gebregziabeher
ERI-04 – Beraki Gebreselassie
ERI-05 – Hamad Hamid Hamad
ERI-06 – Saleh Kekiya
ERI-07 – Germano Nati
ERI-08 – Estifanos Seyoum
ERI-09 – Mahmoud Ahmed Sheriffo
ERI-10 – Petros Solomon
ERI-11 – Haile Woldetensae

Case ERI-COLL-01

Eritrea: Parliament not affiliated to the IPU

Victim(s): 11 members of the opposition (10 men and 1 woman)

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

Submission of complaint(s): September 2002 and 2013

Recent IPU decision: October 2022

IPU mission(s): - - -

Recent Committee hearing(s): Hearing with the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the human rights situation in Eritrea (October 2022)

Recent follow-up:
- Communication(s) from the authorities: - - -
- Communication from the complainants: January 2026
- Communication to the authorities: Letter to the President of Eritrea and the Speaker of the National Assembly (September 2026)
- Communication addressed to the complainants: January 2026

Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Murder
- ✓ Enforced disappearance
- ✓ Torture, ill-treatment and other acts of violence
- ✓ Arbitrary arrest and detention
- ✓ Inhuman conditions of detention
- ✓ Violation of freedom of opinion and expression
- ✓ Impunity
- ✓ Other: crimes against humanity

A. Summary of the case

There has been no official information about the fate of the 11 parliamentarians concerned since they were detained incommunicado on 18 September 2001 shortly after publishing an open letter in support of democracy. They have never been formally charged before a court. Their parliamentary mandates were revoked in 2002 by the National Assembly, which has not reconvened since then.

Since their disappearance, there have been sporadic reports by former prison guards who had sought asylum abroad alleging that the 11 parliamentarians were submitted to torture, ill-treatment and inhumane conditions of detention and denied medical care. It is feared that the 11 members of

parliament may no longer be alive.

In November 2003, upon examination of a complaint concerning their situation, the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights found that the State of Eritrea had violated the right to liberty and security of person, the right to a fair trial and the right to freedom of expression. It urged the State of Eritrea to order their immediate release and to pay them compensation. This decision was ignored by the authorities.

In June 2016, a Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in Eritrea mandated by the United Nations (UN) Human Rights Council referred to the disappeared parliamentarians and other similar cases and found that it had reasonable grounds to believe that these violations constitute crimes against humanity. In the absence of institutional reform that would allow for accountability, it recommended that the matter be referred to the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court and urged all States to exercise their obligation to prosecute or extradite any individual suspected of these crimes present in their territory.

In her report of 11 May 2020, the then-UN Special Rapporteur on the human rights situation in Eritrea once again urged the authorities to reinstate the National Assembly as a critical step towards the restoration of the rule of law. She specifically recalled that the 11 parliamentarians – known as the G11 – have been held incommunicado since September 2001, adding that the authorities had provided no information about their fate and have not complied with the decisions of the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights.

In his 2021 oral update to the Human Rights Council, the new Special Rapporteur echoed these statements and added that he saw no progress in the situation. He also added that it was difficult to speak of progress in Eritrea while the cases remained unresolved and that the "practice of arbitrary and incommunicado detentions in Eritrea has a serious impact on the life of many Eritreans". The Government of Eritrea has denied the findings and refused to cooperate. The Eritrean authorities have not responded to IPU communications for years. On 10 October 2022, the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians held a hearing with the Special Rapporteur, who called on the IPU to urge its members to exert pressure on the authorities and to renew the call made by the UN Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in Eritrea to prosecute those responsible, through the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court or under the principle of universal jurisdiction. In June 2026, the outgoing Special Rapporteur urged "the international community … to support efforts for truth, justice, accountability, and redress for victims".

B. Decision

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

1. *Strongly condemns* the continued and utter contempt of the authorities of Eritrea for the human rights of the 11 parliamentarians who were disappeared for having exercised their parliamentary mandate and their right to freedom of expression in calling for the establishment of a democratically elected parliament; *recalls* that, in light of the consistent conclusions of the Committee, the national authorities are under a duty to spare no effort to shed light on the fate of disappeared parliamentarians through diligent investigations; *recalls* also that failure to abide by this duty has systematically been interpreted as the government bearing responsibility for such disappearances; and *stresses,* in addition, the legitimate right of the relatives of the victims to know the truth about the fate of their loved ones and to receive adequate compensation;

2. *Strongly regrets* the persistent refusal of the authorities to engage with the IPU, the UN Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances, the UN Human Rights Council's Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in Eritrea, the UN Special Rapporteur on the human rights situation in Eritrea, the African Commission for Human and Peoples' Rights, and all other international human rights mechanisms that have spoken out on this case; *regrets*, in particular, that the Eritrean authorities have never allowed the Committee to carry out an on-site mission to meet with relevant stakeholders and seek to resolve this case; and *hopes* that such a mission can take place as soon as circumstances allow;

3. *Emphasizes* 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,

violate the fundamental rights of individual parliamentarians and of those they represent, all the more so when leading figures of parliament are targeted in the context of a broader pattern of repression, as in the present case; and *stresses* that, as defined in Article 7 of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, the widespread and systematic practice of enforced disappearance, imprisonment and torture constitutes a crime against humanity;

4. *Concurs,* in light of the elements at its disposal, with the findings of the Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in Eritrea in its report of 8 June 2016 that the enforced disappearance of the 11 parliamentarians with the involvement of the Eritrean authorities amounts to a crime against humanity and that, given the unlikely prospect of proving accountability in Eritrea, other countries could exercise jurisdiction over Eritreans accused of crimes against humanity, in accordance with the principle of universal jurisdiction, as could the International Criminal Court, if the UN Security Council were to refer this situation to the Court; *calls on* all IPU Member Parliaments, therefore, to prompt the relevant authorities of their respective States to exercise their jurisdiction by prosecuting any individual responsible present in their territory for this crime against humanity, in keeping with the principles reflected in the Preamble to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court;

5. *Renews its call* on all IPU Member Parliaments, in particular members of the IPU African Group, and IPU observers to take concrete actions towards the resolution of this case, including by making representations to the diplomatic missions of Eritrea in their countries and by raising the case publicly, including within the UN Human Rights Council; *hopes* to be able to rely on the assistance of all relevant regional and international organizations, including the African Union, to ensure that justice is done in this case in line with the principles of the UN Charter and the IPU Statutes; and *calls on* all IPU Member Parliaments and observers to support the mandate of the UN Special Rapporteur on the human rights situation in Eritrea to that end;

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

Israel

Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 218th session (Arusha, 9 October 2026)

©Member of Knesset Ofer Cassif

ISR-22 – Ofer Cassif

Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ 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
- ✓ Undue invalidation, suspension, revocation or other acts obstructing the exercise of the parliamentary mandate

Case ISR-22

Israel: Parliament affiliated to the IPU

Victim(s): Male opposition member of parliament

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

Submission of complaint(s): January 2024

Recent IPU decision: October 2025

IPU mission(s): - - -

Recent Committee hearing(s): February 2025

Recent follow-up:
- Communication from the authorities: Letter to the Speaker of the Knesset (April 2025)
- Communication from the complainants: September 2026
- Communication to the authorities: Letter to Speaker of the Knesset (September 2026)
- Communication to the complainants: September 2026

A. Summary of the case

On 10 January 2024, Mr. Ofer Cassif was subjected to an expulsion procedure initiated by a fellow member of the Knesset, who accused him of supporting armed struggle and terrorism against the State of Israel for publicly supporting South Africa's case at the International Court of Justice (ICJ). South Africa had filed a case at the ICJ alleging that Israel was engaging in "genocidal acts" in Gaza following its response to the 7 October 2023 attack by Hamas. Before the expulsion procedure, Mr. Cassif had been suspended by the Knesset Ethics Committee in October 2023, shortly after the beginning of the conflict, for statements he made against the Israeli authorities.

After collecting the signatures of 85 members of the Knesset supporting Mr. Cassif's expulsion, the issue was referred to the Knesset House Committee for approval. According to the Israeli Basic Law, the Knesset can expel a member if (s)he expresses support for armed struggle against the State of Israel, provided that 90 Knesset members, or 75%, have voted in favour of the motion. On 30 January 2024, after a sitting that lasted two days, the Knesset House Committee endorsed the motion to expel

Mr. Cassif, which moved the motion for expulsion to the Knesset plenary. Mr. Cassif has reiterated that his support for South Africa's case against Israel is a plea to end the war in Gaza. He also said in several interviews that he had condemned the 7 October attack against Israel and that he had never shown any support to the terrorist group Hamas. On 19 February 2024, the motion to expel Mr. Cassif failed to gain the needed majority in plenary.

In November 2024, however, the Knesset Ethics Committee decided to suspend Mr. Cassif from participating in plenary debates and committee discussions for six months, while allowing him to vote in plenary, and withheld payment of his parliamentary salary for two weeks. In its decision No. 28/25 of 11 November 2024, the Knesset Ethics Committee concluded that: "There is no doubt that the totality of the statements constitutes a pattern and systematic effort by Mr. Cassif to violate the rules of ethics in an exceptionally blatant and severe manner". According to the complainants, ever since the original attempt to expel Mr. Cassif failed, he has been the victim of an intimidation campaign led by the Knesset Ethics Committee, which relentlessly targets him for his outspoken criticism of the State of Israel and actions by the Israel Defence Forces' (IDF) against Palestinians in Gaza since 7 October 2023. The complainants add that, even though the four members of the Knesset Ethics Committee represent both the ruling coalition and the opposition, they all share the same right-wing political views and have reportedly failed to hold accountable Knesset members of right-wing and far-right political parties in Israel who had incited violence against Palestinians.

According to the complainants, despite the daily threats and acts of intimidation Mr. Cassif faces from the public due to his political views, the Israeli authorities have not granted him personal security, deeming that his situation does not warrant State protection. The complainants also state that opposition Knesset members and critical voices of the Israeli Government are being increasingly repressed and punished.

In April 2025, the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians invited the Israeli parliamentary authorities to a hearing during the 150th IPU Assembly in Tashkent, Uzbekistan, to discuss Mr. Cassif's case. However, in a letter received on 4 April 2025, the Head of the IPU Group, member of the Knesset Mr. Dan Illouz, stated that "Mr. Cassif's suspension followed due legal process and was not arbitrary" without providing any information about the process followed by the Knesset Ethics Committee or any copies of the decisions adopted against Mr. Cassif. The authorities added that "Israel respects the rights of its parliamentarians, including freedom of speech. However, freedom of expression does not grant immunity from consequences when that speech crosses into the realm of incitement or undermines national security".

On 9 July 2025, the Knesset Ethics Committee adopted another decision (No. 45/25) suspending Mr. Cassif for the third time from Knesset plenum and committee meetings for two months, starting on 19 October 2025, and withholding his salary for two weeks during this period. The Knesset Ethics Committee considered Mr. Cassif's statements against war crimes and genocide in Gaza "damaging to the dignity of the Knesset and public trust, harmful to Israel's war efforts, and supportive of the enemy".

During an online hearing with one of the complainants at the 151st IPU Assembly in October 2025 in Geneva, the Committee learned that, under the suspension order, Mr. Cassif was prevented from submitting bills or proposals for discussion, which hindered the full exercise of his parliamentary mandate. The complainant also stated that 92% of decisions adopted by the Knesset Ethics Committee concern members of his political party, Hadash, the only left-wing, Arab-Jewish political party in the Knesset.

