



# Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment

Distr.: General  
9 December 2025

Original: English

---

## Committee against Torture Eighty-third session

### Summary record of the 2212th meeting

Held at the Palais Wilson, Geneva, on Wednesday, 12 November 2025, at 3 p.m.

*Chair:* Mr. Heller

## Contents

Consideration of reports submitted by States Parties under article 19 of the Convention  
(*continued*)

*Sixth periodic report of Israel (continued)*

---

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of the present record to the Documents Management Section ([DMS-DCM@un.org](mailto:DMS-DCM@un.org)).

Any corrected records of the public meetings of the Committee at this session will be reissued for technical reasons after the end of the session.



*The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.*

**Consideration of reports submitted by States Parties under article 19 of the Convention** *(continued)*

*Sixth periodic report of Israel (continued)* (CAT/C/ISR/6; CAT/C/ISR/QPR/6)

1. *At the invitation of the Chair, the delegation of Israel joined the meeting.*
2. **A representative of Israel** said that, contrary to what some of the questions raised the previous day would insinuate about the response to the atrocities committed by Hamas (see CAT/C/SR.2209), senior political and military officials had consistently asserted the country's commitment to international law, including the duty to distinguish between combatants and civilians and to protect the latter. While Israel did not expect to be relieved of its obligations, it did expect the international community to recognize the unprecedented challenges it was facing. Regrettably, some Committee members had relied on disinformation spread by the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967 and the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and Israel, both of which were known for their political agendas, inflammatory and antisemitic rhetoric and attempts to rewrite history to delegitimize the existence of the State of Israel. Israel expected integrity, impartiality and neutrality on the part of the international community, which must do its part to acknowledge the facts and realities on the ground.
3. **A representative of Israel** said that the order of the International Court of Justice of 26 January 2024 had been misrepresented. The Court had never found it plausible that Israel was committing genocide. Indeed, it had stated in the order that its remit was not to ascertain whether any violations of the obligations of Israel under the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide had occurred but, rather, to establish whether the acts and omissions complained of by the applicant appeared to be capable of falling within the provisions of the Genocide Convention. The order did not entail any substantive determination on the claim.
4. It was the long-standing view of Israel that the law of armed conflict, which contained a prohibition of torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment, applied to the Gaza Strip and to Judea and Samaria and that the term jurisdiction in article 2 of the Convention against Torture related to jurisdiction inherent in the sovereign territory of Israel. Furthermore, it was the law of armed conflict that was specifically shaped to accommodate the realities of armed conflict, such as the situation in the Gaza Strip and in Judea and Samaria, and the factual context, including security considerations and practical constraints, always informed the implementation of legal instruments.
5. It was the position of Israel that the conduct of the relevant agencies remained in full compliance with the prohibition of torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment irrespective of the prohibition's normative origin, which also included Israeli law and various security bodies' orders and directives.
6. **A representative of Israel** said that Israel categorically rejected unfounded and false allegations of systematic or widespread use of sexual and gender-based violence, which were inconsistent with the strict legal, ethical and operational framework of the Israeli security forces. Comprehensive oversight and enforcement mechanisms were in place to ensure that any alleged misconduct was thoroughly examined and, where necessary, investigated and prosecuted in accordance with Israeli and international law. The accusations had begun while the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Sexual Violence in Conflict had been in Israel to investigate acts of sexual violence perpetrated by Hamas on 7 October 2023 and were part of a pattern among some bodies appointed by the Human Rights Council of attributing to Israel crimes committed by Hamas.
7. Such attempts to shift focus and politicize human rights discourse were misleading, failed to engage with the factual record of the cruelties perpetrated and diminished the gravity of the atrocities committed against Israeli civilians. Israel firmly rejected any attempt to draw a false equivalence between the horrific documented crimes of Hamas and the allegations of sexual violence attributed to Israeli forces.

8. **A representative of Israel** said that acts and conduct defined as torture under article 1 of the Convention and article 7 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights could constitute offences under the Penal Law. For example, infliction of physical harm was criminalized and carried the penalty of 2 to 20 years' imprisonment depending on the severity of the acts and of the harm, while infliction of mental pain could fall under the offence of abuse of a helpless person, which carried the penalty of up to 9 years' imprisonment. Under the Criminal Procedure Law, the statute of limitations for offences punishable by more than 3 years' imprisonment ranged from 10 to 15 years depending on the severity of the offence. Pursuant to a recommendation by the Turkel Commission on the 2010 blockade of Gaza, a bill on the offence of torture had been drafted; however, its specific content and the time frame for its adoption were not yet known.

9. Under the Penal Law, the courts were authorized to award victims of criminal offences compensation of up to \$73,000 as part of the sentencing of the offenders. A State Attorney directive explicitly stipulated that prosecutors should seek compensation in all criminal proceedings so as to reduce the victims' suffering and expedite the legal process. In that connection, under the Right of Victims of Crime Law, victims could submit a written victim impact statement to the investigative or prosecutorial authority. Courts could find a convicted person liable for compensation to the victim for each of the offences of which they had been convicted. The amount of the compensation was calculated on the basis of the damage or suffering at the time of the offence or on the date of the compensation decision, whichever amount was greater. The compensation award was treated as a fine to expedite collection and took precedence over other debts. Payment was made through the Centre for Collection of Fines, Fees and Expenses of the Ministry of Justice to avoid contact between offender and victim. Where the victim was a minor, the Centre disbursed up to \$2,750 immediately, irrespective of whether the offender had paid; since 2022, the same had applied for victims of sexual offences, murder and attempted murder. There were two civil remedies available to victims who considered the compensation awarded to be inadequate.

