



Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

Distr.: General
14 April 2026

Original: English

Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

Follow-up progress report on individual communications*

I. Introduction

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to article 5 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention, which states that the Committee will hold closed meetings when examining communications under the Optional Protocol and, after examining a communication, will forward its suggestions and recommendations, if any, to the State Party concerned and to the petitioner. The report is also prepared in line with rule 76 (7) of the rules of procedure of the Committee, which stipulates that the special rapporteur or working group for follow-up to Views will regularly report to the Committee on follow-up activities, to ascertain the measures to be taken by States Parties to give effect to the Committee's Views.

2. The present report sets out the information received by the Special Rapporteur for follow-up to Views between the thirty-second and thirty-fourth sessions pursuant to the Committee's rules of procedure, and her recommendations to the Committee. The assessment criteria were as follows:

Assessment criteria

Compliance

A Measures taken are largely satisfactory

Partial compliance

B Substantive measure(s) taken, but additional information and/or action is required

Non-compliance

C Reply received but measures taken do not implement the Views/recommendations

No reply

D No reply to all or parts of recommendations following reminder(s)

* Adopted by the Committee at its thirty-fourth session (9–27 March 2026).



II. Communications

A. *Al-Hawali v. Saudi Arabia* (CRPD/C/30/D/84/2020) and *Al-Awdah v. Saudi Arabia* (CRPD/C/32/D/87/2021)

Dates of adoption of Views:	19 March 2024 (<i>Al-Hawali v. Saudi Arabia</i>) and 19 March 2025 (<i>Al-Awdah v. Saudi Arabia</i>)
Subject matter:	Incommunicado detention of persons with disabilities; enforced disappearance; failure to bring person concerned to trial, to allow access to legal assistance and to provide reasonable accommodation and medical and rehabilitative care; death penalty (<i>Al-Awdah v. Saudi Arabia</i> only)
Articles violated:	Articles 5 (1)–(3) and 14, read alone and in conjunction with articles 3 (b), (c) and (f), 4 and 21; articles 10, 12 (1), 14 and 15; article 13, read alone and in conjunction with articles 3 (b), (c) and (f) and 4; article 25, read alone and in conjunction with articles 3 (b), (c) and (f), 4, 5 (3) and 14 (1); and articles 15 and 17, read alone and in conjunction with articles 3 (b), (c) and (f), 4, 5 (3) and 14 (2), of the Convention (<i>Al-Hawali v. Saudi Arabia</i>) Articles 5 (1)–(3), 10, 12 (1), 13–15, 21 and 29 (b), read alone and in conjunction with articles 3 (b), (c) and (f) and 4; and articles 15, 17 and 25, read alone and in conjunction with articles 3 (b), (c) and (f), 4, 5 (3) and 14, of the Convention (<i>Al-Awdah v. Saudi Arabia</i>)

1. Remedy

3. With respect to Safar bin Abdulrahman al-Hawali and Salman al-Awdah, the State Party is under an obligation:

(a) To promptly review their cases to ensure that they have a fair and public trial by a competent, independent and impartial tribunal and are treated in full accordance with international standards, including the guarantees enshrined in the Convention, the Committee's guidelines on the right to liberty and security of persons with disabilities and the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules), in particular the provision of reasonable accommodation and prompt access to adequate healthcare and therapy, or release them;

(b) To immediately cease, investigate, prevent the reoccurrence of and establish accountability for acts of reprisals against Mr. Al-Hawali and Mr. Al-Awdah and their relatives;

(c) To provide them with an effective remedy, including effective reparation and adequate monetary compensation for the violations of their rights under the Convention.

4. In general, the State Party is under an obligation to take measures to prevent similar violations in the future. In that regard, the Committee refers to the recommendations contained in its concluding observations on the initial report of the State Party¹ and the Committee's guidelines on the right to liberty and security of persons with disabilities, and requires the State Party:

(a) To review the Counter-Terrorism and Financing of Terrorism Act of 2017 to ensure its compliance with international standards on fair trial rights and the right to liberty and security, and ensure that it is not used to infringe the rights to freedom of expression and to liberty and security of person arbitrarily;

(b) To take all necessary measures to prevent, investigate and establish accountability for enforced and incommunicado detention;

¹ CRPD/C/SAU/CO/1.