Mr. Cassif appealed the Knesset Ethics Committee's decision in plenary, which rejected the appeal via vote on 21 July 2025, after which he filed a petition to the Israeli Supreme Court. On 15 October 2025, the human rights organization Adalah also submitted a petition on his behalf to the Court. In its decision of 21 October 2025, the Court found that "The petitioner submitted his petition nearly three months after the Plenum's decision and only four days before the start of his suspension without offering any clear reason for the delay. This alone suffices to justify dismissal of the petition".

In September 2026, the majority Likud Party submitted a disqualification request to the Central Elections Committee (CEC) against Mr. Cassif, the Joint List – along with its leader, Mr. Sami Abu Shehadeh – and Ra'am (the United Arab List), to prevent them from running in the 27 October 2026

elections. Mr. Cassif had already been the subject of a disqualification procedure initiated by the CEC in 2019, which was overturned by the Supreme Court after it concluded that the statutory grounds for disqualification had not been established.

The September 2026 petition seeking Mr. Cassif's disqualification, like that of 2019, was based on two grounds for banning participation in Knesset elections as set out in Article 7a(a) of the Basic Law of the Knesset, namely: "negation of the existence of the State of Israel as a Jewish and democratic state", and "support for armed struggle, by an enemy state or terrorist organization, against the State of Israel". On 23 September 2026, the CEC accepted the disqualification request against Mr. Cassif, the Joint List, Mr. Abu Shehadeh and Ra'am. The CEC's decision was then subject to mandatory review by the Supreme Court.

On 2 October 2026, the Supreme Court, in a majority ruling of seven to two, overturned the CEC's decision regarding Mr. Cassif, the Joint List and Ra'am. Although the justices criticized certain statements and actions by the parties, they found that the evidence did not meet the stringent threshold for disqualification. Mr. Cassif was therefore allowed to stand in the elections. However, a majority of the justices were inclined to uphold the disqualification of the leader of the Joint List, Mr. Abu Shehadeh. He subsequently withdrew his candidacy to avoid establishing a new legal precedent that could be used against Arab citizens standing for election in Israel. The Supreme Court then dismissed the proceedings without issuing a substantive ruling on Mr. Abu Shehadeh's eligibility.

B. Decision

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

1. *Deplores* the Israeli parliamentary authorities' silence regarding the situation of Mr. Cassif and their continued unwillingness to engage substantively with the Committee regarding this case;

2. *Welcomes* the Israeli Supreme Court's ruling overturning the decision of the CEC and allowing Mr. Cassif to stand in the upcoming Knesset elections; *trusts* that the Supreme Court will continue to uphold the rule of law and ensure that judicial proceedings are not instrumentalized against opposition members of Knesset;

3. *Deeply regrets,* however, that Mr. Cassif, an opposition member of the Knesset, was yet again the target of a disqualification request despite a similar request on the same grounds having been rejected by the Supreme Court in 2019; *regrets* also that all opposition parties in Israel were subject to disqualification requests in an attempt to stifle political debate over the Israeli Government's policies and actions in Gaza and the West Bank;

4. *Is concerned* that these repeated disqualification requests aim to discourage opposition members of the Knesset from expressing views and political positions critical of the State of Israel's policies and actions in Gaza and the West Bank, by forcing them to devote their time and attention to defending their eligibility at the expense of campaigning for election, which could ultimately have a chilling effect on the exercise of their freedom of expression and political rights;

5. *Calls on* the Israeli authorities, as Knesset elections approach and related tensions may lead to new violations against certain members of parliament, to take all necessary steps to guarantee the fundamental rights of all parliamentarians, in particular the right to freedom of expression, in order to ensure that political debate reflects all opinions, including those critical of the Israel Defence Forces, the Israeli Government, its members and its policies regarding Palestinians in Gaza and the West Bank;

6. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the Speaker of the Knesset and the complainants;

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

Mongolia

Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 218th session (Arusha, 9 October 2026)

© Ms. Bolormaa Enkhbat

MNG-11 – Bolormaa Enkhbat (Ms.)

Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Threats, acts of intimidation
- ✓ Lack of due process at the investigation stage
- ✓ Lack of fair trial proceedings
- ✓ Violation of freedom of opinion and expression
- ✓ Violation of freedom of movement
- ✓ Failure to respect parliamentary immunity
- ✓ Other acts obstructing the exercise of the parliamentary mandate

Case MNG-11

Mongolia: Parliament affiliated to the IPU

Victim(s): Female majority member of parliament

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

Submission of complaint(s): May 2026

Recent IPU decision: - - -

IPU mission(s): - - -

Recent Committee hearing(s): - - -

Recent follow-up:
- Communication from the authorities: Letters from the Chairman of the State Great Hural (July, August 2026)
- Communication from the complainant: June 2026
- Communication to the authorities: Letter to the Chairman of the State Great Hural (June 2026)
- Communication to the complainant: July 2026

A. Summary of the case

On 13 June 2025, Ms. Bolormaa Enkhbat sent a letter to Mr. Zandanshatar Gombojavyn, the Prime Minister of Mongolia at the time, in which she called for internal party democracy in forming the government and for gender equality in the composition of the cabinet, among other reforMs. Reportedly, 30 members of the Mongolian People's Party (MPP) signed the letter ("joint governance letter").

The complainant alleged that, after Ms. Bolormaa sent the joint governance letter, she became the target of unfair legal proceedings as a result of her open criticism of the policies of the then-Prime Minister.

In February 2025, Ms. Bolormaa had been placed under police investigation for receiving an unsolicited campaign donation from a company subsequently found to have received foreign investment. Upon becoming aware of the company's ownership structure, Ms. Bolormaa returned the donation in early June 2025. The complainant alleged that such conduct should normally constitute only a minor administrative infraction, as according to Article 17.1.23 of the Violations Act, "If a donation received from a person or entity prohibited by law from making donations is not returned, the

illegally obtained property or income shall be confiscated, and the individual shall be fined an amount equivalent to 10,000 units, while the legal entity shall be fined an amount equivalent to 100,000 units". Ms. Bolormaa also filed a complaint with the National Police against the company, because according to the Mongolian electoral law, it is illegal not only to receive a donation from a company backed by foreign capital but also for such companies to make campaign donations. However, the authorities allegedly refused to take up her complaint.

On 9 July 2025, shortly after Ms. Bolormaa sent the joint governance letter to the then-Prime Minister, the Deputy Prosecutor of Khovd Province reportedly charged Ms. Bolormaa, as part of a police investigation and in the absence of any evidence, with "obstruction of electoral rights – vote-buying with money or property", which carries a sentence of one to five years' imprisonment under Article 14.5.2.3 of the Criminal Code.

On 3 March 2026, the Prosecutor allegedly requested a travel ban against Ms. Bolormaa. The court reportedly issued the requested order without prior notice and without lifting Ms. Bolormaa's parliamentary immunity. On 5 May 2026, the court allegedly granted the Prosecutor's request to compel Ms. Bolormaa to appear before it to be indicted, without first requesting the lifting of her parliamentary immunity. On 3 June 2026, Chief Judge J. Boldbaatar of the Sukhbaatar District First Instance Court reportedly upheld the order issued on 5 May 2026.

The complainant also alleged that the criminal proceedings initiated against Ms. Bolormaa carry a gender-based dimension, as they were allegedly fabricated by a male opponent who lost the election in the constituency where they stood against each other. The complainant also stated that the criminal proceedings were intended to remove Ms. Bolormaa from parliament under the pending "Right to Recall" bill, which was introduced by the President of Mongolia and would allow the removal of elected officials if they commit ethical violations or have a judicial decision pending against them. If removed from parliament, the bill would trigger a by-election in the district where her male opponent could run again.

In his letter of 9 July 2026, the Chairman of the State Great Hural stated that Ms. Bolormaa's case was under investigation but that she continued to exercise her mandate without hindrance and that her right to travel had been restored. The complainant argued, however, that the travel ban imposed on Ms. Bolormaa had prevented her from going abroad on two occasions to attend international events as part of her parliamentary duties. Reportedly, Ms. Bolormaa's counsel twice requested the court to lift the ban for that reason, but the court refused, arguing that the performance of her official duties was an obstruction to the criminal proceedings against her. On 22 September 2026, the complainant stated that the travel ban imposed on 3 March 2026 was still in force.

In a second letter dated 18 August 2026, the Chairman of the State Great Hural wrote that he had requested the Prosecutor's Office to provide updated information about the case. According to the information provided by the Prosecutor, an inquiry had been opened and an investigation begun on 4 June 2025 into the charge of "obstruction of electoral rights – vote-buying with money or property". The complainant stated that Ms. Bolormaa and her counsel only became aware of the case against her when she was charged on 9 July 2025. On 2 April 2026, Ms. Bolormaa and her counsel were given access to the case file for the first time and became aware that the case had initially been examined as an administrative violation.

The Chairman of the State Great Hural indicated that all the complaints and issues raised by Ms. Bolormaa and her counsel had been examined and resolved by the Prosecutor. In his letter of 18 August 2026, he added that Ms. Bolormaa had failed to appear before the court on several occasions without a valid reason, which led the Prosecutor to compel her to appear via a court order. An appeal against that order was allegedly heard and dismissed, and the order was upheld. The complainant explained that the only time that Ms. Bolormaa did not appear before the court was when she was summoned to receive her indictment. According to the complainant, the process was unlawful, as the Law of the State Great Hural requires the Prosecutor to submit a proposal to suspend a member's powers and thereby restrict the exercise of their parliamentary mandate before that member can be investigated and prosecuted and the case referred to the courts.

Regarding Ms. Bolormaa's parliamentary immunity, the Chairman of the State Great Hural stated in his letter of 18 August 2026 that Mongolian law did not require the lifting of parliamentary immunity to

open an inquiry, conduct an investigation, begin criminal proceedings, issue a charge, summon a defendant to participate in investigative proceedings, compel a defendant's appearance for failure to comply with a lawful summons without a valid reason or impose preventive measures other than detention.

