



# Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

Distr.: General  
12 October 2020

Original: English

---

## Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

### Report of the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities on its twenty-third session (17 August to 4 September 2020)

#### I. States parties to the Convention and the Optional Protocol thereto

1. As at 4 September 2020, the date on which the twenty-third session closed, there were 182 States parties to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and 97 States parties to the Optional Protocol thereto. The lists of States parties to these instruments are available on the website of the Office of Legal Affairs of the Secretariat.

#### II. Opening of the twenty-third session of the Committee

2. The twenty-third session opened in a public meeting with welcoming remarks by the Chair of the Committee. The opening statement of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) was delivered by the Chief, Human Rights Treaties Branch, Human Rights Council and Treaty Mechanisms Division, and is available on the Committee's website. The Chair delivered an oral report on intersessional activities, which is also available on the Committee's website.

3. The Committee reviewed and adopted the provisional agenda and tentative programme of work for the twenty-third session (CRPD/C/23/1/Rev.1).

#### III. Membership of the Committee

4. The list of members of the Committee as at 4 September 2020, indicating the duration of their terms of office, is available on the Committee's website.

#### IV. Working methods

5. The Committee discussed various issues related to its working methods.

#### V. Activities related to general comments

6. The Committee continued its work to prepare a general comment on article 27 of the Convention, on the right to work and employment, and decided to hold a day of general discussion on the subject at its twenty-fourth session.



## **VI. Activities related to the Optional Protocol**

7. The Committee examined seven communications. It found violations of the Convention in four of them: *J.M. v. Spain* (CRPD/C/23/D/37/2016), concerning the right to non-discrimination in the maintenance or continuance of employment in the public sector; *Calleja Loma and Calleja Lucas v. Spain* (CRPD/C/23/D/41/2017), regarding the right of a minor to inclusive education; *Sahlin v. Sweden* (CRPD/C/23/D/45/2018), regarding the provision of reasonable accommodation in the context of a recruitment process at a public university; and *N.L. v. Sweden* (CRPD/C/23/D/60/2019), regarding deportation of the author to Iraq where she would be at risk from ill-treatment. The Committee declared two communications inadmissible, for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies and lack of substantiation in *F.O.F. v. Brazil* (CRPD/C/23/D/40/2017) and for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies in *A.N.P. v. South Africa* (CRPD/C/23/D/73/2019). The Committee decided to discontinue the consideration of *N.N. and N.L. v. Germany* (CRPD/C/23/D/29/2015), as the subject matter of the communication had become moot.

8. The Committee adopted the report of the Special Rapporteur for follow-up on Views (CRPD/C/23/3). In that connection, it decided to continue the follow-up procedure with regard to *Makarov v. Lithuania* (CRPD/C/18/D/30/2015), *Medina Vela v. Mexico* (CRPD/C/22/D/32/2015) and *V.F.C. v. Spain* (CRPD/C/21/D/34/2015). A summary of the Views and decisions adopted by the Committee regarding communications is available in annex II to the present report.

## **VII. Other decisions**

9. The Committee adopted the present report on its twenty-third session.

10. The full list of the decisions adopted by the Committee is available in annex I to the present report.

## **VIII. Future sessions**

11. The twenty-fourth session of the Committee is scheduled to be held in Geneva from 8 to 26 March 2021 and will be followed by the fourteenth meeting of the pre-sessional working group, from 29 March to 1 April 2021.

## **IX. Accessibility of the Committee's meetings**

12. The twenty-third session of the Committee was held virtually. Members and participants used an online platform for simultaneous interpretation in the three working languages of the Committee, International Sign interpretation and remote captioning were provided. The platform was not compatible with screen-reader software, used by the six members of the Committee who are blind, who were obliged to depend on the support of personal assistants to participate in the meetings, contrary to the principles of the Convention. Only a few personal assistants of members with disabilities qualified for compensation for their work under the United Nations rules governing travel. No plain language, Easy Read or Braille versions of documents were available during the session.