(c) To take all necessary measures to ensure the provision of adequate healthcare to persons with disabilities in detention in accordance with the Committee's guidelines on the right to liberty and security of persons with disabilities and the Nelson Mandela Rules, as well as reasonable accommodation, including in relation to ensuring effective access to and participation in judicial and complaint procedures;

(d) To ensure that mechanisms competent to monitor detention and consider complaints are independent and effective;

(e) To give due consideration to abolishing the death penalty;

(f) To provide sufficient, regular training on the scope of the Convention and the Optional Protocol thereto to prison officials and other law enforcement personnel.

2. State Party's response

5. In its observations, dated 11 November 2024 on *Al-Hawali v. Saudi Arabia* and 16 December 2025 on *Al-Awdah v. Saudi Arabia*, the State Party notes that the Committee failed to rule on admissibility separately from the merits despite the State Party's repeated requests in that regard and disregarded the State Party's arguments and observations in both communications. The State Party reiterates that the communications are inadmissible and that the State Party did not breach the rights of Mr. Al-Hawali or Mr. Al-Awdah under the Convention. The State Party notes that Mr. Al-Hawali has been charged with ideological support for terrorism, ideological support for terrorist organizations such as Da'esh and Al-Qaida, approval of terrorist acts and incitement to commit them, praising of the leaders of terrorist organizations, participation with others in a criminal plan to undermine the security of society, destabilization of the State and threatening of national unity, and illegal possession of weapons of war and firearms. Both his case and that of Mr. Al-Awdah remain pending. Mr. Al-Hawali and Mr. Al-Awdah are being detained at the prison of the General Directorate of Investigation in Riyadh. The Public Prosecutor relied on several pieces of evidence in charging Mr. Al-Awdah, including arrest and search records, technical reports and his confessions before the judiciary.

6. The State Party argues that the Committee exceeded its mandate by addressing allegations of reprisals against Mr. Al-Hawali's family members, which fall outside the scope of the individual communications procedure, and by finding that Mr. Al-Hawali and Mr. Al-Awdah have been subjected to enforced disappearance, although the term "enforced disappearance" does not appear in the Convention. Mr. Al-Awdah and his family have not suffered any form of harassment or retaliation.

7. The State Party explains that Mr. Al-Hawali and Mr. Al-Awdah are being detained in humane conditions consistent with international standards in communal dormitories, receive appropriate medical care monitored by specialized clinics and enjoy regular family visits and phone calls. The Human Rights Commission is overseeing their well-being and has confirmed that their health is stable. Medical reports confirm that they have no disabilities, and in neither communication do the authors demonstrate the contrary. The State Party submits that its national legislation and institutions offer full protection of the rights under the Convention and that the Committee's recommendations are being implemented, as Mr. Al-Awdah and Mr. Al-Hawali are receiving fair trials before a competent court and with access to legal representation, are being treated equally and are receiving the necessary medical care.

8. The State Party argues that its current laws and policies already fulfil the Committee's recommendations, and its Counter-terrorism and Financing of Terrorism Act of 2017 is in conformity with international standards. The State Party has recently adopted the new Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, which aims to cover all the requirements of daily life, provide a foundation for persons with disabilities to have access to their rights in all sectors, ensure support for them and include them in the State Party's Vision 2030 programme, with a view to building an inclusive society that is accessible to everyone.