B. Decision

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

1. *Thanks* the Chairman of the State Great Hural for his recent letters and the information provided regarding this case;

2. *Notes* that the complaint concerning Ms. Bolormaa is admissible, considering that it: (i) was submitted in due form by a qualified complainant under Section I.1(b) of the Procedure for the examination and treatment of complaints (Annex I of the revised Rules and Practices of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians); (ii) concerns an incumbent member of parliament at the time of the alleged facts; and (iii) deals with allegations of threats, acts of intimidation, lack of due process at the investigation stage, lack of fair trial proceedings, violation of freedom of opinion and expression, violation of freedom of movement, failure to respect parliamentary immunity and other acts obstructing the exercise of the parliamentary mandate, allegations that fall within the Committee's mandate;

3. *Is deeply concerned* by the criminal proceedings initiated against Ms. Bolormaa on serious charges of obstructing electoral rights and vote-buying – offences punishable by one to five years' imprisonment – in particular as the conduct in question appears to have initially been treated as an administrative violation;

4. *Fails to understand* how Ms. Bolormaa can be held accountable for an unsolicited campaign donation transferred to her account without her knowledge; *underlines* that, upon becoming aware of the donation and the origins of the funds, Ms. Bolormaa returned the funds and filed a complaint against the company that made the donation; *wishes* to receive information regarding Ms. Bolormaa's complaint and the authorities' apparent refusal to open an investigation into the company;

5. *Is troubled* that Ms. Bolormaa reportedly remains subject to a travel ban and that the parliamentary authorities appear have failed to safeguard the rights and prerogatives derived from her status as a member of the State Great Hural, including her parliamentary immunity; *notes* that, while Mongolian law may allow criminal proceedings to be initiated against a member of parliament without the prior lifting of parliamentary immunity, such proceedings should nevertheless respect procedural safeguards and protections deriving from parliamentary status; *calls*, therefore, on the authorities to uphold Ms. Bolormaa's rights and restore her freedom of movement by lifting the travel ban;

6. *Expresses concern* about the potential gender dimension of this case, in light of the complainant's allegations, the risks that the criminal proceedings and restrictions carry for Ms. Bolormaa as a woman parliamentarian and their potential to contribute to an environment that discourages women from exercising their parliamentary mandates freely and effectively; *calls on* the authorities to ensure that Ms. Bolormaa is not subjected to any form of discrimination, intimidation or adverse treatment on account of her gender or her exercise of parliamentary functions, and to take all necessary steps to ensure that she can carry out her mandate safely and without wrongful interference;

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

Myanmar

Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 218th session (Arusha, 9 October 2026)

Prison officials stand outside Insein prison in Yangon on 12 February 2022.
© STRINGER/AFP

Parliamentarians who were arbitrarily detained:

MMR-267 – Win Myint
MMR-268 – Aung San Suu Kyi (Ms.)
MMR-270 – Mann Win Khaing Than
MMR-272 – Tun Hein
MMR-274 – Than Zin Maung
MMR-275 – Dr. Win Myat Aye
MMR-276 – Aung Myint
MMR-277 – Ye Khaung Nyunt
MMR-278 – Dr. Myo Aung
MMR-280 – Win Mya (Ms.)
MMR-281 – Kyaw Min Hlaing
MMR-285 – Mya Thein
MMR-286 – Tint Soe
MMR-287 – Kyaw Thaung
MMR-309 – Aung Kyaw Oo
MMR-311 – Myint Oo
MMR-312 – Nan Mol Kham (Ms.)
MMR-313 – Thant Zin Tun
MMR-314 – Maung Swe
MMR-315 – Thein Tun
MMR-316 – Than Htut
MMR-317 – Aung Oo
MMR-318 – Ba Myo Thein
MMR-319 – Soe Win (aka Soe Lay)
MMR-320 – U Mann Nyunt Thein
MMR-321 – Khin Myat Thu
MMR-324 – Shwe Pon (Ms.)
MMR-325 – Wai Lin Aung
MMR-326 – Pyae Phyo
MMR-327 – Lin Oo
MMR-328 – Kyaw Lin
MMR-329 – Tin Htwe
MMR-330 – Aung Myint Shain
MMR-331 – Pital Aung
MMR-332 – Ohn Win
MMR-333 – Ma Lay (Ms.)
MMR-334 – Win
MMR-335 – Hla Than
MMR-336 – Tun Wai
MMR-337 – Win Myint Aung
MMR-338 – Aung Lin
MMR-339 – Aung Min Tun
MMR-340 – Khin Sain Hlaing (Ms.)
MMR-341 – Aung Sein
MMR-342 – Hla Moe
MMR-343 – Htay Min Thein
MMR-348 – U Win Naing
MMR-349 – Hla Win
MMR-350 – Aung Soe Min
MMR-358 – Wunna Aung

Parliamentarians who were subjected to threats and intimidation:

MMR-283 – Okka Min
MMR-291 – Htun Myint
MMR-292 – Naing Htoo Aung
MMR-293 – Dr. Wai Phyo Aung
MMR-302 – Myat Thida Htun (Ms.)
MMR-303 – Saw Shar Phaung Awar
MMR-304 – Robert Nyal Yal
MMR-305 – Lamin Tun (aka Aphyo)

MMR-298 – Nay Myo
MMR-299 – Zaw Min Thein
MMR-300 – Win Naing
MMR-301 – Zay Latt
MMR-306 – Aung Kyi Nyunt
MMR-307 – Lama Naw Aung
MMR-308 – Sithu Maung

Parliamentarians who died while avoiding arrest:
MMR-345 – Tin Ye (Ms.)
MMR-346 – Htike Zaw
MMR-347 – Myint Win
MMR-348 – Saw Tin Win
MMR-349 – Thein Shwe
MMR-352 – Aung Tin Linn
MMR-353 – Eit Kha
MMR-354 – Myint U
MMR-355 – Hla Tun Aung (aka Mg Mg)
MMR-356 – Kaywal Aung (Ms.)
MMR-357 – Saw Ngwe Saw
MMR-359 – Kyaw Soe
MMR-360 – Tin Maung Soe
MMR-361 – Aung Kyaw Soe (aka Khin Maung Win)
MMR-362 – Hla Myint Than
MMR-363 – Khin Maung Than
MMR-364 – Tin Htut Linn

Parliamentarians who were arbitrarily stripped of their nationality:
MMR-289 – Phyu Thin (Ms.)
MMR-290 – Ye Mon (aka Tin Thit)
MMR-294 – Zin Mar Aung (Ms.)
MMR-295 – Lwin Ko Latt

Case MMR-COLL-03

Myanmar: Parliament affiliated to the IPU

Victim(s): 86 parliamentarians from the opposition (75 male and 11 female)

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

Submission of complaint(s): March 2021

Recent IPU decision: October 2025

IPU Mission(s): - - -

Recent Committee hearing: Hearing with the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar (March 2022)

Recent follow-up:
- Communication from the authorities: *Note verbale* from the Permanent Mission of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva (February 2025)
- Communication from the complainant: September 2026
- Communication to the authorities: *Note verbale* to the Permanent Mission of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva (May 2025)
- Communication to the complainant: September 2026

Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Murder
- ✓ Enforced disappearance
- ✓ 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
- ✓ 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
- ✓ Other violations: unlawful revocation of citizenship
- ✓ Other violations: right to health

A. Summary of the case[1]

After refusing to recognize the results of the November 2020 parliamentary elections, the military declared a state of emergency and proceeded to seize power by force on 1 February 2021, the day

[1] For the purposes of this report, the term "opposition" relates to members of parliament from political groups or parties whose decision-making power is limited and who are opposed to the military authorities.

that the new parliament was due to take office. The President of Myanmar and former Speaker of the House of Representatives (*Pyithu Hluttaw*), Counsellor Aung San Suu Kyi and six other parliamentarians were placed under house arrest on the day of the coup, while 20 other parliamentarians were arbitrarily arrested shortly thereafter. (As of September 2026, the military-aligned authorities maintained that only 13 parliamentarians remained in detention, whereas the complainant alleged that the total was 17.)

On 4 February 2021, 70 elected members of parliament met in Naypyidaw and took an oath of office pledging to abide by the mandate granted to them by the people. The next day, 300 members of parliament met online and established the Committee Representing the *Pyidaungsu Hluttaw* (CRPH), which is considered a terrorist organization by the military-appointed State Administration Council. On 31 March 2021, the CRPH appointed a National Unity Government (NUG), which they see as the legitimate interim government. Although at first the military allowed largely peaceful protests to take place, the situation in Myanmar took a devastating turn for the worse in March 2021 when the military sought to crush the protests with live automatic fire, artillery and air strikes, leading to a full-scale civil war. The United Nations (UN) Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar has recognized the widespread and systematic nature of the extrajudicial killings, enforced disappearances and other violations carried out by the military (known as the *Tatmadaw*) and declared that their scale reached the threshold of crimes against humanity. According to the Assistance Association for Political Prisoners, as of 11 September 2026, some 8,367 people have been killed and 31,907 have been arbitrarily arrested, while the number of people in detention has dropped from 22,334 (in 2025) to 14,806. According to the complainant, members of the CRPH have been forced into hiding, fearing reprisals because of their political activities, and four have been arbitrarily stripped of their nationality. The complainant also stated that six parliamentarians had died while avoiding arrest in 2026, bringing the total number of such deaths to 17.

On 16 November 2021, Ms. Aung San Suu Kyi and 15 other officials were charged with election fraud during the 2020 elections, and on 5 December 2021 she was found guilty and convicted, which was followed by another conviction on three charges. Altogether, she was sentenced to 27 years in prison. UN Security Council resolution 2669 (2022) urged the military to release her and fellow arbitrarily detained prisoners immediately. In 2026, the military-aligned authorities placed Ms. Aung San Suu Kyi under house arrest and granted amnesty to President Win Myint, although the complainant describes the limitations on the latter's movements and the surveillance placed upon him as de-facto house arrest. Following her placement under house arrest, Ms. Aung San Suu Kyi was visited in August 2026 by a delegate of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) as called for in several IPU decisions, although other imprisoned parliamentarians have yet to receive such visits.

On 24 April 2021, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) held a leaders' meeting, during which it adopted a five-point consensus on Myanmar, calling for the immediate cessation of violence and the nomination of a special envoy to visit the country to meet with all parties concerned. As the military authorities showed no willingness to implement the five-point consensus, they have been excluded from ASEAN meetings as of October 2021.

At a hearing with the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians in March 2022, the UN Special Rapporteur called for more concerted pressure on the military authorities by the entire international community. He also renewed his call to halt the flow of arms towards the military, which had reportedly received air fuel and weapons from a limited number of countries well after the coup d'état, which were used in strikes against civilians as described in one of his reports.[2] Meanwhile, the IPU Secretariat had received correspondence from the military authorities accusing the CRPH of choosing the path of confrontation and fostering terrorism and disorder, which had allegedly claimed over 1,000 lives. The military authorities also indicated a commitment to implementing the five-point consensus and the possibility of resuming dialogue, provided that trust and confidence-building measures were taken first.

In July 2022, the complainant communicated that the situation of detained members of parliament had deteriorated markedly, as the military authorities had banned all visits and communication with detained members of parliament, who were reportedly transported to secret locations. The whereabouts of some of them has been hidden, prompting fears that they may be victims of enforced

2 Report by the UN Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar – *Enabling Atrocities: UN Member States' Arms Transfers to the Myanmar Military*. Available here.

disappearance. This move followed the news that the *Tatmadaw* had executed four activists – including former parliamentarian Phyo Zayar Thaw – which provoked consternation among prisoners; some reportedly went on hunger strike. After the first executions in three decades, the *Tatmadaw* claimed that more would follow.

In January 2025, the complainant shared that in the preceding months a few parliamentarians had been freed by NUG-affiliated forces, which had made significant gains in the civil war. According to unofficial reports, as of late 2025 the military controlled a limited part of the country's territory, although it retained control over many townships, most of which had been surrounded or fought over by NUG-affiliated forces. It was in this context that General Min Aung Hlaing declared that elections would be held in December 2025, which were immediately rejected by the opposition as a sham. Thousands of political prisoners, including Mr. Win Myint, were granted amnesty by the military ahead of these elections. The UN Special Rapporteur called upon the international community not to recognize the outcome, and the *Tatmadaw* authorities declared that protesting the elections with the intent of interfering would be punishable by a 20-year prison sentence. As of October 2026, ASEAN continued to deny the legitimacy of the elections and has called for the military authorities to allow its special envoy to visit Ms. Aung San Suu Kyi.