## **X. Cooperation with relevant bodies**

### **A. Cooperation with United Nations organs and specialized agencies**

13. At the opening meeting of the session, representatives of the following United Nations agencies, departments, programmes and bodies made statements: the Human Rights Council task force on secretariat services, accessibility for persons for disabilities and use of information technology, the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the World Intellectual Property Organization, the Committee on Victim Assistance under the Convention on the

Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, the International Labour Organization and the United Nations Mine Action Service. The Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities also addressed the Committee.

14. At the closing meeting, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) addressed the Committee.

## **B. Cooperation with non-governmental organizations and other bodies**

15. At the opening meeting of the session, the Committee was addressed by representatives of the International Disability Alliance, the Center for the Human Rights of Users and Survivors of Psychiatry and the COVID-19 Disability Rights Monitor Coordinating Group.

16. Also at the opening meeting, a representative of the European Network of Equality Bodies addressed the Committee on the subject of participation and engagement by independent monitoring frameworks and national human rights institutions.

17. On 19 August 2020, the Committee met in private with representatives of more than 20 organizations of persons with disabilities and other civil society organizations, national human rights institutions with A and B status, which were members of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions, independent monitoring frameworks under article 33 (2) of the Convention and equality bodies to discuss the impact of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic on persons with disabilities. Stakeholders shared their experiences in advocating and monitoring the rights of persons with disabilities during the pandemic and provided the Committee with written and oral information on the major areas of concern to be addressed in order to protect the rights of persons with disabilities during the resulting humanitarian emergency.

18. At the closing meeting of the session, a video message from the Chair of the Working Group on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions was delivered.

## **XI. Consideration of reports submitted in accordance with article 35 of the Convention**

19. Owing to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Committee was unable to hold dialogues with States parties.

20. At its fourteenth session, which would be held virtually immediately after the present session of the Committee, the pre-sessional working group would adopt lists of issues in relation to Andorra, Bahrain, Burkina Faso, Israel, Kazakhstan, Togo and Zambia and lists of issues under the simplified reporting procedure in relation to Chile and Qatar.

## Annex I

### Decisions adopted by the Committee at its twenty-third session

1. The Committee considered seven individual communications submitted for its consideration under the Optional Protocol to the Convention. It found violations of the Convention in four of them, declared two inadmissible and decided to discontinue the consideration of the other. The Views and decisions would be transmitted to the parties as soon as possible and would subsequently be made public.
2. The Committee adopted a follow-up progress report on individual communications (CRPD/C/23/3).
3. Noting the contributions of organizations of persons with disabilities and national human rights institutions received during the session, which evidenced various violations of the human rights of persons with disabilities in the context of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic, especially of older persons with disabilities and persons with intellectual or psychosocial disabilities who were still institutionalized, the Committee decided that the closing remarks of the Chair of the Committee should consist of a statement on measures to prevent and address such violations.
4. The Committee decided to advance its work with the Committee on the Rights of the Child, the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women) and the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, with a view to adopting joint statements. The Committee acknowledged the role that UNICEF could play in supporting the process leading to a joint statement between the Committee on the Rights of the Child and the Committee. While concerned about a white paper issued by a regional office of UNICEF, which appeared not to be in accordance with the Convention, the Committee welcomed the fact that UNICEF would include a disclaimer on its website and on the document itself indicating that the white paper did not represent the views of the entity.
5. The Committee decided to appoint two of its members to the informal inter-committee working group on COVID-19.
6. The Committee decided to establish a working group to support deinstitutionalization.
7. The Committee decided to continue its work to prepare a general comment on article 27 of the Convention, on the rights of persons with disabilities to work and employment, with a view to adopting a draft outline, describing the content of the general comment, on which consultations would be held with all interested parties. It decided to hold a day of general discussion on the subject at its twenty-fourth session.
8. The Committee recognized and congratulated the outgoing Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities, Catalina Devandas-Aguilar, on her work over the past six years in promoting and protecting the rights of persons with disabilities. The Committee endorsed the International Principles and Guidelines on Access to Justice for Persons with Disabilities, published jointly in August 2020 by the Special Rapporteur and the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General on Disability and Accessibility.
9. The Committee decided to continue cooperation with United Nations entities, agencies, programmes, departments and units in the implementation of the United Nations Disability Inclusion Strategy.
10. The Committee decided to draw the attention of the President of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General and all the entities concerned to the issue of the inclusion of persons with disabilities in the work of the United Nations and the challenges of accessibility, universal design and reasonable accommodation in the context of the Committee's work performed virtually. The position of the Committee was that digital platforms should be accessible to all members with disabilities and allow them to perform their work independently and with autonomy. As members had been forced to rely on their personal assistants, the latter should be fully compensated, on grounds of reasonable

accommodation. Moreover, existing frameworks, such as the travel rules and regulations, were inappropriate to respond to the disability-specific support required by individual members with disabilities to ensure remote participation.