10. Although several provisions of Israeli criminal law allowed for its imposition, the death penalty had been enforced only twice since the establishment of the State. The offences that carried the death penalty included crimes against the Jewish people or crimes against humanity committed during the period of the Nazi regime, war crimes committed during the Second World War, genocide, conspiracy, incitement of or attempt to commit genocide, treason during armed hostilities, offences involving the illegal use of firearms against persons and use of an explosive or inflammable object with intent to kill or cause grievous bodily harm. The death penalty could not be imposed on anyone who was a minor at the time of the offence. None of the bills applying the death penalty to other serious offences that had been put forward over the years had come to fruition.

11. The temporary amendment to the Youth Law allowing for the imprisonment of minors under the age of 14 charged with murder or attempted murder committed as part of a terrorist attack or on behalf of a criminal terrorist organization had yet to be applied. Moreover, imprisonment could only be ordered after consideration of the minor's well-being and personal circumstances and the circumstances of the offence. Transfer from a closed residential facility to a juvenile prison could take place only after the minor turned 14 and the aforementioned considerations were re-assessed. In addition, minors under the age of 14 could be temporarily placed in a juvenile prison only if the head of a closed residential facility considered that the minor posed a risk to him or herself or to others. Imprisonment of a minor could be ordered for a maximum of 10 days and was appealable.

12. Under the Prevention of Domestic Violence Law, technological enforcement of restraining orders could be permitted only with regard to persons with a criminal record of domestic violence, which included physical or sexual violence, unlawful confinement and sustained psychological abuse against a family member, and only if requested or agreed to by the woman concerned. The statute of limitations for civil claims relating to sexual offences had been extended, and victims of sexual offences or serious violent offences were entitled to claim rapid compensation from the State without having to seek compensation from the offenders. Furthermore, victims of sexual offences, trafficking or servitude were entitled to free legal aid, as early as the investigation stage, regardless of their income; free legal aid was also available in civil proceedings relating to those offences, subject to income criteria.

13. Pursuant to a 2019 amendment to the Criminal Procedure Law, the statute of limitations for specific serious offences, including rape, indecent acts and sexual offences within the family, was 15 years from the date of the offence. The statute of limitation was longer for sex offences involving minors to enable cases to be prosecuted even where the victim disclosed the event years after reaching adulthood. As of 2024, there had been 17 permanent shelters for women victims of domestic violence; seven rooms in the shelters were fully accessible to persons with disabilities.

14. **A representative of Israel** said that, once its inquiries were completed, the inspection unit responsible for handling complaints against Israel Security Agency interrogators submitted its findings and recommendations to the Inspector Supervisor at the State Attorney's Office for a decision on whether there were sufficient grounds to pursue a criminal investigation. The Inspector Supervisor issued decisions on dozens of examinations by the unit each year. Some were closed without any legal or disciplinary measures, while others led to measures or changes to Israel Security Agency procedures. In accordance with case law, where a detainee had already been indicted, claims relating to ill-treatment during Israel Security Agency interrogation should usually be clarified first through the judicial process.

15. Under Supreme Court case law, whenever interrogations were conducted using special measures in application of the necessity defence, the discretion that had led to the activation of the measures, as well as the manner in which the measures had been implemented, were examined, even in the absence of a formal complaint. While the Supreme Court had ruled that the Israel Security Agency did not have the legal authority to employ certain methods during interrogation, it had noted that the necessity defence could be invoked by an official accused of using unnecessary or excessive physical pressure. Most cases referred to the Department of Internal Police Investigations by the Attorney General or State Attorney were closed for failing to meet the evidentiary threshold for criminal investigation.

16. The courts had discretion to rule on the admissibility of evidence obtained unlawfully in the light of the circumstances of each case and in accordance with the standards established for weighing the right to a fair trial against the public interest. Nevertheless, under the Evidence Ordinance, out-of-court confessions were admissible only where proven to have been made freely and voluntarily. A central judgment in that regard was the case of *Ben Uliel v. State of Israel*, in which confessions taken from an underaged defendant had been excluded and some charges dropped after violations had been found to have been committed during the first and second interrogations, although it had not been deemed legally necessary to exclude information obtained in subsequent interrogations.

17. In recent years, the Israeli authorities had made considerable efforts to enhance law enforcement in Judea and Samaria, including by establishing an additional police station and designated task forces, increasing funds, stepping up arrest operations and adding professional personnel. The Deputy State Attorney for Special Affairs periodically convened all the relevant bodies, including the Israel Defense Forces, the Israel Security Agency and the police, to enhance cooperation for the prevention of ideologically motivated offences, to identify and remove potential bottlenecks in the response and to monitor the progress of investigations. Law enforcement decisions in such cases could be challenged before the courts.

18. The relevant authorities were committed to responding to such offences as rapidly as possible. For example, the Israel Defense Forces central command had imposed restrictions on and had instituted monitoring of Israeli citizens allegedly involved in such incidents. Pursuant to restriction orders, 63 suspects had been removed from specific areas in 2023, 45 suspects in 2024 and 54 suspects as of mid-October 2025. Pre-deployment briefings were held for Israel Defense Forces, emphasizing the duties to maintain public order, to prevent harm to Palestinian residents, including to their health and lands, and to properly address law and order violations by Israeli citizens, including violations of the duty not to stand idly by. In relevant areas, patrols and preventive deployments had been increased to reduce potential friction, and additional forces were deployed on the basis of ongoing risk assessments to respond to emerging incidents. It should be borne in mind that ideologically motivated offences against Palestinians were a minority of overall offences committed in Judea and Samaria, and the majority of such offences were committed by Palestinians against Israelis.

19. **A representative of Israel** said that the curriculum at the National Police Academy included dozens of courses, aimed at police officers of all ranks, on a wide range of topics, including the human rights conventions to which Israel was a party, investigation of minors, investigation of sexual offences, diversity and multiculturalism, the ultra-Orthodox and Arab populations and persons with disabilities. The effectiveness of training was evaluated through tests. In May 2018, the Office of the Deputy Attorney General for International Law, in cooperation with the Public Committee against Torture in Israel, had conducted a one-day training seminar for the Unit for Investigation of Wardens on the topic of the Convention and the Manual on the Effective Investigation and Documentation of Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (Istanbul Protocol). The Unit for Gender Equality and Cultural Diversity conducted training and raised awareness on topics within its remit. In addition, each district headed by a Brigadier General had a special police officer position responsible for implementing the Unit's objectives.