In a communication dated 14 September 2026, the Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Inter-Parliamentary Union (JCIPU) representing the military-aligned Union Assembly, stated that five of the 17 parliamentarians known to be in detention at the time had been released following the completion of their sentences and were in good health. The Chairman confirmed that Ms. Aung San Suu Kyi was no longer in prison but had been placed under house arrest, and he shared information on the 13 members of parliament still in detention. According to the complainant, however, another parliamentarian, Mr. Wunna Aung, was arrested in the town of Mong La in eastern Shan State, near the border with China, on 26 July 2026. Of the five parliamentarians whom the authorities reported as having been freed, the complainant could only confirm the release of three. The complainant therefore alleges that a total of 17 parliamentarians remain in arbitrary detention.

B. Decision

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

1. *Notes* that this case includes a new complaint regarding the situation of seven additional members of parliament and is admissible, considering that the complaint: (i) 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 revised Rules and Practices of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians); (ii) concerns incumbent members of parliament at the time of the initial allegations; and (iii) concerns allegations of torture, ill-treatment and other acts of violence, threats and acts of intimidation, arbitrary arrest and detention, inhumane conditions of detention, violation of freedom of opinion and expression, violation of freedom of assembly and association, failure to respect parliamentary immunity and lack of fair trial proceedings, allegations that fall under the Committee's mandate;

2. *Thanks* the Chairman of the JCIPU – representing the military-aligned Union Assembly, which was established following a vote carried out by the military authorities on territory still under their control in 2025 – for the information provided on the status of 17 parliamentarians known to have been detained; *welcomes* the information that four of these parliamentarians are confirmed as having been released from prison, as repeatedly called for by the IPU; *takes note*, however, that among this group, Ms. Aung San Suu Kyi, while no longer in prison, has been placed under house arrest; *welcomes* the news that she was recently visited by a delegate of the ICRC, as requested in past IPU decisions; *urges* the military authorities and the JCIPU to ensure that all other detained parliamentarians receive ICRC visits; and *looks forward* to receiving information from the JCIPU on the modalities for such visits;

3. *Is dismayed* that six additional parliamentarians have lost their lives attempting to avoid arbitrary arrest; *remains extremely concerned* by eye-witness reports that 16 parliamentarians are being held incommunicado in prisons where they reportedly face ill-treatment, torture and gender-based violence and are being held in inhumane conditions with limited access to medical care or legal counsel;

4. *Calls on* the military authorities to release the imprisoned parliamentarians without delay as required under UN Security Council resolution 2669 (2022); *urges* the military authorities, once again, for as long as these parliamentarians remain imprisoned, to provide specific information on each individual, including with regard to their right to humane and safe conditions of detention, family visits and confidential meetings with their lawyers, as well as the legal proceedings against them; and *renews its call* for the military authorities to cease all attempts to arrest parliamentarians on political grounds, thereby exposing them to the risk of death;

5. *Notes* that the military authorities have held elections on the portion of territory that they control; *fails to see*, however, how those elections could be considered meaningful given the ongoing armed conflict and the fact that several elected parliamentarians remain in arbitrary detention; and *hopes* that in time, genuinely free and fair elections can be held throughout the territory of Myanmar in accordance with universally accepted norms;

6. *Reiterates its belief* that the release of all detained parliamentarians is an essential step towards ending the violence and building trust that will allow for the restoration of democratic and parliamentary life in Myanmar; *calls on* the military authorities to protect the lives and respect the rights of all members of parliament elected in November 2020, allowing them to associate, assemble, express their views, receive and impart information and travel without fear of reprisals; *urges* the military authorities to implement in earnest UN Security Council resolution 2669 (2022), immediately ceasing the use of lethal force against non-combatants, employing genuine restraint against those exercising their human rights and allowing the free flow of aid to those in need;

7. *Calls* on the military authorities and all entities that have pledged allegiance to the CRPH and the NUG to take the necessary confidence-building and de-escalation measures to allow, as a preparatory step, for a process of dialogue and reconciliation;

8. *Renews its call* for all IPU Member Parliaments and observers, in particular in Asia, to press for respect for human rights and democratic principles in Myanmar and to show solidarity with the members of parliament who were elected in 2020, including members of the CRPH; *welcomes* the actions taken thus far; *calls on* IPU Member Parliaments to take additional steps, such as raising the case publicly and ensuring that any parliamentarians who have found safe refuge in neighbouring States are not deported to territory under the control of the military authorities, which would expose them to the risk of death and repression; *hopes* to rely on the assistance of all relevant regional and international organizations, including ASEAN, to ensure that justice is done in this case, including through the prosecution of any individual suspected of committing crimes against humanity and other mass atrocities, under the principle of universal jurisdiction; and *calls on* all IPU Member Parliaments and observers to support the UN Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar;

9. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the JCIPU, the CRPH and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information; *also requests* the Secretary General to explore all other possibilities for effectively addressing the concerns raised in this decision;

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

Nicaragua

Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 218th session (Arusha, 9 October 2026)

© Wikimedia - Brooklyn Rivera Bryan

NIC-32 – Brooklyn Rivera Bryan
NIC-33 – Nancy Elizabeth Henríquez James

Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Enforced disappearance
- ✓ Threats, acts of intimidation
- ✓ Arbitrary arrest and detention
- ✓ Inhumane conditions of detention
- ✓ Lack of due process in proceedings against parliamentarians
- ✓ Violation of freedom of opinion and expression
- ✓ Abusive revocation or suspension of the parliamentary mandate
- ✓ Failure to respect parliamentary immunity

Case NIC-COLL-02

Nicaragua: Parliament affiliated to the IPU

Victim(s): Two opposition members of parliament (one man and one woman)

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

Submission of complaint(s): April 2024

Recent IPU decision: April 2026

IPU mission(s): - - -

Recent Committee hearing(s): - - -

Recent follow-up:
- Communication(s) from the authorities: Letter from the Speaker of Parliament (September 2026)
- Communication from the complainant: April 2026
- Communication to the authorities: Letter to the Speaker of Parliament (August 2026)
- Communication to the complainant: April 2026

A. Summary of the case

In April 2023, Mr. Brooklyn Rivera Bryan, a Miskitu indigenous leader, prominent member of the YATAMA organization (*Yapti Tasba Masraka Nanih Aslatakanka,* "Children of Mother Earth United") and elected member of Nicaragua's National Assembly, participated in the 22nd session of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. According to the complainant, during this event Mr. Rivera Bryan denounced the treatment of indigenous peoples and Afro-descendants in Nicaragua. Upon attempting to return to his country on 24 April 2023, the Nicaraguan Government allegedly blocked his entry. After a few days abroad, Mr. Rivera Bryan returned to Nicaragua, where he was reportedly persecuted by the national police. According to the information received, on 29 September 2023, State agents forcibly entered his home, assaulted him and arrested him without a warrant. His whereabouts remained unknown until May 2026. According to the complainant, his family was denied any information, leading to growing concerns about his health and safety, especially given his pre-

existing health conditions, which required specialized medical attention. The complainant also states that Mr. Rivera Bryan's family faces continued threats and intimidation, and that some family members have been forced into exile.

According to official information from the Nicaraguan authorities released on 31 May 2026, Mr. Rivera Bryan died from complications related to COVID-19 while in State custody. According to other information received, his health had deteriorated during his prolonged incommunicado detention and the authorities had failed to provide proof of life or transparent information regarding his condition.

According to public reports, the authorities allegedly refused to release Mr. Rivera Bryan's body to his family and community, who had come to claim it. Several reports cite statements from family members and sources close to his community to the effect that Mr. Rivera Bryan wished to be buried in Sandy Bay on the Caribbean coast in accordance with Miskitu tradition. However, the same reports suggest that those wishes were not respected. Instead, the authorities allegedly organized a funeral service in Managua and did not allow his family to attend the burial, despite their wishes and traditions.

Ms. Nancy Elizabeth Henríquez James, also a Miskitu indigenous leader and member of the YATAMA organization, took over Mr. Rivera Bryan's parliamentary seat in April 2023 as his alternate. The complainant alleges that she was arrested by undercover police officers on 1 October 2023. Her whereabouts remained unknown for approximately two months. On 13 December 2023, Ms. Henríquez James was sentenced to eight years' imprisonment during a trial held at La Esperanza women's prison, where she was allegedly denied legal representation, an interpreter and due process. It appears that the conviction was in response to charges brought against Ms. Henríquez James for "undermining national integrity" and "spreading false information to the detriment of the Nicaraguan State and society". Her family had expressed concern for Ms. Henríquez James' health, considering that she suffers from several chronic health conditions requiring specialized medical attention, which she was reportedly unable to receive while in detention. In March 2026, the complainant reported that Ms. Henríquez James had been released on 21 March 2026. No further information has been provided by the complainant since then.

The complainant claims that what happened to both parliamentarians is a direct consequence of their actions as indigenous leaders in opposition to the current government and of their parliamentary activities in opposition, and that there is no basis for any criminal charges against them. The complainant also reported that, Mr. Rivera Bryan and Ms. Henríquez James were removed from the list of members of the National Assembly immediately after being detained and that their parliamentary mandates were not subject to any official termination procedure.

The IPU has formally requested information and official comments from the National Assembly regarding this case on several occasions since receipt of the complaint. To date, parliament has not submitted any information, and repeated requests for support in facilitating an IPU delegation visit to Nicaragua have gone unanswered. On 5 September 2026, the National Assembly stated in a formal letter that the IPU's requests for information regarding these cases constituted interference in internal affairs.

B. Decision

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

1. *Condemns* in the strongest terms the death in State custody of Mr. Rivera Bryan after more than two and a half years of his whereabouts being concealed from his family, legal representatives, colleagues and the international community; *recalls* that persons deprived of their liberty remain under the full responsibility of the State, which has a heightened duty to protect their life, physical integrity and dignity at all times;

2. *Deeply regrets* the lack of response from the Nicaraguan parliamentary authorities to repeated requests from the Committee to provide information and official observations regarding the situation of Mr. Rivera Bryan and Ms. Henríquez James; *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; and *reiterates its call* to the National Assembly of

Nicaragua to engage in constructive and continuous dialogue with the Committee in order to ensure a resolution of this case;

3. *Reaffirms* that all allegations of enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention, ill-treatment and deaths occurring in custody must be subject to a prompt, thorough, independent, impartial and transparent investigation capable of establishing the full truth and ensuring accountability; *urges* in this regard the competent Nicaraguan authorities to carry out such an investigation into the circumstances surrounding Mr. Rivera Bryan's enforced disappearance and death, to make its findings public and to ensure that all those responsible are held accountable in accordance with Nicaraguan law and the applicable international human rights standards; *invites* the National Assembly of Nicaragua, in accordance with its constitutional mandate regarding international treaties, to consider promoting accession by Nicaragua to the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, thereby strengthening the legal and institutional framework for preventing and addressing enforced disappearances;

4. *Expresses grave concern* at reports that Mr. Rivera Bryan's remains were not returned to his family and community and that burial arrangements were carried out without the participation of his family and contrary to their wishes and cultural traditions; *solemnly recalls* that indigenous peoples have the right to manifest, practise and maintain their spiritual and cultural traditions, customs and ceremonies and to repatriate human remains via fair, transparent and effective mechanisms; in this regard, *calls* on the Nicaraguan authorities to provide full information regarding the handling of Mr. Rivera Bryan's remains and all decisions taken in that regard;

5. *Remains concerned* about the allegation that both Mr. Rivera Bryan and Ms. Henríquez James were removed from the list of members of the National Assembly without being subject to any procedure; *reiterates* its wish to receive official information on the steps taken by the National Assembly, if any, to terminate the parliamentary mandates of Mr. Rivera Bryan and Ms. Henríquez James and the legal basis for doing so;

6. *Remains concerned* also at the allegations of serious violations of the right to a fair trial in the legal proceedings against Ms. Henríquez James; *calls* on the competent authorities to provide official and detailed information on the facts justifying each of the charges brought against Ms. Henríquez James and the current status of her case;

7. *Calls* on all IPU Member Parliaments to take concrete action in support of the resolution of this case in a manner consistent with democratic and human rights values; and *hopes* to be able to rely on the assistance of all relevant regional and international organizations to that effect;

8. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the National Assembly of Nicaragua, the complainant and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information or contribute to the settlement of the case;

9. *Requests* the Committee to continue examining the case and to report back to it in due course.