3. Author's comments

9. In their comments, dated 4 April 2025 on *Al-Hawali v. Saudi Arabia* and 18 February 2026 on *Al-Awdah v. Saudi Arabia*, the authors refute the State Party's arguments that the communications are inadmissible and that the State Party did not breach the rights of Mr. Al-Hawali and Mr. Al-Awdah under the Convention. The violations of their rights, including their indefinite detention and denial of access to care and legal representation, remain ongoing. The same is true for the reprisals against their family members, who remain subject to travel bans, even though Mr. Al-Awdah's brother, Khaled al-Awdah, was released in June 2025 after years in detention for expressing support for him. Mr. Al-Hawali and Mr. Al-Awdah have been kept in insolation since their respective arrests and have been denied essential items and rehabilitation. Mr. Al-Awdah has, in addition, been denied access to collective prayers and to all means of intellectual expression and scholarly pursuit. Mr. Al-Awdah's family are allowed to visit only once monthly, but the visits are regularly denied and are constrained owing to Mr. Al-Awdah's hearing impairment and the soundproofed glass that separates him from his family. No further hearings have been scheduled in Mr. Al-Awdah's case. The treatment referred to by the State Party is irregular, inadequate and not provided by independent doctors. Prison medical staff have confirmed Mr. Al-Awdah's hearing and vision loss to his family. The charges against Mr. Al-Hawali listed by the State Party were not previously communicated to Mr. Al-Hawali or to the Committee. Other than a list of the charges, Mr. Al-Awdah has not been provided with any other documents. Neither Mr. Al-Hawali nor Mr. Al-Awdah has been allowed access to legal counsel. According to the authors, in both cases the State Party merely asserts that its laws are not problematic, while rejecting the Committee's findings without engaging with them in good faith. The authors argue that the State Party's reference to new disability legislation is not credible given its denial of the disabilities of Mr. Al-Hawali and Mr. Al-Awdah, who are being left to die in solitary confinement. The authors request that the State Party release Mr. Al-Hawali and Mr. Al-Awdah and, in the meantime, end their solitary confinement, allow unrestricted family visits, provide access to rehabilitation, independent medical care, books, writing materials, telephone communication and legal counsel and restore Mr. Al-Awdah's religious rights. The authors invite the Committee to use its margin of interpretation and pursue its follow-up by issuing public statements, calling for the State Party to release Mr. Al-Hawali and Mr. Al-Awdah, applying enhanced scrutiny, requesting emergency measures to protect their right to life and physical integrity and proposing monitoring visits.

4. Decision of the Committee

10. The Committee regrets the lack of any measures taken to implement its individual or general recommendations. The Committee notes the State Party's arguments regarding Mr. Al-Hawali's and Mr. Al-Awdah's health conditions, but regrets the lack of information provided on any specific measures taken in their regard. The Committee notes the adoption of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, but regrets that the State Party has not provided information to explain how this law serves to implement the recommendations contained in the Views. In view thereof, the Committee decides to discontinue the follow-up procedure with regard to both communications, with an assessment of "C" (non-compliance).

B. *E.O.J. et al. v. Sweden* (CRPD/C/31/D/104/2023)

Date of adoption of Views:	29 August 2024
Subject matter:	Deportation of children with psychosocial and intellectual disabilities and their family members to Nigeria
Article violated:	Article 7 (3) of the Convention

1. Remedy

11. Concerning E.O.J., the State Party is under an obligation:

- (a) To provide him with an effective remedy, including quashing the present removal order against him and his family;
- (b) To reassess his asylum request after hearing him;
- (c) To provide him with adequate compensation;
- (d) To publish the Committee's Views and circulate them widely in accessible formats so that they are available to all sectors of the population.

12. In general, the State Party is under an obligation to take measures to prevent similar violations in the future. In that regard, the Committee refers to the recommendations contained in its concluding observations on the combined second and third periodic reports of Sweden.² In particular, the Committee recommends that the State Party guarantee respect for the evolving capacities of children with disabilities to ensure that they can form their own views and express them freely in all matters affecting them, including in asylum proceedings, and ensure that their views are given due weight in accordance with their age and maturity; and ensure that they receive disability- and age-appropriate support to realize their right to be heard.

2. State Party's response

13. In its observations dated 3 March 2025, the State Party notes that the Migration Agency has heard E.O.J. and will reconsider the family's new application for residence.

14. The State Party claims that it is not under any international obligation to provide the author with compensation or reimbursement of legal costs. Consequently, the State Party has not initiated any processes aiming at providing the author with compensation.

15. The State Party has distributed the Views to the relevant public authorities, including the Migration Agency and the migration courts, and has published them on the Government's website with a summary in Swedish. The State Party has not found it necessary to take any general measures.

16. In its observations dated 10 July 2025, the State Party notes that on 3 July 2025, the Migration Agency decided to grant E.O.J. and his family residence permits valid until 3 August 2026. This decision was made given the exceptionally distressing circumstances in view of E.O.J.'s adaptation to life in Sweden, meaning that it was in his best interests to grant him a residence permit.