20. By law, detainees were entitled to meet and consult with a lawyer. At the request of the detainee or the lawyer, the officer in charge must facilitate a meeting promptly unless it would entail terminating or suspending the investigation or would place the investigation at risk. In such situations, a written reasoned decision was required to delay a meeting. A meeting could be delayed for more than a handful of hours, subject to a reasoned decision, if it might obstruct the arrest of additional suspects or prevent the disclosure of evidence in the case. Such additional delay should not exceed 24 hours from the time of arrest but could be extended for a total of 48 hours if necessary for safeguarding human life. The detainee would nonetheless be given a reasonable opportunity to meet or consult with legal counsel prior to his or her arraignment. The right of detainees to be informed of the reasons for their arrest and the right of families to be notified of a person's arrest and whereabouts were addressed in Police National Headquarters Order No. 14.01.34.

21. Under Government Resolution No. 549, several measures had been taken to eradicate crime and violence among the Arab population, including violence against women. They included the recruitment of 15 investigators deployed across 13 police stations, the creation of over 225 police officer positions, which were nearly 90 per cent filled, and the allocation of an additional \$220,000 to the Centre for Victims of Crime.

22. Criminal investigation and testimony procedures had been adjusted for persons with psychosocial and/or intellectual disabilities or communication difficulties, including the assignment of specially trained social workers, the availability of sign language interpreters, the development of a communication tool for non-verbal persons used with the assistance of speech therapists, the provision of relevant training and the introduction of procedural and physical accommodations. Medicine, medical equipment and devices and essential services were provided to detainees with disabilities.

23. The main police oversight body was the Department of Internal Police Investigations under the Ministry of Justice, with which anyone could file a complaint. In addition, the Police Disciplinary Tribunal had jurisdiction over all Israel Police and border police officers in active service and those within 180 days of discharge from service. Its decisions were appealable. Only six complaints of excessive use of force had been submitted to it in 2023, 11 complaints in 2024 and 17 complaints as of 31 October 2025.

24. Allegations of criminal offences committed by Israel Prison Service wardens were handled by the police's Unit for Investigation of Wardens. Any information indicating criminal conduct by a warden must immediately be transmitted to the Unit. Serving inmates could submit written complaints in a sealed envelope, which must be delivered to the Unit within 24 hours, or request a personal meeting with a Unit investigator, while former inmates could file a complaint with the police. In addition, heads of prisons were required to immediately report any suspected improper use of force by wardens, even if no formal complaint had been filed, and all relevant materials must be transferred to the Unit without any preliminary enquiries. Once the Unit completed its investigation, the case was either transferred to the State Attorney's Office or closed by the head of the Unit if there was insufficient evidence or the suspect could not be identified. Following the decision of the State Attorney's Office whether to file an indictment, recommend disciplinary action or close the case, the head of the Unit submitted a report to the relevant Israel Prison Service authorities. Between 7 October 2023 and 30 September 2025, the Unit had received 397

claims of ill-treatment of security detainees, 172 of which related to Gazan inmates in the custody of the Israel Prison Service; of those, 152 cases had been referred to the State Attorney's Office for review and decision on indictment, 150 cases had been closed by the Unit and 20 remained under investigation by it.

25. By law, in case of death during detention or imprisonment, the supervisor of the facility must immediately inform the police. The Attorney General, the police, a physician or any other concerned party could request the magistrate's court in the jurisdiction in which the death occurred or in which the body was located to investigate the cause of death. The investigation, the rules of which were in line with international standards, such as those established in the Minnesota Protocol on the Investigation of Potentially Unlawful Death, must take place no later than 15 days from the submission of the request.

26. **A representative of Israel** said that the Israel Prison Service was the competent national authority for the lawful custody, treatment and oversight of all categories of detainees and prisoners, including high-risk security detainees, among them individuals involved in the terrorist attack of 7 October 2023. All individuals held by the Service were detained pursuant to a lawful order and remained subject to regular, independent judicial review by the competent courts.

27. The absolute prohibition of torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment was enshrined in the Service's professional code of conduct and was implemented consistently and without discrimination. The Service ensured that conditions of detention at all its facilities were humane, appropriate and consistent with the requirements of Israeli law and the principles of international law. Detainees enjoyed access to proper nutrition and clean water, hot showers, medical care, daylight and fresh air, appropriate clothing and hygiene products and the right to practise their religion. Adjustments were made to address the specific needs of women, minors, persons with disabilities and other vulnerable groups and to safeguard their dignity and well-being. Women were always held separately from men, and special directives had been issued to Service personnel on the treatment of women inmates, for instance with regard to strip searches and the provision of appropriate medical care, hygiene products and religious attire.

28. All prisoners under the Service's authority received three meals per day consisting of food in the quantity and composition required to maintain their health. The meals had been approved by professional nutritionists and the Service's medical authorities. Food distribution was continuously monitored to ensure that all prisoners received their allotted portion. Special arrangements were made for prisoners who required specific food for health or religious reasons. A committee, headed by a senior officer, had recently been appointed to assess existing measures and identify additional measures to ensure the continued supply of food to all prisoners in accordance with the law.

29. All prisoners, regardless of their religion, race or grounds for imprisonment, had access to medical care that was adapted to their needs and provided directly and continuously by qualified medical personnel stationed in all detention facilities. In addition, the Service operated a 24-hour hundred-bed facility with an enhanced medical team, designed to deliver complex medical care requiring close supervision and nursing support. It also operated four national specialist clinics offering services in orthopaedics, cardiology, psychology and other medical disciplines, and every prison ran an on-site dental clinic. All prisoners were examined by a physician upon admission and could subsequently register for a clinic appointment. Where necessary, all prisoners could be referred to specialist clinics or external hospitals.