Tunisia

Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 218th session (Arusha, 9 October 2026)

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

TUN-06 – Abir Moussi (Ms.)

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

Case TUN-06

Tunisia: Parliament affiliated to the IPU

Victim(s): Former female member of the opposition

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

Submission of complaint(s): October 2020

Recent IPU decision: February 2026

IPU mission(s): - - -

Recent Committee hearing(s): Hearing with the Tunisian delegation to 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: September 2026
- Communications to the authorities: Letter to the Speaker of the Assembly of People's Representatives (September 2026)
- Communication to the complainant: September 2026

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 had 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 Makhlouf 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.
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 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. On 13 March 2026, the Court of Appeal reduced this sentence to 10 years in prison. The Court of Cassation rejected Ms. Moussi's appeal on 29 September 2026.

Ms. Moussi is also the object of two complaints filed in 2022 and 2023 by the Independent High Authority for Elections (*Instance supérieure indépendante pour les élections* – ISIE), 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 2022 ISIE complaint, on 5 August 2024 Ms. Moussi received a two-year prison sentence under Article 24 of Decree-Law No. 54. On 22 November 2024, the appeal court reduced the prison sentence to 16 months. Ms. Moussi filed a cassation appeal, and the Court of Cassation referred the case back to a different panel of the Court of Appeal. On 18 February 2026, the Court of Appeal confirmed Ms. Moussi's conviction but reduced her sentence from 16 to six months in prison. Ms. Moussi completed this sentence on 26 May 2025.

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 back 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 at first instance to two years in prison. On 30 December 2025, the Tunis Court of Appeal confirmed this sentence. On 29 September 2026, the Court of Cassation rejected the cassation appeal.

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. The IPU's request to send a mission to the country 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.

The complainant also stated that Ms. Moussi's detention conditions were 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 August 2026, the complainant stated that Ms. Moussi was transferred to hospital after her health had deteriorated while in prison. Despite the Committee's requests, the parliamentary authorities have not provided any information on this case since 2024.

B. Decision

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

1. *Deeply regrets* the continued lack of concrete information from the Tunisian authorities on the case of Ms. Moussi;

2. *Deplores* the continued detention of Ms. Moussi and the confirmation on appeal of her conviction of 10 years of prison instead of 12 for exercising her right to freedom of expression and opinion while carrying out her parliamentary mandate;

3. *Condemns* the fact that this sentence is disproportionate to the acts of which Ms. Moussi is accused and the fact that there is no basis or concrete evidence to justify such a severe sentence; *is deeply concerned* about the potential repercussions of this decision and the deterrent effect that it could have on the political participation of Tunisian women and their ability to fully exercise their mandates and publicly express their opinions, in a context in which women parliamentarians can be exposed to specific forms of violence, intimidation and pressure owing to their political engagement;

4. *Recalls* that the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, in its opinion issued in 2024, concluded that Ms. Moussi's detention was arbitrary and called upon the authorities to release her immediately; *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. *Firmly reiterates* its request to the Tunisian authorities to welcome a mission from the Committee, as soon as possible, being of the opinion that such a mission would be a concrete opportunity to strengthen dialogue and cooperation with the Tunisian authorities, would enable the Committee to speak directly with the various stakeholders and better understand the situation on the ground, and would make a decisive contribution to identifying, together with the authorities, solutions that would lead to 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. *Requests* the Committee to continue examining this case and to report back to it in due course.

Tunisia

Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 218th session (Arusha, 9 October 2026)

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

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

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

Case TUN-COLL-01

Tunisia: Parliament affiliated to the IPU

Victim(s): 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 complaint(s): August, September and October 2021

Recent IPU decision: February 2026

IPU mission(s): - - -

Recent Committee hearing(s): Hearing with the parliamentary authorities during 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: September 2026
- Communications to the authorities: Letter to the Speaker of the Assembly of People's representatives (September 2026)
- Communication to the complainants; September 2026

A. Summary of the case[1]

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 and dissolution of parliament in 2021 and 2022, respectively, 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.

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. Makhlouf was arrested in Algeria for the irregular crossing of Algerian borders and was sentenced to three months in prison. While in detention, Mr. Makhlouf 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. Makhlouf was returned by the Algerian authorities on 18 January 2026 to Tunisia, where he is 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

[1] 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.

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, former Speaker of Parliament, he has been charged in at least 12 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. On 10 November 2025, the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention adopted Opinion No. 63/2025 regarding Mr. Ghannouchi's situation and concluded that his detention was arbitrary, in particular due to violations of his rights to freedom of expression and a fair trial, as well as to discriminatory measures based on his political opinions. The Working Group called on the Tunisian authorities to release him immediately.

In February 2026, Mr. Ghannouchi was sentenced to 20 years of prison in connection with the case of conspiracy against State security. On 1 June 2026, the former Speaker of Parliament was sentenced to life imprisonment, together with an additional penalty of 30 years' imprisonment for having created a "secret security apparatus" in service of *Ennahda*, the party that governed the country starting in 2011. When added together, Mr. Ghannouchi's prison sentences total 107 years, in addition to a sentence of life imprisonment.

Mr. Sayed Ferjani and Mr. Ahmed Mechergui 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. Ben Salem was allegedly released in July 2026. Ghazi Chaouachi was arrested in February 2023 in connection with a plot against State security. In November 2025, the appeals court upheld a 20-year prison sentence against him.

Mr. Ali Laraiedh, 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 March 2025, Mr. Ayachi Zammal was sentenced to over 32 years' imprisonment in cases relating to sponsorships during the presidential elections. However, on 23 July 2026, he was released after receiving a presidential pardon to mark the 69th anniversary of the proclamation of the Republic.

At the Committee's request, a meeting was held between the latter and the Tunisian 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 to the country has remained unanswered by the Tunisian authorities.

The Tunisian authorities, in their various communications to the IPU, have essentially stated that matters regarding legal proceedings fell within the remit of the judicial authorities, without providing any concrete information on the ongoing proceedings or any information that would address the

allegations raised since 2024.

B. Decision

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

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 nine former Tunisian members of parliament in connection with cases whose circumstances and underlying facts remain unclear to date; and *also deplores* 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. *Is particularly concerned* by the numerous convictions of the former Speaker of Parliament, Mr. Ghannouchi, and by the prison sentences imposed on him, which total 107 years of prison plus life imprisonment; *emphasizes* that these convictions appear to have resulted from proceedings that were seriously marred by irregularities, in particular the failure to comply with international standards regarding the right to a fair trial;

4. *Takes note* of the opinion issued in November 2025 by the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention regarding Mr. Ghannouchi's situation, in which it concluded that his detention was arbitrary, in particular due to violations of his rights to freedom of expression and a fair trial, as well as to discriminatory measures based on his political opinions, and called on the Tunisian authorities to release him immediately; *concurs* with these findings; and *urges* the Tunisian authorities to release Mr. Ghannouchi;

5. *Urges* the Tunisian authorities, once again, to immediately release the other former members of parliament detained for expressing opposition to the exceptional measures adopted by the President of the Republic and drop all charges against them and all other former members of parliament concerned in this case;

6. *Takes note* of the release of Mr. Ben Salem and Mr. Zammal; *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 from the Tunisian authorities on their situation and that of the former members of parliament who were released;

7. *Firmly reiterates* its request to the Tunisian authorities to welcome a mission from the Committee, as soon as possible, being of the opinion that such a mission would be a concrete opportunity to strengthen dialogue and cooperation with the Tunisian authorities, would enable the Committee to speak directly with the various stakeholders and better understand the situation on the ground, and would make a decisive contribution to identifying, together with the authorities, solutions that would lead to the definitive resolution of all cases concerning Tunisian former members of parliament;

8. *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;

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

Türkiye

Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 218th session (Arusha, 9 October 2026)

A demonstrator holds up a picture of Figen Yüksekdağ ,co-leader of the pro-Kurdish People's Democratic Party (HDP), in front of the court in Ankara during her trial on 13 April 2017. © ADEM ALTAN/AFP

TUR-69 – Gülser Yildirim (Ms.)
TUR-70 – Selma Irmak (Ms.)
TUR-71 – Faysal Sariyildiz
TUR-73 – Kemal Aktas
TUR-75 – Bedia Özgökçe Ertan (Ms.)
TUR-76 – Besime Konca (Ms.)
TUR-77 – Burcu Çelik Özkan (Ms.)
TUR-78 – Çağlar Demirel (Ms.)
TUR-79 – Dilek Öcalan (Ms.)
TUR-80 – Dilan Dirayet Taşdemir (Ms.)
TUR-81 – Feleknas Uca (Ms.)
TUR-82 – Figen Yüksekdağ (Ms.)
TUR-83 – Filiz Kerestecioğlu (Ms.)
TUR-84 – Hüda Kaya (Ms.)
TUR-85 – Leyla Birlik (Ms.)
TUR-86 – Leyla Zana (Ms.)
TUR-87 – Meral Daniş Beştaş (Ms.)
TUR-88 – Mizgin Irgat (Ms.)
TUR-89 – Nursel Aydoğan (Ms.)
TUR-90 – Pervin Buldan (Ms.)
TUR-91 – Saadet Becerikli (Ms.)
TUR-92 – Sibel Yiğitalp (Ms.)
TUR-93 – Tuğba Hezer Öztürk (Ms.)
TUR-94 – Abdullah Zeydan
TUR-95 – Adem Geveri
TUR-96 – Ahmet Yildirim
TUR-97 – Ali Atalan
TUR-98 – Alican Önlü
TUR-99 – Altan Tan
TUR-100 – Ayhan Bilgen
TUR-107 – Ferhat Encü
TUR-108 – Hişyar Özsoy
TUR-109 – Idris Baluken
TUR-110 – Imam Taşçier
TUR-112 – Lezgin Botan
TUR-113 – Mehmet Ali Aslan
TUR-114 – Mehmet Emin Adiyaman
TUR-115 – Nadir Yildirim
TUR-116 – Nihat Akdoğan
TUR-118 – Osman Baydemir
TUR-119 – Selahattin Demirtaş
TUR-120 – Sirri Süreyya Önder
TUR-121 – Ziya Pir
TUR-122 – Mithat Sancar
TUR-123 – Mahmut Toğrul
TUR-124 – Aycan Irmez (Ms.)
TUR-125 – Ayşe Acar Başaran (Ms.)
TUR-126 – Garo Paylan
TUR-128 – Aysel Tuğluk (Ms.)
TUR-129 – Sebahat Tuncel (Ms.)
TUR-130 – Leyla Güven (Ms.)
TUR-131 – Ayşe Sürücü (Ms.)
TUR-132 – Musa Farisogullari
TUR-133 – Emine Ayna (Ms.)
TUR-134 – Nazmi Gür
TUR-135 – Ayla Akat Ata (Ms.)
TUR-136 – Beyza Ustün (Ms.)
TUR-137 – Remziye Tosun (Ms.)
TUR-138 – Kemal Bulbul
TUR-140 – Gültan Kışanak (Ms.)