11. The Committee recognized the work, dedication and commitment of the members of the Committee whose mandate would end on 31 December 2020.

12. The Committee decided that its twenty-fourth session would be held in Geneva from 8 to 26 March 2021, subject to confirmation by the Secretariat of the feasibility of an in-person session. At that session, the Committee would consider the initial reports of Bangladesh, Djibouti, Estonia, France, Jamaica and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). In the event that an in-person session was not possible, the Chair of the Committee, with the support of the Secretary, would decide on the appropriate course of action.

13. The Committee requested the pre-sessional working group, at its fourteenth session – which would be held immediately after the twenty-third session of the Committee, from 4 to 18 September 2020 – to adopt lists of issues in relation to Andorra, Bahrain, Burkina Faso, Israel, Kazakhstan, Togo and Zambia and lists of issues under the Committee's simplified reporting procedure in relation to Chile and Qatar.

14. The Committee decided that the fifteenth session of the pre-sessional working group would be held from 29 March to 1 April 2021. The Chair of the Committee, with the support of the Secretary, would identify the lists of issues and lists of issues prior to reporting to be adopted by the pre-sessional working group at that session.

## Annex II

### Summary of the Views and decisions adopted by the Committee regarding communications submitted under the Optional Protocol

#### *Sahlin v. Sweden*

1. The Committee examined the communication in the case of *Sahlin v. Sweden* (CRPD/C/23/D/45/2018). The author, who was deaf, claimed violations of his rights under articles 27 (1) (b), (g) and (i), 5 (2) and (3), 3 and 4 (2) of the Convention in the context of a recruitment process for a position as lecturer (associate professor) in public law at a public university. The author had been considered to be the most qualified candidate for the position by the recruiters, and had been given the opportunity to give a trial lecture as a step in the recruitment process. Despite his qualifications, the university had cancelled the recruitment process, claiming that it would be too expensive to finance sign language interpretation as a means of guaranteeing the author's right to employment on an equal basis with others.

2. The author had filed a complaint to the Equality Ombudsman, which had brought a civil suit on his behalf before the Labour Court, claiming that the decision to cancel the position had been discriminatory, in violation of the Discrimination Act (2008:567). On 11 October 2017, the Court had found that the university had not discriminated against the author, considering that the appointment had been cancelled because it had been too expensive for the university to finance the required sign language interpretation. It had found that it was not reasonable to demand that the university finance interpreting expenses. The author claimed that the State party had failed to ensure his equal right to work and to provide him with reasonable accommodation in employment. He further claimed that the university had failed to assess whether other measures of reasonable accommodation could have been taken to enable him to perform the functions of the position for which he had applied.

3. In its Views, the Committee recalled that, in accordance with article 27 (a) of the Convention, States parties had a responsibility to prohibit discrimination on the basis of disability with regard to all matters concerning all forms of employment. The Committee also recalled that under article 2 of the Convention, "reasonable accommodation" meant necessary and appropriate modification and adjustments not imposing a disproportionate or undue burden, where needed in a particular case, to ensure to persons with disabilities the enjoyment or exercise on an equal basis with others of all human rights and fundamental freedoms. The Committee further recalled that, under article 5 of the Convention, States parties were required to prohibit all forms of discrimination against persons with disabilities, an obligation that included the denial of reasonable accommodation and that was not subject to progressive realization. It noted that the duty bearer must enter into a dialogue with individuals with disabilities, for the purposes of including them in the process of finding solutions to better realize their rights and building their capacities.