30. The Service employed 10 psychiatrists and, in cooperation with community-based institutions, conducted approximately 20,000 psychiatric evaluations annually. Detainees considered at risk of suicide were placed on a special supervision schedule depending on the level of the risk, which might include observation by wardens several times a day and every half hour at night, pairing with a trained peer support detainee who had undergone specialized mental health support training or transfer to the dedicated supervision wing. In cases requiring immediate, intensive intervention, detainees were placed in a cell equipped with 24-hour video surveillance and devoid of objects that could be used to commit suicide. Such

protective measures were applied with strict respect for the person's privacy. Service staff received regular training in suicide prevention.

31. The treatment of scabies in prison was top of the Service's organizational agenda. When cases arose, the infected detainees received immediate medical care, and detailed medical instructions were issued to prevent the spread of the disease among detainees and prison staff. In addition, significant resources were being invested in prevention and treatment, including laundry services.

32. **A representative of Israel** said that the actions taken by the Israel Prison Service to ensure adequate living space and comply with the relevant High Court of Justice ruling included transforming public areas into additional holding cells, adding extensions onto existing facilities and building new facilities. The Service had established a new division responsible for alternatives to detention, including electronic monitoring, notably for suspects awaiting trial, persons eligible for early release and, subject to a court order, persons charged with security offences. Currently, the maximum number of individuals who could be under electronic monitoring at any given time was 1,750. Since the beginning of 2024, that alternative to detention had been applied to more than 4,500 people, including 247 minors and 105 women. A multidisciplinary working group was exploring possibilities for further expanding the use of non-custodial measures, including house arrest.

33. Detention conditions were subject to continuous oversight by a range of entities, including the Service's internal audit mechanism, the State Comptroller's Office, the Prisoners Complaint Ombudsman, the judiciary, the Ministry of Justice and the Public Defender's Office. Under the Prisons Ordinance, the Service was required to grant all duly authorized inspectors access to its facilities and to provide all the information and cooperation necessary for the performance of their duties. Detention conditions were also reviewed through prisoner petitions, of which some 4,600 had been filed in 2024 and 3,600 so far in 2025. Security detainees could also file such petitions, either themselves or through their lawyer. Information on detainee rights, oversight mechanisms and complaints procedures was displayed in multiple areas in all facilities, in the five most commonly spoken languages among detainees.

34. All detainees were allowed to meet with a lawyer – without delay in the case of persons not yet indicted – even outside legal proceedings. Meetings were held in specifically designated rooms and in a manner that guaranteed confidentiality. In May 2025, the Service had set up a new inquiry centre where lawyers could obtain information and assistance regarding the scheduling of meetings with detainees and administrative matters concerning their clients. In addition, through the Service's legal department, which was an independent body under the professional guidance of the Attorney General, prison staff had direct access to prompt legal advice on all matters relating to detainee rights.

35. The Service maintained a zero-tolerance policy towards any unjustified harm to detainees. In keeping with article 10 of the Convention, all prison personnel with direct responsibility for prisoners must undergo comprehensive basic and in-service training in human rights, the preservation of human dignity and physical integrity and the principles of Israeli and international law. In addition, all Service personnel received continuous training in the prevention of sexual harassment and the promotion of respectful and ethical conduct in the workplace. In 2025, more than 2,100 Service personnel had received such training. Training in specific topics, such as imprisonment of minors and persons with disabilities, was provided to relevant personnel.

36. Whenever a matter related to Service operations required examination, a commission of inquiry was appointed in accordance with the Prisons Ordinance. As a general rule, in the event of the death of an inmate, a commission of inquiry was appointed immediately, subject to certain exceptions that did not apply to the death of security detainees. The commission was chaired by a senior officer, accompanied by a medical doctor not involved in any medical treatment related to the incident; no members could be from the same unit or regional command where the incident occurred. If the inquiry raised suspicions of criminal conduct, it was immediately suspended and the case was transferred to the appropriate investigative body. The commission's findings and recommendations were submitted to the competent authority for further action.

37. **A representative of Israel** said that Israel had comprehensively integrated international humanitarian law into all aspects of its military operations through legal training, operational procedures and plans and robust, independent investigation mechanisms for addressing allegations of misconduct by the Israel Defense Forces. The atrocities committed by Hamas and other terrorist organizations on 7 October 2023 had not changed the Forces' deep commitment to international law.

38. Recalling that the context for Israeli detention actions in Gaza was an intensive two-year war, he noted that detention of enemy combatants was an inherent feature of every war and was essential in removing such individuals from the cycle of hostility. During the war, the Israel Defense Forces had detained Gazans who were reasonably suspected of being involved in terrorist activity. Safeguards under international and Israeli law were reinforced through multilayered internal and external oversight mechanisms. Where it was reasonably suspected that rules had been breached, appropriate action was taken either at the individual or the systemic level. Claims that the Forces systematically mistreated detainees were false and did not represent reality on the ground.

39. Hundreds of terrorists had been detained in situ on 7 October 2023. During the subsequent ground operations in Gaza, suspects apprehended in combat areas typically underwent an initial screening by the personnel on the ground, in accordance with military procedures, to assess the need for their detention and further questioning. That process could be challenging, as militants belonging to terrorist organizations in Gaza deliberately embedded themselves in civilian surroundings and dressed in civilian clothing, making it difficult for the Israel Defense Forces to distinguish them from the civilian population. Suspects identified as being involved in terrorist activity or deemed to require further questioning were detained in detention facilities of the Israel Defense Forces on Israeli territory. Those found not to be involved in terrorist activity were released to the Gaza Strip as soon as possible, taking into account both their personal security and operational considerations. Those whose detention was continued for preventive security reasons or as part of criminal proceedings were designated for transfer to a facility of the Israel Prison Service.