TUR-101 – Behçet Yildirim
TUR-102 – Berdan Öztürk
TUR-106 – Ertuğrul Kürkcü
TUR-141 – Semra Güzel (Ms.)
TUR-142 – Salihe Aydeniz (Ms.)
TUR-143 – Can Atalay

Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Failure to respect parliamentary immunity
- ✓ Lack of due process at the investigation stage
- ✓ Lack of fair trial proceedings and excessive delays
- ✓ Violation of freedom of opinion and expression
- ✓ Violation of freedom of assembly and association
- ✓ Arbitrary arrest and detention[5]
- ✓ Ill-treatment[6]
- ✓ Abusive revocation or suspension of the parliamentary mandate[7]

Case TUR-COLL-02

Türkiye: Parliament affiliated to the IPU

Victim(s): 66 members of the opposition (32 men and 34 women)

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

Submission of complaint(s): June 2016

Recent IPU decision: April 2026

IPU mission(s): June 2019; December 2025

Recent Committee hearing(s): Hearings with the Turkish delegation and the complainant at the 152nd and 153rd IPU Assemblies (April and October 2026)

Recent follow-up:
- Communication from the authorities: Letter from the head of the Turkish IPU Group (September 2026)
- Communication from the complainant: September 2026
- Communication to the authorities: Letter to the head of the Turkish IPU Group (September 2026)
- Communication to the complainant: September 2026

A. Summary of the case

Over 600 criminal and terrorism charges have been brought against members of parliament belonging to the People's Democratic Party (HDP) since 20 May 2016, when the Turkish Constitution was amended to authorize the wholesale lifting of parliamentary immunity. They are being tried on terrorism-related charges and for offences such as defamation of the President, Government or State of Türkiye. Some of the individuals concerned also face earlier charges linked to proceedings in connection with the Kurdistan Communities Union (*Koma Civakên Kurdistan* – KCK) while others face more recent charges. In these cases, their parliamentary immunity was allegedly not lifted.

Since November 2016, scores of parliamentarians have been detained, and others have gone into exile. Over 30 parliamentarians have been sentenced to prison terms in recent years, and several have lost their parliamentary mandates, largely as a result of their criminal convictions. Five current and former parliamentarians are in prison, namely the former HDP co-chairs, Mr. Selahattin Demirtaş and Ms. Figen Yüksekdağ, as well as Ms. Leyla Güven, Mr. Nazmi Gür and Mr. Can Atalay.

Some of the individuals concerned were arrested in September 2020 in connection with the 2014 Kobane protests. In May 2024, several former HDP parliamentarians, including Mr. Demirtaş, were convicted in this context and sentenced to lengthy prison terms, while others were acquitted or released pending appeal. Mr. Can Atalay (TUR-143), elected to parliament in 2023, also remains in prison despite an August 2024 Constitutional Court ruling declaring the revocation of his mandate null and void. The authorities have not implemented that ruling. Moreover, in October 2025, Member of Parliament Mr. Berdan Öztürk was sentenced to six years and four months in prison on charges of aiding a terrorist organization and engaging in terrorist propaganda.

According to the complainant, the charges against HDP parliamentarians are groundless and stem primarily from peaceful political speech and activities, including public statements, participation in demonstrations and other actions carried out in the exercise of their parliamentary functions, which fall within the scope of the rights to freedom of expression, assembly and association.
The European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) has, in several judgments, found violations of the

[5] Concerns only the members of parliament placed in detention, as listed in the case report (section on detention).

[6] Concerns only three male members of parliament (Mr. Adiyaman – TUR-114; Mr. Behçet Yildirim – TUR-101; Mr. Mahmut Toğrul – TUR-123) and three women members of parliament (Ms. Feleknas Uca – TUR-81, Ms. Besime Konca – TUR-76 and Ms. Sibel Yigitalp – TUR-92).

[7] Concerns 10 members of parliament (Ms. Selma Irmak – TUR-70; Mr. Faysal Sariyildiz – TUR-71; Ms. Besime Konca – TUR-76; Ms. Figen Yüksekdag – TUR-82; Ms. Leyla Birlik – TUR-85; Ms. Nursel Aydoğan – TUR-89; Ms. Tugba Hezer Oztürk – TUR-93; Mr. Ahmet Yildirim – TUR-96; Mr. Ferhat Encü – TUR-107; and Mr. Osman Baydemir – TUR-118).

rights of HDP parliamentarians, notably of the rights to freedom of expression, liberty and security and free elections, and has called for the immediate release of Mr. Demirtaş. On 8 July 2025, the ECHR delivered its judgment in *Selahattin Demirtaş v. Türkiye (No. 4)*, finding that Mr. Demirtaş's renewed detention since 2019 violated Article 5, paragraphs 1, 3 and 4, and Article 18 in conjunction with Article 5, paragraph 1 of the European Convention on Human Rights. The Court concluded that the Turkish authorities had deliberately circumvented its previous Grand Chamber judgment of 2020, which had ordered Mr. Demirtaş's release, by filing new but substantially identical charges with the aim of prolonging his detention. In September 2026, the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe called on Türkiye to secure the immediate release of Mr. Demirtaş and Ms. Yüksekdağ in the context of its supervision of the relevant judgements.

An IPU trial observer concluded in 2018 that the prospects for Ms. Yüksekdağ and Mr. Demirtaş receiving fair trials were remote and that the political nature of both prosecutions was evident. It should be noted that, on 17 July 2022, the Constitutional Court ruled in one of the cases against Ms. Yüksekdağ that her rights to freedom of thought and expression, as well as to be elected, were violated when she was stripped of her parliamentary immunity in 2016. A 2018 IPU review of 12 court decisions issued against HDP members reached similar conclusions.

The Turkish authorities reject allegations that HDP parliamentarians have been politically targeted. They stress that counter-terrorism offences require conduct linked to an organized structure and, in cases of propaganda, the legitimization, praise or encouragement of violence or coercion. The authorities also maintain that the 2016 temporary constitutional amendment on parliamentary immunity was general in scope and led to the cases of 144 parliamentarians from various political parties being referred to the judiciary. According to the authorities, only ten immunity cases concerning five parliamentarians have been approved by the relevant parliamentary committee since 2016, of which parliament has authorized judicial proceedings in three cases concerning two parliamentarians. The authorities further highlighted Türkiye's judicial independence, available domestic and international remedies and high overall rate of execution of European Court judgments. The complainant disputes that these safeguards have prevented the selective or disproportionate use of criminal proceedings against opposition parliamentarians.

On 17 March 2021, the chief prosecutor of the Turkish Court of Cassation referred a request for the dissolution of the HDP to the Constitutional Court, accusing the HDP of terrorist activities. It appears that the prosecution drew heavily on the trial against several HDP politicians in the 2014 Kobane case referred to earlier. Facing dissolution, the HDP leadership refrained from formally dissolving the party; its members decided to run in all 2023 elections under the Green Left Party (YSP) banner, a legally distinct but politically aligned structure. In October 2023, the YSP renamed itself the DEM Party (Peoples' Equality and Democratic Party), hence becoming the *de facto* successor to the HDP.

A delegation from the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians carried out an on-site mission to Türkiye from 10 to 12 December 2025. The delegation found that the legislative and jurisprudential clarifications introduced in recent years were positive but limited, and its members remained concerned by terrorism-related charges involving political speech and activities, the cumulative impact of repeated legal proceedings and the difficulties in implementing certain binding judgments. The delegation also considered that the work of the Turkish parliament's National Solidarity, Sisterhood/Brotherhood and Democracy Committee could offer an important opportunity for peace and democratic reform.

At a hearing with the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians during the 153rd IPU Assembly in October 2026, a member of the Turkish delegation belonging to the governing Justice and Development Party (AKP) highlighted the adoption of a new legislative framework by 467 of the 600 members of parliament on 10 August 2026: the Law on Strengthening National Solidarity and Social Integration, which aims to address cases linked to the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) and related organizations. The Turkish delegation member explained that, once the National Security Council had confirmed the dissolution and disarmament of the PKK and related structures, ongoing investigations, trials and sentences would be suspended for five or ten years depending on the seriousness of the offence, with pre-trial detention and judicial supervision measures lifted if the law's conditions were met. If no new offence were committed during the suspension period, proceedings would be terminated and sentences deemed fully served. According to the delegation

member, most former HDP parliamentarians and others with cases before the Committee concerning terrorism-related convictions would be eligible to benefit, subject to a written application.

B. Decision

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

1. *Thanks* the Turkish authorities for their continued cooperation with the Committee; *thanks* in particular a member of the Turkish delegation to the 153rd IPU Assembly for meeting with the Committee and providing detailed information on that occasion; and *welcomes* the authorities' ongoing readiness to engage in frank and constructive dialogue with the Committee;

2. *Welcomes* the adoption, with broad parliamentary support, of a new legislative framework intended to help resolve cases linked to the PKK and related activities; *notes with interest* that most of the former HDP parliamentarians concerned are expected to fall within the scope of this new framework and that, once its conditions are met, their investigations, prosecutions and sentences may be suspended and their detention measures lifted; and *expresses the strong hope* that the new framework will swiftly produce tangible progress, including the release of those currently detained;

3. *Expresses concern*, however, that submission of an individual written application will be required to benefit from the new framework; *considers* that once the framework has entered into force, it should in principle apply automatically to all persons investigated, prosecuted or convicted for offences that fall within its scope, rather than require them to come forward to request it; and *hopes* that implementing arrangements will be designed accordingly;

4. *Recalls* in this regard that legitimate political expression and activity should not be conflated with terrorism; *stresses* that the implementation of the new framework provides an important opportunity to remedy the consequences of criminal proceedings in which political speech and association and other legitimate parliamentary and political activities may have been treated as acts related to terrorism; and *expresses the strong hope* that the framework will be used to resolve the situations of Mr. Demirtaş, Ms. Yüksekdağ and other current and former parliamentarians concerned in this case;

5. *Notes* that binding national and international judicial decisions have yet to be implemented for several individuals concerned in this case; *highlights*, in particular, continuing calls for the release of Mr. Demirtaş and Ms. Yüksekdağ and the situation of Mr. Atalay; and *stresses* that implementation of the new framework should complement, not replace, the full and timely implementation of the aforementioned judicial decisions and the provision of effective remedies;

6. *Wishes* to be kept updated on the entry into force and implementation of the new framework, including with regard to the requirements for its application, the establishment and work of the parliamentary monitoring mechanism and the concrete implications for each of the current and former parliamentarians concerned in this case;

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

Türkiye

Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 218th session (Arusha, 9 October 2026)