3. Author's comments

17. In her comments dated 3 June 2025, the author explains that, following the Committee's adoption of its Views, she made repeated efforts to engage with the State Party's Ministry of Foreign Affairs regarding the implementation of the recommendations, but was referred back and forth between the Ministry and the Migration Agency. A new application was registered on 26 September 2025.

18. The author also explains that, in September 2020, the Social Insurance Agency ceased financial assistance despite her repeated appeals for support. The family was facing the possibility of eviction. The author argues that the State Party should retroactively pay the disability-related benefits that it has failed to pay since September 2020.

19. The author stresses that the most recent domestic report with medical country of origin information confirms that support and services for persons with autism in Nigeria remain extremely limited and inaccessible.

² CRPD/C/SWE/CO/2-3, paras. 17 and 18.

20. In her comments dated 13 August 2025, the author argues that when the domestic authorities registered their new asylum application, it was not in response to the Committee's recommendations, but only after the previous removal order became statute-barred. The State Party thus did not quash the removal order. The author confirms that the family was granted residence permits and that she and O.O.J. were granted work permits, but argues that the State Party did not provide them with compensation.

4. Decision of the Committee

21. The Committee notes that the State Party has granted residence permits to E.O.J. and his family, and that it has distributed the Committee's Views to the relevant authorities and published them online with a summary in Swedish. However, the Committee regrets that the State Party has not provided compensation to E.O.J. or taken any steps to implement the general recommendations. In view thereof, the Committee decides to discontinue the follow-up procedure, with an assessment of "B" (partial compliance).

C. *Al-Sayed and Mangisto v. State of Palestine* (CRPD/C/28/D/67/2019-CRPD/C/28/D/68/2019)

Date of adoption of Views:	23 March 2023
Subject matter:	Disappearance and incommunicado detention of persons with psychosocial disabilities
Articles violated:	Articles 10, 14, 15 and 25, read alone and in conjunction with article 11, of the Convention and article 4 of the Optional Protocol

1. Remedy

22. Concerning the authors and the alleged victims, the State Party is under an obligation:

(a) To provide the authors with an effective remedy, including compensation for any legal costs incurred in filing the communications;

(b) To take all diplomatic, economic, judicial or other measures available, in accordance with international law, to conduct a prompt, effective, thorough, impartial, independent and transparent investigation into the circumstances of the alleged disappearance and arbitrary detention of Avera Mangisto and Hisham al-Sayed, with a view to establishing the truth and securing their safe return to their families; to provide the authors with detailed information on the outcome of the investigation; and to guarantee Mr. Mangisto's and Mr. Al-Sayed's safety and access to medical care, including in relation to their disabilities, and contact with their families and representatives;

(c) To publish the Committee's Views and circulate them widely in accessible formats so that they are available to all sectors of the population.

23. In general, the State Party is under an obligation to take measures to prevent similar violations in the future. In that regard, the Committee requires the State Party to ensure, in particular, that claims of disappearance are promptly investigated in order to establish the fate and whereabouts of the alleged victims and to ensure their release.

2. State Party's response

24. In its observations dated 4 July 2023, the State Party requests the Committee to call on Israel to grant it access to the Gaza Strip, provide information about Mr. Mangisto and Mr. Al-Sayed and about the ongoing negotiations between Israel and Hamas, which, according to international media outlets, concern Mr. Mangisto and Mr. Al-Sayed, and remove all obstacles to and restrictions on access for medical goods and equipment, medicine and medical staff to Gaza imposed by Israel.

25. On 7 August 2025, the secretariat of the Committee sent a reminder to the State Party, noting that the State Party's reply dated 4 July 2025 did not contain the information requested by the Committee, on any action taken in the light of its Views and recommendations. The State Party made no further submissions.

3. Decision of the Committee

26. While remaining extremely troubled about the situation in the State Party, particularly in the Gaza Strip, the Committee regrets the lack of any measures taken to implement its individual or general recommendations. In view thereof, the Committee decides to discontinue the follow-up procedure, with an assessment of "C" (non-compliance).