40. The Incarceration of Unlawful Combatants Law was written in strict congruity with the Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field (First Geneva Convention), which, while setting more stringent standards than international humanitarian law, explicitly recognized the possibility of holding in preventive detention individuals found to pose a security threat during a conflict. The Law stipulated that detainees must be held in appropriate conditions that did not harm their health or dignity and was accompanied by detailed regulations covering accommodation, clothing, food, medical treatment, hygiene, exercise, work, religious practice, visits and other aspects of daily life, in compliance with international law.

41. Typically, application of the Law began with a temporary detention warrant. An internment order under the Law could be issued only by a senior officer once the detainee had undergone an administrative hearing and the case had been individually assessed by intelligence and legal bodies. Detainees who did not meet the threshold for internment were promptly released. Where an internment order was issued, its lawfulness was examined by the civilian district court at a hearing involving the detainee. Where the order was upheld, it was subject to judicial review every six months. Every decision taken in a case by the district court was appealable before the Supreme Court, thus exceeding the minimum standard established in the First Geneva Convention. While classified material could not be shared with the detainee so as to protect sources, the courts had access to the entire case file.

42. Persons detained under the Law had the right to meet with legal counsel and to be represented in the proceedings, although such meetings could be temporarily delayed for a limited period of time where necessary to prevent harm to State security or to preserve human life. In the context of the war in Gaza, meetings between detainees and their lawyers had been delayed owing to the serious tangible risks that detained militants would exploit the meetings to transfer operational information to terrorist organizations in Gaza that might put the Israel Defense Forces, Israeli civilians and the Israeli hostages in immediate danger. However, the delays were shorter than those mentioned by the Committee. It should be noted

that the First Geneva Convention did not require access to legal counsel in case of preventive detention; the additional safeguard was provided for under Israeli law.

43. The Forces were obliged as soon as a person was apprehended to act in accordance with military regulations on detention, which required that detainees should be treated humanely and respectfully at all times and strictly prohibited torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment, violence of any kind, including sexual violence, collective punishment and offence to religious beliefs.

44. The Forces had been operating two facilities for detainees from Gaza, but most of the detainees who had been held in those detention facilities had already been transferred to the custody of the Israel Prison Service or had been released to the Gaza Strip following the recent exchange of Israeli hostages for detained terrorists from Gaza. Before the war, the Forces had not been the authority designated to hold enemy militants from Gaza for extended periods and had had to quickly adapt. Accordingly, the Forces had been employing vast financial and human resources to build, expand and upgrade their detention facilities, purchase necessary equipment and recruit and train additional personnel to ensure that all detainees under their custody were provided with adequate conditions of detention.

45. Detainees underwent a medical examination as part of the intake process and were provided with medical attention throughout their detention in Forces facilities. Where necessary, they could receive specialist medical care outside the detention facility and be referred for surgery or complex treatment at civilian hospitals.

46. Claims regarding detention conditions in Forces facilities, whether raised in the media, in public reports by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) or by individuals, had been regularly transmitted to the relevant Forces bodies for review and possible action. Findings of logistical gaps or a need for clearer instructions were followed by corrective actions, while alleged misconduct by individuals was addressed through appropriate enforcement actions. The Forces categorically rejected allegations of systematic abuse of detainees but nevertheless took with utmost seriousness every individual complaint addressed to them.

47. In that regard, a robust system of oversight and review was in place to ensure that detainees were held in humane conditions and in compliance with regulations. In Forces detention facilities, direct supervision was exercised by commanding officers, with the support of closed-circuit television, and had proved effective. For example, in over a dozen cases of misconduct or inappropriate attitude, including prolonged restraint of a detainee, improper use of force and verbal mocking, internal reporting by commanders and soldiers at detention facilities had led to disciplinary proceedings or administrative measures, even discharge, against individual soldiers. Where appropriate, incidents were referred to the relevant authorities for criminal investigation.

48. The Israel Defense Forces operated a clear and accessible complaint system that allowed detainees to raise concerns directly with staff or through formal written submissions that were regularly reviewed by commanders. Following one complaint, worn-out copies of the Qur'an had immediately been replaced. Large signs in Hebrew and Arabic setting out detainees' rights and the complaints procedure were posted in visible places. The regulations explicitly prohibited commanders from preventing detainees from filing complaints. The Incarceration of Unlawful Combatants Law had also been amended to provide for the establishment of an external inspection mechanism similar to that used to monitor the Israel Prison Service. It had the authority to enter facilities, inspect conditions, privately interview detainees and issue official inspection reports. Thus far, the inspector had met more than 40 times with heads of facilities and had carried out scheduled and unannounced inspections of all Israel Defense Forces facilities. The Law provided that Supreme Court judges and other senior officials also had those powers.

49. In May 2024, prior to the introduction of the mechanism, the Chief of the General Staff had appointed an external advisory committee, headed by a retired district court judge, that had reviewed the conditions of detention, the treatment of detainees and compliance with internal regulations and domestic and international law at all detention facilities, including through on-site visits and interviews with officers and detainees. The authorities had implemented most of the resulting recommendations, including by improving infrastructure and clarifying procedures. Periodic discussions were held to monitor their implementation.

Another form of judicial oversight was provided by the Supreme Court in its role as the High Court of Justice, in which it heard and discussed petitions from individuals and NGOs on constitutional and administrative issues, including matters concerning detention. The mechanisms in place, which complemented the military justice system, attested to the efforts made to implement relevant laws in practice and in accordance with international standards.

50. The Israel Defense Forces were committed to investigating complaints of torture and ill-treatment and holding wrongdoers accountable through criminal proceedings or other enforcement measures, as appropriate. It was explicitly acknowledged in directives issued by the Israel Defense Forces and the Attorney General that the military justice system was not subject to the chain of command, but only to the law. In general, the military prosecution, which was part of the Military Advocate General's Corps, ordered the opening of a criminal investigation whenever there was a prima facie reasonable suspicion of criminal misconduct by soldiers. During the current war, the military prosecution had ordered 13 criminal investigations concerning alleged mistreatment of detainees to be opened, one of which had already been tried before a military tribunal and had resulted in the conviction of a reservist soldier. In cases of deaths of detainees – which had included deaths of persons who had entered detention with battlefield wounds or existing medical conditions – criminal investigations were promptly opened as a matter of policy.