Peoples' Equality and Democracy Party (DEM) on 15 October 2023 in Ankara.
© DEM Party press office

TUR-144 – Ayten Kordu (Ms.)
TUR-146 – Burcugül Çubuk (Ms.)
TUR-147 – Ceylan Akça Cupolo (Ms.)
TUR-148 – Dilan Kunt Ayan (Ms.)
TUR-149 – Fatma Kurtulan (Ms.)
TUR-151 – Gülderen Varlı (Ms.)
TUR-152 – Gülistan Kılıç Koçyiğit (Ms.)
TUR-153 – Hakkı Saruhan Oluç
TUR-154 – Hasan Özgüneş
TUR-155 – Hüseyin Kaçmaz
TUR-156 – Hüseyin Olan
TUR-157 – Kamuran Tanhan
TUR-158 – Kemal Peköz
TUR-159 – Keskin Bayındır
TUR-160 – Keziban Konukcu Kök (Ms.)
TUR-161 – Mehmet Rüştü Tiryaki
TUR-162 – Mehmet Zeki Irmez
TUR-163 – Murat Çepni
TUR-164 – Nejla Demir (Ms.)
TUR-165 – Nevroz Uysal Aslan (Ms.)
TUR-166 – Nuran İmir (Ms.)
TUR-167 – Oya Ersoy (Ms.)
TUR-168 – Pero Dundar (Ms.)
TUR-169 – Sabahat Erdoğan Sarıtaş (Ms.)
TUR-170 – Sait Dede
TUR-171 – Serhat Eren
TUR-172 – Serpil Kemalbay (Ms.)
TUR-173 – Sezai Temelli
TUR-174 – Sümeyye Boz (Ms.)
TUR-175 – Tülay Hatimoğulları Oruç (Ms.)
TUR-176 – Yılmaz Hun
TUR-177 – Zeynep Oduncu (Ms.)
TUR-178 – Zülküf Uçar
TUR-179 – Çiğdem Kılıçgün Uçar (Ms.)
TUR-180 – Ömer Öcalan
TUR-181 – Öznur Bartin (Ms.)
TUR-182 – Ömer Faruk Gergerlioğlu
TUR-184 – Çiçek Otlu (Ms.)
TUR-185 – George Aslan
TUR-186 – Heval Bozdağ
TUR-187 – Sinan Çiftyürek

Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Ill-treatment
- ✓ 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

Case TUR-COLL-04

Türkiye: Parliament affiliated to the IPU

Victim(s): 41 opposition members of parliament (20 men and 21 women)

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

Submission of complaint(s): March 2025

Recent IPU decision: April 2026

IPU mission(s): December 2025

Recent Committee hearing(s): Hearings with the Turkish delegation and the complainant at the 152nd and 153rd IPU Assemblies (April and October 2026)

Recent follow-up:
- Communication from the authorities: Letter from the head of the Turkish IPU Group (September 2026)
- Communication from the complainant: September 2026
- Communication to the authorities: Letter to the head of the Turkish IPU Group (September 2026)
- Communication to the complainant: September 2026

A. Summary of the case

This case concerns 41 incumbent and former opposition parliamentarians from the Peoples' Equality and Democracy Party (DEM), the Democratic Regions Party (DBP), and the Peoples' Democratic Party (HDP) in Türkiye. The alleged violations concerning them span from 2018 to 2025 and reflect an intensifying pattern of harassment, intimidation, criminal prosecution and violence targeting Kurdish and other opposition parliamentarians.

According to the complainant, the alleged violations occurred across Türkiye, particularly in provinces with significant Kurdish populations and in Ankara, where legal proceedings are handled by the investigative bureau for parliamentary crimes. Incidents reportedly took place during demonstrations, party events, parliamentary debates and peaceful marches, including the "Great Freedom March" in February 2024 and protests over electoral interventions in Van and Bitlis in April 2024. Other allegations relate to earlier events, including the 2014 Kobane protests and Newroz celebrations between 2019 and 2023.

The complainant states that many parliamentarians face investigation or prosecution for offences such as "terrorist propaganda", "membership in a terrorist organization", "incitement", or "participation in unlawful assemblies", often in connection with speeches, demonstrations, funerals, social media posts or political activities. Several parliamentarians have also faced travel restrictions, police raids and passport confiscations. Four current members of parliament – Ms. Fatma Kurtulan, Ms. Ayşe Acar Başaran, Ms. Besime Konca and Ms. Pero Dundar – have sought asylum abroad, citing fear of persecution.

Several members of parliament, including female members, reported physical assaults, intimidation, and surveillance by law enforcement, particularly during protests in Hakkari, Van, Silopi, İzmir, Şanlıurfa and Diyarbakır. Complaints of police violence are reportedly frequently dismissed or remain unresolved, contributing to a climate of impunity. Smear campaigns and death threats, often amplified by senior government officials, have allegedly further undermined the safety of members of parliament and their ability to represent their constituents.

According to the complainant, most of the legal proceedings are handled by public prosecutors' offices in Ankara and involve the use of anti-terrorism laws and related legislation restricting political speech and activity. Parliamentary immunity has allegedly been disregarded or lifted in summary proceedings in numerous cases. Although none of the 41 parliamentarians in this case have been convicted at final instance, the complainant argues that overlapping investigations, prosecutions, threats, restrictions and alleged violence impair their ability to carry out their mandates and, in some cases, to continue their political careers after leaving parliament. The complainant also stated that scores of parliamentarians were the object of *fezleke*: prosecutorial case summaries that are sent to the Grand National Assembly of Türkiye requesting the lifting of parliamentary immunity so that criminal proceedings may be pursued. At a hearing with the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians during the 152nd IPU Assembly in April 2026, a member of the Turkish delegation belonging to the governing Justice and Development Party (AKP) stated that *fezleke* are rarely acted

upon; unless they concern serious matters, they are generally not considered until the end of a parliamentarian's mandate.

The complainant argues that the above developments are part of a broader trend of deteriorating democratic space in Türkiye and the use of the judiciary and other State institutions to target legitimate opposition voices. The Turkish authorities reject this characterization, arguing that criminal proceedings are based on individual conduct and the applicable law, that parliamentary immunity does not remove criminal responsibility and that judicial independence and effective remedies are constitutionally guaranteed.

Similarly, a delegation of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians that travelled to Türkiye in December 2025 heard very different assessments from the authorities, the opposition and legal counsel. Delegation members welcomed certain legal reforms and the authorities' willingness to engage but considered that the pressures affecting opposition parliamentarians had not fundamentally changed. The delegation remained concerned by repeated legal proceedings linked to political expression and assembly, allegations of excessive use of force against parliamentarians, the ongoing effects of the wholesale lifting of parliamentary immunity in 2016 and the difficulties encountered in implementing certain binding judicial decisions. The delegation also found, however, that a new peace process being launched could provide an opportunity to move towards a more inclusive political framework, provided it was accompanied by concrete reforms in the areas of human rights, rule of law and public institutions.

As part of renewed efforts to end the armed conflict with the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) and address the political and social consequences of the conflict, the Turkish parliament created the National Solidarity, Sisterhood/Brotherhood and Democracy Committee, which adopted a report in February 2026. At a hearing with the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians during the 153rd IPU Assembly in October 2026, a member of the Turkish delegation belonging to the governing AKP highlighted that the report had resulted in the adoption of a new legislative framework by 467 of the 600 members of parliament on 10 August 2026: the Law on Strengthening National Solidarity and Social Integration, which aims to address cases linked to the PKK and related organizations. The Turkish delegation member explained that, once the National Security Council had confirmed the dissolution and disarmament of the PKK and related structures, ongoing investigations, trials and sentences would be suspended for five or ten years depending on the seriousness of the offence, with pre-trial detention and judicial supervision measures lifted if the law's conditions were met. If no new offence were committed during the suspension period, proceedings would be terminated and sentences deemed fully served. According to the delegation member, most former HDP parliamentarians and others with cases before the Committee concerning terrorism-related convictions would be eligible to benefit, subject to a written application. The delegation member also stated that a parliamentary committee would monitor implementation of the new framework and that parliament and the Ministry of Justice were preparing an initiative to review and discontinue pending *fezleke* where no prosecution was being pursued.

During the session of the Committee held during the 153rd IPU Assembly, the complainant brought further allegations of human rights violations affecting opposition parliamentarians. It was not possible for the Committee to review those allegations during its session, and any necessary follow-up action was planned for after the session.

B. Decision

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

1. *Thanks* the Turkish authorities for their continued cooperation with the Committee; *thanks* in particular the member of the Turkish delegation to the 153rd IPU Assembly for meeting with the Committee and providing relevant information on that occasion; and *welcomes* the authorities' ongoing readiness to engage in frank and constructive dialogue with the Committee;

2. *Welcomes* the adoption, with broad parliamentary support, of the new legislative framework intended to help resolve cases linked to the PKK and related activities; *expresses the hope* that, where applicable, the framework will help bring to an end to ongoing investigations, prosecutions and other restrictions affecting the current and former parliamentarians concerned

in this case; and *wishes* to be kept informed of its concrete implications for them;

3. *Recalls* that legitimate political activities, participation in peaceful demonstrations and other forms of legitimate political expression should not be conflated with terrorism; and *hopes* that the implementation of the new framework will provide an opportunity to review and resolve proceedings in which such activities may have been treated as acts related to terrorism;

4. *Welcomes* the Turkish delegation's acknowledgement of the problems arising from the large number of pending *fezleke*, as well as the announced initiative by parliament and the Ministry of Justice to review and discontinue those for which no prosecution is being pursued; *expresses the hope* that this initiative will lead to a system in which *fezleke* are not systematically used against parliamentarians, even if left pending, but rather are used only where there is a concrete basis and genuine likelihood of prosecution; and *hopes*, in particular, that pending *fezleke* concerning parliamentarians concerned in this case will be promptly reviewed;

5. *Remains concerned* by the allegations of manhandling, ill-treatment, threats and intimidation by law-enforcement officials in several of the cases under examination; *stresses* that parliamentarians must be able to exercise their rights to freedom of expression and peaceful assembly without fear of violence or intimidation; and *trusts* that allegations of such conduct will be subject to prompt, independent and effective investigation and that appropriate remedies will be provided where violations are confirmed;

6. *Wishes* to be kept updated on the implementation of the new legislative framework, the review of pending *fezleke* and action taken in response to the allegations of violence, ill-treatment and intimidation committed against the parliamentarians concerned in this case;

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

Uganda

Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 218th session (Arusha, 9 October 2026)

© Muwanga Kivumbi

UGA-28 – Muwanga Kivumbi

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, towards the end of the general election day on 15 January 2026, in Butambala District, Mr. Muwanga Kivumbi, an opposition member of parliament, collected declaration of results (DR) forms from his designated representatives in order to analyse the results. The DR form is the official document used at polling stations to record and formally declare the votes counted at the respective stations. The complainant reported that Mr. Kivumbi used his garage at home as the location for tallying the forms, an exercise that went on late into the night and early the next morning.

According to the complainant, while the tallying was taking place, military personnel arrived at Mr. Kivumbi's residence and opened fire on the garage, resulting in the death of approximately 10 individuals. The complainant stated that Mr. Kivumbi attempted to approach the scene but was prevented by his family, who feared he would also be killed. The complainant further alleges that the operation may have been linked to an intention to seize or destroy the DR forms from candidates who had won, thereby undermining their ability to rely on them as evidence in potential legal proceedings.