4. The Committee recalled that the process of seeking reasonable accommodation should be cooperative and interactive and aim to strike the best possible balance between the needs of the employee and those of the employer. In determining which reasonable accommodation measures to adopt, the State party must ensure that the public authorities identify the effective adjustments that could be made to enable the employee to carry out key duties. In the author's case, the Committee noted that on various occasions the author had suggested alternative measures of accommodation to the university and to the Equality Ombudsman, in the hope that that specialized public authority would raise the issue before the courts, enabling them to consider whether other funding measures had been available to facilitate the author's employment through everyday interpretation and an annual wage subsidy. The Committee considered that the decisions and interventions of the State party authorities had limited the possibility of persons with disabilities being selected for positions requiring adaptation of the working environment to their needs. In particular, it considered that the Labour Court's assessment of the requested support and adaptation measure had upheld the denial of reasonable accommodation, resulting in a de facto

discriminatory exclusion of the author from the position for which he had applied, in violation of his rights under articles 5 and 27 of the Convention.

***J.M. v. Spain***

5. The Committee examined the communication in the case of *J.M. v. Spain* (CRPD/C/23/D/37/2016). In 2008, the author had suffered a traffic accident that had left him with a permanent disability. Subsequently, the Ministry of Labour and Immigration had declared the author's status was one of permanent total disability for the performance of his occupation, and he had been granted a pension equivalent to 55 per cent of his salary. In 2009, the author had submitted an application to Figueras Municipal Council requesting it to assign him to "modified duty", which had been rejected, and he had been required to take mandatory retirement. The author had submitted an application for a review of the Council's decision. The application had been rejected on the basis that a declaration of "permanent total disability" was a ground for mandatory retirement, and that modified duty was not an option as it had enacted no regulations to that effect. The author had filed appeals before all the judicial bodies available at the national level and all his requests had been denied. The author claimed a violation of his rights under article 27 (a), (b), (e), (g), (i) and (k), read alone and in conjunction with articles 3 (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e); 4 (1) (a), (b) and (d) and (5); 5 (1), (2) and (3); and 13 (2) of the Convention. He claimed that the State party, in the absence of regulations at the local level, had discriminated against him by depriving him of the possibility of continuing to work under modified duty, on the grounds of his "permanent total disability for usual occupation".

6. In its Views, the Committee noted that the rules under which the author had been prevented from undertaking a modified-duty assignment or entering into a dialogue aimed at enabling him to carry out activities complementary to the usual tasks of police work contravened the rights enshrined in articles 5 and 27 of the Convention. The Committee noted that the State party must comply with its general obligations, under article 4 of the Convention, to modify and harmonize all local, autonomous-community and national provisions that barred individuals from being assigned to modified duty without providing for an assessment of the challenges and opportunities that persons with disabilities might have, and that thereby violated the right to work. The Committee found that the author's mandatory retirement as a result of a traffic accident that had left him with a permanent disability had constituted a violation of article 27 (a), (b), (e), (g), (i) and (k), read alone and in conjunction with articles 3 (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e); 4 (1) (a), (b) and (d) and (5); and 5 (1), (2) and (3) of the Convention.

***Calleja Loma and Calleja Lucas v. Spain***

7. The Committee examined the communication in the case of *Calleja Loma and Calleja Lucas v. Spain* (CRPD/C/23/D/41/2017). The authors of the communication were a minor and his father, who had challenged the decision of the State party authorities to enrol the minor in a special education centre on account of his Down Syndrome. The child had initially been enrolled in a mainstream school with the support of a special education assistant. He claimed that in 2009, then aged 10 and upon entering grade 4 of compulsory education, he had been subjected to discrimination, neglect and abuse at the school. The authors claimed that despite complaints raised by the parents with the domestic authorities, the allegations had not been adequately investigated. In 2011, the Provincial Directorate of Education had decided to enrol the child in a special education centre without taking the opinion of his parents into account. The parents had unsuccessfully challenged the decision before the courts. In addition, criminal charges had been brought against the parents because of their refusal to bring their child to a special education centre.