51. A number of other criminal investigations that had been opened during the war, most of which were still ongoing, included alleged cases of destruction of property, illegal appropriation of enemy property and illegal use of force. Criminal investigations concerning operational matters, including the treatment of enemy detainees in the custody of the Israel Defense Forces, were handled by a special unit of the Military Police Criminal Investigation Division that was independent from Israel Defense Forces commanders, guided by the Military Advocate General's Corps and staffed by investigators who had received additional training, including in relevant international law. At the conclusion of criminal investigations, the Division transferred the investigation files to the Military Advocate General's Corps, which decided whether to file charges or to close cases; it could also instruct commanders to carry out disciplinary proceedings or recommend other action. Such decisions could be challenged through the submission of complaints – including by NGOs – to the Attorney General or petitions to the High Court of Justice. When charges were filed, cases were adjudicated before an independent military tribunal. Complaints that did not raise a prima facie reasonable suspicion of criminal misconduct were assessed to determine whether criminal investigation or other measures were warranted. In the context of the hostilities in Gaza, the assessment was conducted by the Fact-Finding Assessment Mechanism, an impartial mechanism for examining exceptional incidents during the conduct of hostilities. The fact that Israel had carried out such investigations and assessments despite the ongoing hostilities reflected its commitment to the rule of law, while its practices had surpassed those observed globally in other armed conflicts in recent decades.

52. The legal and factual context of detention in the Gaza Strip was different to that in Judea and Samaria, where detentions were typically carried out in the context of law enforcement and detainees were held only for short periods by the Israel Defense Forces before being transferred to other agencies. In Gaza, administrative detention was regulated by Military Order No. 1651 of 2009, which was consistent with article 78 of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (the Fourth Geneva Convention). Under the Order and Israeli case law, administrative detention was used only as a last resort for persons who, according to credible, up-to-date and reliable information, posed a concrete and substantial security threat. Criminal prosecution was preferred over administrative detention where possible. Detention orders – the duration of which was limited to 6 months – and orders extending detention were subject to a multilayered system of judicial review, including appellate review, which exceeded the requirements of the Fourth Geneva Convention. Administrative detainees were entitled to legal representation of their choice. The military courts, which were independent from the chain of command of the Israel Defense Forces, could uphold, annul or reduce the duration of orders. In the past year, there had been multiple cases in which they had ordered the release of detainees or had reduced the duration of their detention after reviewing the available intelligence. Their decisions could be appealed before the High Court of Justice, which reviewed hundreds of cases of that nature every year.

53. The increase in the number of arrests and administrative detentions that had taken place since October 2023 was due to a sharp rise in serious terrorist activity. Strengthened directives issued to ensure the respectful and humane treatment of all detainees, including women and minors in both the Gaza Strip and Judea and Samaria, prohibited any form of verbal, physical or sexual abuse and provided that female detainees must be searched exclusively by female personnel in private settings. Men, women and minors who were not members of the same nuclear family were held separately, and gender-specific logistical arrangements, including for the provision of hygiene products, were in place. In Gaza, a relatively small number of women had been subject to detention orders, and they were detained in conditions consistent with international humanitarian law. Women and minors – who were systematically recruited and exploited in combat roles, sometimes at only 15 years of age, by terrorist organizations in Gaza and in Judea and Samaria – could be detained only with authorization from senior command. The cases of vulnerable persons, including women and minors, were prioritized for expedited handling. The Incarceration of Unlawful Combatants Law provided for shorter time frames for holding minors in temporary detention.

54. Although the use of artificial intelligence by the Israel Defense Forces fell outside the substantive scope of the Convention, Israel wished to clarify that it did not use any artificial intelligence systems that automatically selected and engaged targets. All intelligence-based procedures employed for the identification and approval of targets were conducted by human personnel who exercised professional judgment and ensured that each decision complied with the rules and principles of international humanitarian law. Israel had been clear, consistent and transparent on that matter, emphasizing that human responsibility, legal oversight and accountability remained central to all operational decision-making processes.

55. In the ongoing case concerning the abuse allegedly committed by a group of soldiers at the Sde Teiman facility, a formal charge had been filed before a military tribunal. The unit of reservist soldiers in question had been disbanded and replaced shortly after the allegations had come to light.

56. **A representative of Israel** said that, for decades, the Israeli judicial system had been open to Palestinians wishing to bring legal challenges against the State of Israel. The High Court of Justice had heard thousands of cases involving Palestinian interests – including those of residents of the Gaza Strip and Judea and Samaria – and had not hesitated to strike down executive policy and legislation that had been found to excessively contravene individual rights. Legal proceedings involving Palestinians had continued in Israel even during times of intense hostilities. Given the extensive resources that Israel had devoted to facilitating litigation by Palestinians before Israeli courts, the volume of cases adjudicated and the extensive case law pertaining to the West Bank, Palestinian claims that there was a lack of access to effective remedies in Israel were untenable. To ensure that access to legal proceedings was not unreasonably denied, the Supreme Court had set forth various guidelines in its case law for the lower courts to follow when imposing security deposits on plaintiffs, including the need to take into consideration their right of access to the courts, the lawsuit's chances of success, the complexity of the proceedings, the identity of the parties and the extent of complainants' good faith in initiating proceedings. As a result, Palestinian complainants were regularly exempted from providing such deposits.