Case UGA-28

Uganda: Parliament affiliated to the IPU

Victim(s): Male member of the opposition

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

Submission of complaint(s): April 2026

Recent IPU decision: - - -

IPU mission(s): - - -

Recent Committee hearing(s):
Hearing with the delegation of Uganda to the 153rd IPU Assembly (October 2026)

Recent follow-up:
- Communication(s) from the authorities: Letter from the Speaker of Parliament (October 2026)
- Communication from the complainant: July 2026
- Communication to the authorities: Letter to the Speaker of the National Assembly (August 2026)
- Communication to the complainant: July 2026

According to the complainant, Mr. Kivumbi was arrested on 22 January 2026. His whereabouts were initially unknown, but it was later established that he had been taken to Kira Road Police Station. The complainant further stated that, later that day, Mr. Kivumbi was transferred to the Chief Magistrate's Court of Butambala, where he was charged with terrorism and remanded in custody. The matter was subsequently transferred to the international crimes division of the High Court for trial. Mr. Kivumbi stands accused, together with 24 co-accused, of orchestrating and carrying out a violent attack on Kibibi Police Station and the Butambala Electoral Commission Tally Centre while the election results were being counted, which allegedly caused material damage and resulted in the death of seven people. Mr. Kivumbi denies these allegations. The complainant stated that the criminal proceedings were politically motivated.

At a hearing with the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians held during the 153rd IPU Assembly in October 2026, the Ugandan delegation, led by the Speaker of Parliament, stated that the allegations against Mr. Kivumbi remain unproven and must be heard by a competent court through a fair and impartial judicial process. The delegation emphasized that, under Uganda's Constitution and other applicable laws, the burden of proof lies with the prosecution and that Mr. Kivumbi continues to be presumed innocent. According to the delegation, the granting of bail by the courts shows that they have exercised their independent judicial mandate in determining the appropriate treatment of a defendant pending trial and have not interfered with the criminal proceedings, the outcome of which the courts will decide based on the merits of the case. The delegation further stressed that neither parliamentary membership nor political affiliation confers immunity from investigation and prosecution for offences allegedly committed outside the legitimate exercise of parliamentary functions, and that political opposition to the government is not, in itself, a basis for criminal prosecution. The delegation added that Mr. Kivumbi enjoys full due-process rights, including the right to legal representation, the right to apply for bail and the right to have the charges heard by a competent and independent court. The delegation further stated that the Government was committed to safeguarding the constitutional rights of all criminal defendants, irrespective of their political affiliation and whether they held public office, while respecting the independence of the judiciary and upholding Mr. Kivumbi's constitutional rights as the legal process unfolds. The Speaker of Parliament also invited the Committee to visit Uganda at the earliest possible opportunity.

The complainant also submitted allegations concerning events that took place after Mr. Kivumbi's parliamentary mandate ended in May 2026, which fall outside the Committee's mandate.

B. Decision

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

1. *Notes* that this complaint is admissible, considering that it: (i) was submitted in due form by a qualified complainant under Section I.1.(c) of the Procedure for the examination and treatment of complaints (Annex I of the revised Rules and Practices of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians); (ii) concerns an incumbent member of parliament at the time of the alleged facts; and (iii) deals with allegations of arbitrary arrest and detention and lack of due process in proceedings against parliamentarians, which fall within the Committee's mandate;

2. *Thanks* the Speaker of Parliament of Uganda for the extensive information provided, both in writing and at the hearing with the Committee during the 153rd IPU Assembly, for his willingness to engage in constructive dialogue with the Committee and for the invitation for a Committee delegation to visit Uganda at the earliest opportunity to further discuss the outstanding issues in this case and in other Ugandan cases currently before the Committee;

3. *Expresses concern* that Mr. Kivumbi has been charged with terrorism – an offence that may, under certain circumstances, carry the death penalty under Ugandan law – in connection with events that occurred during the general elections while he was seeking re-election as an opposition candidate; *takes note* of the authorities' position in this regard but also of the allegations that the proceedings may be politically motivated; and *recalls* the importance of ensuring that any investigation and judicial proceedings are conducted in full compliance with international fair-trial guarantees and are free of any political interference;

4. *Expresses concern* also at the allegations that military personnel opened fire on Mr. Kivumbi's

residence on election day, resulting in the deaths of several individuals, and that the operation may have been aimed at destroying evidence that could have been used to legally challenge the election results; *recalls* the State's obligation to ensure a prompt, independent, impartial and effective investigation into these allegations, in accordance with international human rights standards*;* and *wishes* to receive detailed information on any investigative, judicial or other measures taken to establish the facts and ensure accountability where warranted;

5. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the Parliament of Uganda and the complainant;

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

Zimbabwe

Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 218th session (Arusha, 9 October 2026)

Still from a live video shared by Mr. Takudzwa Ngadziore seconds before his abduction on 1 November 2023.
© Facebook

ZWE-70 – Takudzwa Ngadziore

Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Abduction
- ✓ Torture, ill-treatment and other acts of violence
- ✓ Threats, acts of intimidation
- ✓ Impunity

A. Summary of the case

Mr. Takudzwa Ngadziore is the youngest parliamentarian to be elected in the 2023 general elections in Zimbabwe. He is the Chairperson of the Youth Taskforce of the Citizens Coalition for Change (CCC) opposition party.

According to the complainant, as Mr. Ngadziore was making his way to parliament's pre-budget seminar on 1 November 2023, he was met by a group of men armed with AK-47 assault rifles who disembarked from six vehicles and abducted him, forcing him into one of their vehicles. The complainant shared a live Facebook video filmed by Mr. Ngadziore as the events were unfolding.

The complainant adds that the gang that abducted Mr. Ngadziore was equipped with guns, tasers, syringes and baton sticks. According to the complainant, Mr. Ngadziore was blindfolded and taken to Christon Bank in Mazoe, about 30

Case ZWE-70

Zimbabwe: Parliament affiliated to the IPU

Victim(s): Male member of the opposition

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

Submission of complaint(s): November 2023

Recent IPU decision: February 2024

IPU mission(s): - - -

Recent Committee hearing(s): - - -

Recent follow-up:
- Communication(s) from the authorities: Letter from the Speaker of the National Assembly (February 2025)
- Communication from the complainant: January 2026
- Communication to the authorities: Letter to the Speaker of the National Assembly (September 2026)
- Communication to the complainant: September 2026

kilometres north of Harare, where he was tortured and questioned about his political plans. The complainant also reports that Mr. Ngadziore was injected with an unknown substance, stripped naked and left for dead in Christon Bank, Mazoe. According to the complainant, Mr. Ngadziore was then taken to hospital, where he received emergency treatment. The complainant has shared photos showing the scars caused by the torture and violence meted out by the abductors.

The complainant stresses that Mr. Ngadziore was the third CCC official to be abducted and injected with an unknown substance since the disputed 23 August 2023 elections in Zimbabwe. The complainant claims that a member of the CCC Youth Taskforce, Mr. Womberal Nhende, and a former member of parliament, Mr. James Chidhakwa, were also recently abducted, tortured, subjected to injections and dumped by a roadside. The complainant stresses that these cases were not properly investigated by the authorities and have remained unpunished. In the case of Mr. Ngadziore, the complainant highlights that the video made by the victim at the time of the abduction enables the identification of some of the perpetrators, namely police officers Mr. Nicholas Kajese, Mr. Abraham Pasi and Mr. Ishmael Mada, who are reportedly stationed at the Harare Central Police Station.

The complainant reports that the video quickly went viral and put pressure on the authorities to release Mr. Ngadziore without having him killed, unlike the late Pastor Tapfumaneyi Masaya, who, according to the complainant, was abducted by armed men on 11 November 2023 and found dead two days later. The complainant specifies that Pastor Masaya was abducted while he was campaigning on behalf of a CCC parliamentarian who was standing in a by-election in his constituency following a decision to revoke the mandate of 23 parliamentarians on the basis of a letter from an impostor claiming to be the CCC Secretary General. According to the complainant, since then an additional 18 parliamentarians have been stripped of their mandate and arbitrarily prevented from taking part in by-elections in their constituencies.

Also according to the complainant, this situation should be seen within the context of increased repression against the opposition and the closing of civic space that followed the disputed elections of 2023, which saw the ruling ZANU-PF party lose its two-thirds majority in parliament.

The complainant alleges that a report regarding Mr. Ngadziore's abduction and torture was made to the police but that no action has been taken to investigate. However, in a meeting with the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians during the 153rd IPU Assembly in October 2026, the Speaker of the National Assembly of Zimbabwe stated that the case could not be investigated because the police claim that they have not received a report from the victim. The Speaker stated further that this explains the lack of progress in establishing accountability and stressed that Mr. Ngadziore can lodge a complaint with the High Court, the Constitutional Court of Zimbabwe and the National Human Rights Commission.

B. Decision

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

1. *Thanks* the Speaker of the National Assembly for the information provided in a meeting with the Committee regarding this case and for his readiness to facilitate the exchange of information in relation to all cases in Zimbabwe; *takes note* of the Speaker's statement that the lack of progress in establishing accountability for the abduction and torture of Mr. Ngadziore is due to the fact that the police have not received a report from the complainant; *hopes* to be able to carry out a mission to Zimbabwe to meet with all relevant stakeholders with a view to bringing about a satisfactory resolution of this case;

2. *Condemns once again* both the abduction of Mr. Ngadziore, allegedly by police officers working in plain clothes, and the reported acts of torture inflicted upon him; and *reaffirms* that such attacks against parliamentarians can never be tolerated;

3. *Finds it disturbing* that this unconscionable attack on a sitting parliamentarian has not yet been duly investigated and that his captors remain at large, even though their appearance in the live video recorded and shared by Mr. Ngadziore at the moment he was abducted allowed them to be easily identified;

4. *Stresses* once again that these crimes must not go unpunished; *recalls* that impunity, by

shielding those responsible from judicial action and accountability, decisively encourages the perpetration of further serious human rights violations, and that attempts on the lives 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, all the more so when leading figures of parliament and the opposition are targeted in the context of a broader pattern of repression, as in the present case;

5. *Rejects* the view that the absence of a formal complaint by Mr. Ngadziore releases the competent authorities from their obligation to investigate the allegations concerning his abduction and torture; *recalls* that, under international human rights law, allegations of torture or other serious ill-treatment must be investigated promptly, thoroughly, independently and impartially whenever the authorities have reasonable grounds to believe that such acts may have occurred, irrespective of whether the victim has lodged a formal complaint; *considers* that the public nature and seriousness of the allegations concerning Mr. Ngadziore are sufficient to require the competent authorities to act on their own initiative; and *urges* the authorities, therefore, to open, without further delay, an effective investigation capable of identifying those responsible and holding them to account;

6. *Reaffirms its view* that the Parliament of Zimbabwe has a direct responsibility for ensuring that every effort is made by all relevant authorities to investigate thoroughly and diligently the many leads and concerns that have emerged, to identify and punish those responsible for the reported abduction and torture of one of its members and to do everything possible to ensure that such violations do not recur in the future, including by exercising effective oversight over law enforcement institutions; *urges* parliament to take decisive and effective measures to this end; and *wishes* to be kept informed of progress made in this regard;

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

*

* *