D. *Medina Vela v. Mexico* (CRPD/C/22/D/32/2015)

Date of adoption of Views:	6 September 2019
Subject matter:	Right to enjoy legal capacity on an equal basis with others
Articles violated:	Articles 5, 9, 12–14 and 19, read in conjunction with article 4, of the Convention
Previous follow-up information:	CRPD/C/23/3 , section B.2

1. Remedy

27. Concerning the author, the State Party is under an obligation:

- (a) To provide him with an effective remedy, including reimbursement of any legal costs incurred by him, together with compensation;
- (b) To make a public acknowledgement of the violation of the author's rights in accordance with the Committee's Views and adopt any other appropriate measure of satisfaction;
- (c) To publish the Committee's Views and circulate them widely in accessible formats so that they are available to all sectors of the population.

28. In general, the State Party is under an obligation to take measures to prevent similar violations in the future. In that regard, the Committee refers to the recommendations contained in its concluding observations³ and requires the State Party:

- (a) In close consultation with persons with disabilities and the organizations that represent them, to make all necessary amendments to the criminal law of the Federal District and all equivalent or related federal and state laws with regard to the "exempt from liability" concept and the special procedure for persons exempt from criminal liability, with a view to bringing them into line with the principles of the Convention and ensuring respect for due process in cases involving persons with disabilities;
- (b) To review the application of security measures involving committal for the purposes of medical and psychiatric treatment and take the necessary steps to promote alternatives in line with the principles of the Convention;
- (c) To ensure that persons with intellectual and psychosocial disabilities are provided with appropriate support and reasonable accommodation to enable them to exercise their legal capacity before the courts;

³ [CRPD/C/MEX/CO/1](#), paras. 28 and 30.

(d) To ensure that judges, judicial officials, public prosecutors and public servants working to facilitate the work of the judiciary are provided with appropriate and regular training on the scope of the Convention and the Optional Protocol thereto.

2. State Party's response

29. In its observations dated 24 March 2020, 4 April 2025 and 27 June 2025, the State Party notes that it has provided compensation to the author and that the Executive Commission for Victims Support has registered him and his sister on the National Register of Victims. In addition, the State Party covered the author's healthcare expenses and made a public apology to him on 4 October 2021, in Mexico City, with his prior consent as to the format of the event.

30. The State Party notes that it published the Committee's Views on 30 November 2021 and has made them available in Braille, sign language and another format accessible to persons with disabilities.

31. The State Party has initiated proposals for legislative reforms aimed at harmonizing domestic criminal legislation with international recommendations. These initiatives remain pending. The State Party also refers to a decision of 12 April 2023 by the Supreme Court, which declared unconstitutional article 226 of the National Code of Criminal Procedure, a provision that prevented persons with disabilities from filing complaints or criminal reports. Moreover, local authorities have received training on the rights of persons with disabilities, their participation in judicial proceedings and reasonable accommodation. Lastly, the State Party has published protocols on care and the inclusion of persons with disabilities within the justice system. The State Party notes that, in 2018, in collaboration with the civil society organization Documenta, the High Court of Mexico City developed a protocol on support for persons with disabilities.

3. Author's comments

32. In his comments dated 15 February 2025, the author argues that the announced legislative reforms have not yet been implemented. Furthermore, the author has promoted the harmonization of the criminal legislation of Mexico City with the standards established by the Convention by filing *amparo* appeal No. 115/2024. This petition seeks to abolish the security measure, concerning the special procedure for persons considered exempt from criminal liability, that allows for detention and confinement on the basis of disability. The petition remains pending before the Supreme Court. The author argues that, to date, there is only one cooperation programme within the entire judiciary aimed at facilitating the participation of persons with disabilities in criminal proceedings, established through an agreement between the High Court of Mexico City and Documenta.

4. Decision of the Committee

33. The Committee welcomes the State Party's satisfactory implementation of the individual measures regarding compensation and satisfaction, and its publication of the Views. The Committee acknowledges that legislative reforms announced by the State Party and the harmonization of the local criminal laws remain pending. In addition, the Committee observes that the cooperation programmes have not been fully implemented throughout the judicial system, and that no information was provided regarding the regular training offered to authorities on the scope of the Convention and the Optional Protocol thereto. In view thereof, the Committee decides to discontinue the follow-up procedure with an assessment of "A" for the individual measures (compliance), and to examine compliance with the general measures in the context of the consideration of the State Party's next periodic report under article 36 of the Convention.