57. Under the Authorities for Prevention of Internet Use for the Commission of Offences Law, courts could, when necessary, issue orders restricting access to websites to prevent offences involving prostitution, child sexual abuse, drug trafficking, gambling or terrorism. Unlike criminal law, which targeted publishers of harmful content, that Law was designed to enable rapid and efficient handling of the content itself. Orders could be issued to restrict access to a website in whole or in part when the content was hosted outside Israel or to remove websites hosted in Israel. Between 2024 and 2025, seven requests concerning a total of 19,336 websites containing child sexual abuse material had been approved by the courts. Recent investigations by the Child Online Protection Bureau had also resulted in the filing of serious charges against persons suspected of sexual offences against children. The cybercrime department of the State Attorney's Office also sent requests to Internet platforms to voluntarily remove harmful and dangerous content that violated their terms of use and Israeli law. Such requests covered a range of offences, including violations involving children, sexual harassment, privacy and extortion.

58. **Mr. Kessing** (Country Rapporteur) said that the treatment that the two members of the delegation who had spoken in the first half of the dialogue had suffered in the events of 7 October 2023 onwards went against basic human values and was a blatant violation of international law, including the Convention, that nobody should endure. The Committee had received reports that Palestinians also had been exposed to treatment during interrogation and detention that went against basic human values and was a blatant violation of international law, including the Convention, that nobody should endure. As the Committee wished to assess the State Party on the basis of correct, unbiased information, he would be grateful if the delegation could explain why the Committee should not believe the consistent information provided in the alternative reports, which it had received from more than 35 institutions, including United Nations entities and Israeli, Palestinian and international NGOs.

59. He wished to know what steps the State Party had taken to investigate statements made in the press by senior Israeli officials, including the current Minister of National Security, in which they had publicly endorsed or even encouraged practices that usually amounted to ill-treatment, including dehumanizing and discriminatory statements in which Palestinians had been referred to as human animals, and to ensure that public narratives did not incite or legitimize violence, collective punishment or inhuman treatment against Palestinians. He would welcome an explanation of what special measures could be used lawfully under the necessity defence. He would appreciate information about the outcomes of efforts to ensure accountability, including the number of judgments, if any, in which Israeli officials had been found guilty of exposing Palestinian detainees to torture or ill-treatment and the sentences, if any, handed down in those cases.

60. **Ms. Racu** (Country Rapporteur) said that she would appreciate information about the independence of medical personnel in prisons, particularly with regard to reporting injuries that might have resulted from acts of violence committed by prison personnel or other prisoners, and about the manner in which such incidents were reported and documented at a practical level. She would also welcome relevant data, including on the number of complaints submitted, cases examined and criminal proceedings initiated and on their outcomes. The delegation might provide clarification as to the regime under which minors were held in administrative detention and their ability to meet with family members and doctors. She would appreciate more information about the material conditions of detention at older prison facilities, Saharonim prison, which was reportedly one of the most overcrowded facilities in Israel, and Yahalom detention facility at Ben Gurion Airport. Details about the application of solitary confinement, particularly to minors, would be welcome.

61. She wished to receive statistics on complaints lodged, criminal cases initiated and convictions handed down in relation to acts of violence against women and girls, including Palestinian and non-Palestinian prisoners. Given that international personnel of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) had not been granted access to the Occupied Palestinian Territory since the beginning of January 2025 and that a significant amount of humanitarian aid remained outside Gaza pending authorization from the State Party, she wished to hear details of the measures taken to ensure that humanitarian assistance reached Gaza in a regular and predictable manner and that international humanitarian actors were provided with safe and effective access to civilians in need. She would appreciate clarification as to why restrictions had been placed on the ability of independent monitoring bodies such as the International Committee of the Red Cross, which played a vital role in providing the Committee with objective information, to visit places of detention in the State Party, and wondered whether steps were being taken to ensure that such bodies could promptly resume regular visits.

62. **Mr. Iscan** said that it was commonly understood, including by the Committee, that terrorism, whatever its form and whoever committed it, constituted one of the most serious threats to international peace and security and must be condemned and that victims must receive appropriate redress. However, it was also understood, as established in the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy and resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, that any measures taken by States to combat terrorism must comply with their obligations under international law, in particular human rights law and international humanitarian law.

63. **Mr. Rouwane** said that, in the light of videos that showed the Israeli Minister of National Security visiting Palestinian prisoners who were lying on the ground in humiliating positions and Israeli soldiers who had been accused of torturing and raping a Palestinian prisoner being cheered by a large number of people in court, the delegation might comment on whether, as the Committee frequently encouraged States Parties to do, Israel would consider making an official declaration at the highest level that torture would not be tolerated under any circumstances and perpetrators would be prosecuted.

64. **Mr. Tuzmukhamedov** said that he wished to know whether, if adopted, the bill to permit the execution of terrorists, which appeared to be discriminatory towards a particular group, would mark a reversal of the position of Israel, which had always voted in favour of resolutions of the General Assembly calling for a moratorium on the use of the death penalty.

65. **Mr. Contesse** said that he wished to know on what basis the delegation had distinguished between some United Nations officials whose work it had cited in support of its statements and others whose work it had claimed was politically motivated. He wondered whether, in the delegation's view, the reports that violence in the West Bank had reached record levels in October 2025 were accurate or politically motivated. The renowned Israeli jurist Shabtai Rosenne had said that advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice possessed great legal weight and moral authority and that States Members of the United Nations were expected to act on their basis in good faith. He wished to know how Israel applied that understanding to the advisory opinion set forth by the International Court of Justice in 2024, in which it had stated that the State of Israel was under an obligation to bring to an end its unlawful presence in the Occupied Palestinian Territory as rapidly as possible and had an obligation to cease immediately all new settlement activities and to evacuate all settlers from the Occupied Palestinian Territory.

*The meeting was suspended at 5.15 p.m. and resumed at 5.30 p.m.*

66. **A representative of Israel** said that Israel refuted the claim that its authorities had a policy of widespread and systematic use of torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment. The delegation had provided details of the laws and policies in place to ensure that such acts were not committed and that, in the exceptional cases in which they were, they were investigated and punished. To claim that exceptional cases amounted to a systematic practice of torture was false and misleading. Israel deplored the parallel that the Committee had implied existed between the Israeli hostages and Palestinian detainees, between whom there could be no comparison.