8. In its Views, the Committee found that the State party had violated the child's right to an inclusive education as, among other reasons, it had not adopted legislation or policies that ensured that right and it had not explored the possibility of making reasonable accommodation that could have allowed him to remain in the mainstream education system. The State party had also failed to conduct an effective investigation into the allegations of abuse and neglect at the school. The Committee further found that the State party authorities had violated the right of the authors to family life by bringing criminal charges against the parents on the ground that they had refused to bring their child to a special education centre. The Committee concluded that the State party had failed to fulfil its

obligations under articles 24, 23, 7, 15 and 17 of the Convention, read alone and in conjunction with article 4.

***N.L. v. Sweden***

9. The Committee examined the communication in the case of *N.L. v. Sweden* (CRPD/C/23/D/60/2019). The author of the communication was a national of Iraq whose application for asylum had been rejected by the State party. She claimed that, by deporting her to Iraq, the State party would violate her rights under articles 6, 10, 12 and 15 of the Convention.

10. The author had been diagnosed with depression with psychotic features. She had been committed twice under the Swedish Compulsory Psychiatric Care Act, after experiencing hallucinations and suicidal ideation. She claimed that there would be a serious risk to her life and health if she were to be removed to Iraq, as she would be unable to access essential medical care. After the author's application for asylum had been rejected, she had submitted three applications for an impediment to the enforcement of the deportation order against her. In the course of the proceedings, she had submitted several medical certificates to State party authorities, according to which she was undergoing treatment for severe depression. In the medical reports, her condition was described as life-threatening without the treatment, and her risk of relapse was assessed to be grave without adequate care. The State party migration authorities had rejected the author's applications for an impediment to the enforcement of the deportation decision against her. The authorities had not questioned whether the author had been diagnosed with physical and mental illness, but they had found that in order for an applicant to be granted a re-evaluation of an asylum decision based on health conditions, it must be established as plausible that the condition was severe and lasting. The authorities had concluded that the author had not established that her condition was lasting.

11. In its Views, the Committee recalled that article 10 of the Convention stipulated that every person had the inherent right to life and that States parties were required to take all necessary measures to ensure its effective enjoyment by persons with disabilities on an equal basis with others. The Committee further recalled that under article 15 of the Convention, States parties had the obligation to take all effective legislative, administrative, judicial or other measures to prevent persons with disabilities, on an equal basis with others, from being subjected to torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. The Committee noted the findings of the Human Rights Committee in its general comment No. 31 (2004) on the nature of the general legal obligation imposed on States parties to the Covenant, in which it referred to the obligation of States parties not to extradite, deport, expel or otherwise remove a person from their territory when there were substantial grounds for believing that the person would face a real risk of irreparable harm. It noted that the Human Rights Committee had indicated in its jurisprudence that the risk must be personal and that there was a high threshold for providing substantial grounds to establish that a real risk of irreparable harm existed. The Committee further referred to the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights in *Paposhvili v. Belgium* (application No. 41738/10, Judgment, 13 December 2016) in which the Court noted that the removal of a person in need of ongoing medical care might in "very exceptional cases" raise an issue under article 3 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. The Committee noted the Court's findings that it was for the applicants to adduce evidence capable of demonstrating that there were substantial grounds for believing that they would be exposed to a real risk of being subjected to ill-treatment if they were to be removed. Where such evidence was adduced, it was for the authorities of the returning State, in the context of domestic procedures, to dispel any doubts raised by it. The risk alleged must be subjected to close scrutiny, in the course of which the authorities in the returning State must consider the foreseeable consequences of removal for the individual concerned in the receiving State. The authorities in the returning State must verify on a case-by-case basis whether the care generally available in the receiving State was sufficient and appropriate in practice for the treatment of the applicant's illness. The authorities must also consider the extent to which the individual in question would actually have access to care and facilities in the receiving State.

12. The Committee considered that, taking into account that the author had submitted several medical certificates to the domestic authorities in which her health condition had



been assessed as severe and life-threatening without the treatment that she was receiving in the State party, the State party authorities should, in the light of the information available during the domestic proceedings, have assessed whether the author would in fact have access to adequate medical care if removed to Iraq. The Committee observed that it was undisputed between the parties that the domestic authorities had not assessed whether the author would have access to such medical care in Iraq. The Committee therefore considered that the failure by the domestic authorities to assess the risk facing the author in the light of the information available to them concerning the author's state of health amounted to a violation of her rights under article 15 of the Convention. In the light of those findings, the Committee considered it unnecessary to separately consider the author's claims under article 10 of the Convention.