E. *S.K. v. Finland* (CRPD/C/26/D/46/2018)

Date of adoption of Views:	24 March 2022
Subject matter:	Personal assistance
Articles violated:	Article 19 (b), and article 5 (1) and (2), read alone and in conjunction with article 19, of the Convention
Previous follow-up information:	CRPD/C/30/3 , paras. 17–24, and CRPD/C/32/3 , paras. 60–65

1. Remedy

34. Concerning the author, the State Party is under an obligation:

(a) To provide him with an effective remedy, including by reconsidering his application for personal assistance to ensure that he can exercise his right to live independently, in the light of the Committee's Views;

(b) To provide adequate compensation to the author for the costs incurred in filing the communication;

(c) To publish the Committee's Views and circulate them widely in accessible formats so that they are available to all sectors of the population.

35. In general, the State Party is under an obligation to take measures to prevent similar violations in the future. In that regard, the Committee requires the State Party to ensure that its legislation on personal assistance and the manner in which it is applied by administrative institutions and domestic courts is consistent with the State Party's obligations to ensure that legislation does not have the purpose or effect of impairing or nullifying the recognition, enjoyment or exercise of any right by persons with intellectual disabilities on an equal basis with persons with other types of disabilities when seeking access to personal assistance.

36. In particular, the Committee recommends that the State Party amend the Disability Services Act to ensure that the resources criterion, under which the beneficiary is required to have the ability to determine the content of the required assistance and the modalities for providing it, is not an obstacle to independent living for persons who require support in decision-making.

2. Author's comments

37. In his comments dated 16 June 2025, the author notes that the Western Uusimaa Well-being Services County made its decision of 24 November 2023 without a new application, but it was discriminatory and was issued late. The author argues that the municipal and county authorities were already in possession of expert opinions regarding his circumstances and requirements, all of which supported the provision of personal assistance and his requirement to live in his own apartment rather than in a service housing unit. The author's appeal to the Administrative Court of Helsinki concerning the decision remains pending.

38. On 20 January 2025, the Chair of the National Non-Discrimination and Equality Tribunal decided not to consider the author's application to it, dated 17 July 2024, as the same matter was pending before the Administrative Court of Helsinki. On 28 February 2025, the author appealed against that decision to the Tribunal. On 12 March 2025, the Tribunal upheld the decision. On 17 April 2025, the author appealed against the decision of the Tribunal to the Administrative Court of Helsinki. The case remains pending. The author has not been granted personal assistance to live independently in his own apartment.

3. State Party's observations

39. In its observations dated 10 December 2025, the State Party notes that safe independent living cannot be provided to the author through home-delivered services, and

that his guardian's opinion continues to differ from that of the social workers, who consider a placement in service housing to be the best solution. The State Party submits that, in addition to the assistance provided in the service housing environment, individualized day activities and personal assistance may be arranged for the author. The author continues to be a client of the disability services, which are still working on a service package that would best serve his requirements.

4. Decision of the Committee

40. The Committee regrets that the most recent domestic decisions have not enabled the author to live independently and that no compensation has been provided to him. The Committee notes that the author's appeal to the Administrative Court of Helsinki concerning the decision of 24 November 2023, with regard to personal assistance, remains pending. In view thereof, the Committee decides to keep the follow-up dialogue open and to request further information from the State Party.

F. *N.I. v. Sweden* (CRPD/C/32/D/64/2019)

Date of adoption of Views:	19 March 2025
Subject matter:	Deportation of a person with disabilities to Lebanon
Articles violated:	Articles 10 and 15 of the Convention

1. Remedy

41. Concerning the author, the State Party is under an obligation:

- (a) To provide him with an effective remedy, including compensation for any legal costs incurred in filing the communication;
- (b) To review his case, taking into account the State Party's obligations under the Convention and the Committee's Views;
- (c) To publish the Committee's Views and circulate them widely in accessible formats so that they are available to all sectors of the population.

42. In general, the State Party is under an obligation to take measures to prevent similar violations in the future. In that regard, the Committee requires the State Party to ensure that the rights of persons with disabilities, on an equal basis with others, are properly considered in the context of asylum decisions.

2. State Party's response

43. In its observations dated 29 September 2025, the State Party notes that following the adoption of the Committee's Views, the Migration Agency examined whether there were any impediments to the enforcement of the expulsion of the author and his family to Lebanon. On 17 September 2025, the Agency rendered its decision, finding that no such impediments existed. The Agency took the view that, on the basis of medical country of origin information and additional country of origin information, there was sufficient care in Lebanon for the author. It considered that his individual circumstances were such that he could have access to such care and treatment, noting that he would return there with his family and to a social network that could support him. Furthermore, there was no reason to consider that the author would be excluded from care because he was Alawite or because of the stigmatization of persons with "mental illness" in Lebanon. The decision to expel the author and his family therefore remains in force. The State Party submits that it has provided the author with an effective remedy and reviewed his case in accordance with the Committee's recommendations. The State Party has not provided compensation to the author for legal costs, in the absence of any international obligation to this effect. The State Party has published the Committee's Views on the Government's website with a summary in Swedish and has distributed them to relevant authorities.

44. As for the Committee's general recommendation, the State Party notes that the Migration Agency is responsible for implementing the ordinance on the responsibility of public authorities to implement the disability policy, and is guided, in this regard, by the Convention. The Agency's legal position paper No. RS/008/2020 on the application of article 3 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (European Convention on Human Rights) when "ill health" is invoked, which is binding upon the Agency's case workers, is a specific measure in the context of which the rights of persons with disabilities are considered in asylum decisions. Moreover, Swedish asylum legislation is consistent with the Convention. The State Party has therefore not found it necessary to take any general measures in response to the Committee's Views.

3. Author's comments

45. In his comments dated 17 October 2025 and 22 December 2025, the author notes that, in June 2025, in the context of the re-examination of his case, he submitted additional medical certificates to the Migration Agency that indicate that he has complex psychiatric issues for which he requires continuous and comprehensive specialist treatment, including medication and psychotherapy, and that he requires support from his brother in all daily activities. The certificates also state that his condition is life-threatening owing to a risk of suicide and that he poses a danger to others. The Agency requested and obtained an opinion regarding medical country of origin information, but did not share this opinion with the author and did not appoint a public counsel. The opinion stated that if care was not available in his home town in Lebanon, Tripoli, he could travel to Beirut for this purpose. The author appealed against the decision of the Agency, dated 17 September 2025, to the Migration Court. The latter rejected his appeal on 7 November 2025, concurring with the Agency that medication and treatment would be accessible to him in Lebanon. On 12 December 2025, the Migration Court of Appeal decided not to grant leave to appeal. The author considers that the State Party has not complied with the Committee's recommendations. In his comments dated 12 February 2026, the author notes that, on an unspecified date, the Migration Agency lifted its suspension of the enforcement of the removal order and was proceeding with the removal of the author, his wife and their four children. In his comments dated 22 February 2026, the author notes that on 16 February 2026, he appealed against the expulsion order to the Migration Court with a request for a new examination pursuant to chapter 12, section 19, of the Aliens Act. On an unspecified date, the Migration Court rejected the appeal without examining the medical grounds invoked. On an unspecified date, the Migration Court of Appeal rejected the author's appeal against the decision of the Migration Court. The author reiterates that his removal would breach articles 10 and 15 of the Convention and that the State Party has not implemented the Committee's recommendations. In his comments dated 6 March 2026, the author argues that it would be impossible for him to obtain access to the required treatment in Lebanon in the light of the situation provoked by the armed hostilities between Hizbullah and Israel.

4. Decision of the Committee

46. The Committee notes with appreciation that the Migration Agency issued a new decision on the author's case, but, particularly in view of the life-threatening nature of the author's condition, regrets that the State Party has decided to proceed with the author's removal to Lebanon without explaining how it considers that his access to care would be guaranteed, taking into account the high cost of treatment, his lack of contact with relatives there and his inability to work, among other factors. The Committee further regrets that the State Party has not provided the author with compensation for legal costs. The Committee notes the distribution and translation of its Views, but regrets that the State Party has not taken any steps to implement the general recommendation. In view thereof, the Committee decides to discontinue the follow-up procedure, with an assessment of "B" (partial compliance).