***F.O.F. v. Brazil***

13. The Committee examined the communication in the case of *F.O.F. v. Brazil* (CRPD/C/23/D/40/2017). The author claimed to be a victim of violations by the State party of articles 2, 5, 13, 17, 25 and 27 (1) (a), (b) and (i) of the Convention. The author had knee stiffness resulting from chronic osteomyelitis in his left leg. He also had thrombosis in his left leg and a herniated disc, as a consequence of lack of adaptation of the furniture in his workplace. The author had lodged several sets of proceedings, in particular against his employer – a regional council – with a view to obtaining reasonable accommodation at work to prevent deterioration of his health and equal remuneration for work of equal value, and against a company in order that it be required to comply with accessibility norms for persons with disabilities at his place of residence. The author claimed that denial of reasonable accommodation in the workplace for persons with disabilities represented discrimination based on disability, and alleged a violation of his right to equal pay for work of equal value. The State party submitted that the conflict revolved around an interpretation with which the author disagreed, mainly regarding the measures adopted by his employer and the refusal of his request to reduce his working hours without reducing his salary. The State party considered that those issues had already been examined in administrative and judicial proceedings, and that the Committee should not act as an appeal body.

14. In its consideration of admissibility, the Committee noted that the author had complained to the Regional Labour Prosecutor about a lack of suitable furniture in his workplace, but had not brought the matter before the labour courts. It also noted that the author's allegations of discrimination, arbitrariness and denial of justice lacked substantiation. The Committee therefore concluded that the communication was inadmissible under article 2 (d) and (e) of the Optional Protocol.

***A.N.P. v. South Africa***

15. The Committee examined the communication in the case of *A.N.P. v. South Africa* (CRPD/C/23/D/73/2019). The author claimed to be the victim of a violation, by the State party, of his rights under articles 1, 3 (e), 4 (1) (d), 5 (1), 8 (1) (b), 12 (3) and (5), 13 (1), 15 (2), 17 and 28 (1) and (2) of the Convention. The author had multiple medical disabilities and chronic conditions, in connection with which he had received monthly payments from a permanent disability insurance claim. The author's annual applications to the City of Cape Town for rebates on the municipal taxes payable over the ownership of his flat under the rates rebate programme for disabled persons and senior citizens had been denied for the years 2008–2013 because, according to the author, the City had wrongly counted his insurance payments as income. His applications for the years 2014–2018 had not yet been finalized, owing to what he described as the City of Cape Town's unjustified demands. He claimed that he had exhausted all available domestic remedies, as his claims filed with the City of Cape Town, the South African Human Rights Commission, the Office of the Public Protector, the Western Cape provincial government and the office of the Presidency had either been "brushed aside" or ignored. He added that although the City of Cape Town had advised him that he could file a claim in the South African courts, that was not a viable option for a person in a poor financial situation and in poor health. Moreover, court proceedings would entail expenditure by the City of Cape Town of taxpayers' money in defending its actions.

16. The Committee considered that the author had not shown that bringing a complaint to the courts would objectively have no prospect of success. The author's comment that

legal aid fees were steep was of a general nature, and he had not explained whether he had tried to obtain access to low-cost or free legal aid. Further, he had provided no substantiation demonstrating that his health situation inhibited him from submitting a court claim. Lastly, the contention that judicial proceedings would cost taxpayers' money was immaterial to the requirement of exhaustion of domestic remedies. The Committee therefore found that it was precluded from considering the communication under article 2 (d) of the Optional Protocol.

***N.N. and N.L. v. Germany***

17. Regarding the communication in the case of *N.N. and N.L. v. Germany* (CRPD/C/23/D/29/2015), the State party had informed the Committee that the author had left its territory. That information had not been contested by the author, who had confirmed that she was no longer residing in the State party. In view of that information, the Committee concluded that the subject matter of the communication had become moot, and decided to discontinue the consideration of the communication.

---