67. **A representative of Israel** said that the Israel Prison Service held only 700 detainees at the Saharonim prison. The Population and Immigration Authority used custody for the purpose of removing foreign nationals, whom it held at the Yahalom and Giv'on detention facilities, only as a last resort. Custody orders were issued only after cases had been reviewed by border control officers and were subject to an additional review 24 hours after they had been issued and prior to the issuance of removal orders. Detainees must be brought before a judge within 96 hours and could present their arguments, including through legal counsel, at a hearing held in a language they understood or with interpretation services. To enable detainees to file an appeal, removal orders were not enforced until 72 hours after their issuance. The legality of custody and removal orders was subject to routine judicial review, following which the terms of custody could be altered or detainees could be released.

68. Under section 13 (f) of the Entry into Israel Law, persons staying illegally in the country could be released on bail for specific reasons. Foreign nationals could also be released from custody if they had not been removed from Israel within 60 days, except in cases where the delay was due to their failure to cooperate with authorities. Under a pilot project, removal hearings were currently being recorded with a view to improving procedures; detainees and their legal counsel could obtain copies. Under the procedures followed by the Population and Immigration Authority, families with children that were subject to custody and removal orders were placed at the Yahalom facility, which was currently undergoing renovations to increase the size of holding rooms and create an accessible room for persons with disabilities and special rooms for families with children. Under the relevant guidelines, children at the facility met with social workers, who submitted reports to the authorities regarding their well-being and the impact on them of removal from Israel, taking into account

the children's best interests, which were a central consideration and could influence decisions taken in relation to removal orders. Children aged 12 years and above could express their opinions freely before a border control officer with, if they wished, a parent present; those opinions were given due consideration. Social workers assisted in the consideration of removal cases involving minors. Border control supervisors routinely received training in such matters with the participation of social workers from the Ministry of Welfare and Social Affairs and specialists in international law from the Ministry of Justice.

69. As of October 2025, there had been 28,000 asylum applications pending, a high number relative to the country's size. Under Procedure No. 5.2.0012, the Population and Immigration Authority was undertaking to improve asylum services and shorten processing times in accordance with the obligations of Israel under the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and the 1967 Protocol thereto by ensuring that asylum-seekers had access to relevant information and legal representation, could easily submit asylum applications and understood their rights and obligations. They could not be removed until their applications had been reviewed. Applications were handled by a dedicated unit, and decisions denying asylum could be appealed before an appeals tribunal, district courts and, with permission, the Supreme Court. A new provision of the asylum procedure provided that interviews with asylum-seekers who claimed or were suspected by interviewers to be victims of torture or severe physical, psychological or sexual violence must be conducted with special sensitivity to prevent retraumatization. The employment of such an approach did not imply acknowledgement that the victim had, in fact, been tortured.

70. All women and babies in Israel, including those with no legal civil status, were entitled to receive preventive medicine, including routine vaccinations, and growth and development follow-up at mother-and-child healthcare centres. Under section 3 (b) of the Patients' Rights Law, all persons were entitled to receive urgent medical care at any facility in Israel. Children with no legal civil status were also entitled to receive primary healthcare, including routine checks, laboratory services, scans, oncological treatment, dialysis, surgery, long- and short-term inpatient care, rehabilitation and addiction recovery, at designated healthcare facilities. Although co-payments were currently required, the possibility of reducing costs for patients' families was under consideration.

71. **A representative of Israel** said that allegations of enforced disappearance or incommunicado detention of Palestinian detainees were unfounded. Under Israeli law, all detainees were registered upon intake into detention facilities as a matter of regular procedure, and all detentions were subject to rigorous administrative and judicial review. Issues regarding conditions of detention were regularly reviewed by the judicial system, particularly the Supreme Court. Detainees were entitled to meetings with legal counsel, which could be postponed on security grounds for only limited periods. Relatives of detainees from Judea and Samaria could obtain information about their whereabouts by contacting the incarceration command and control centre of the military police. Where needed, family members could initiate court proceedings to compel the State to provide information on the grounds and legality of detention.

72. **A representative of Israel** said that, under the Israeli legal system, international treaties were incorporated into domestic law through the enactment of laws; therefore, in addition to direct application of provisions codifying previously existing customary norms, international human rights conventions could be implemented through a wide range of legal instruments, including basic laws, municipal bylaws and court rulings. Although the High Court of Justice had ruled that customary international law applied only as long as it did not contradict the law of the parliament, it had also ruled that both customary and treaty law affected Israeli law due to the presumption of compatibility between domestic law and international norms that Israel had undertaken to uphold. Human rights treaties were thus also an important tool for the interpretation of domestic laws and served to further enhance international human rights norms in the domestic sphere.

73. Following each review by the various human rights treaty bodies, an interministerial team met to consider how to implement their concluding observations, which were translated into Hebrew and disseminated among all relevant governmental bodies and to the public. Although the delegation could not comment on recent developments involving the former military advocate general, which were under investigation, the Committee's description of

the issue had been partial and misleading and had not accurately reflected the context or complexity of the incident in question. Under a ruling of the Supreme Court, the special measures permitted under the necessity defence could not amount to torture as defined in article 1 of the Convention.

74. **A representative of Israel** said that Israel rejected the premise of the question asked by the Committee regarding the discrepancy between the reports that it had received and the information that the delegation had provided. The vicious cycle in which sources emanating from Gaza were relied on by biased mechanisms and requoted in reports, resulting in the presentation of an alternate reality as fact, was a tremendous challenge that Israel was obliged to tackle. For example, data on mortality coming out of Gaza originated from the so-called Ministry of Health, an organ of the terror organization Hamas. The issue warranted a more thorough response addressing the methodology of reporting by the United Nations.

75. Policies that ministers declared wishing to pursue were subject to a number of oversight measures prior to implementation to ensure their alignment with the obligations of Israel under international law and its commitment to the rule of law as a democratic State. The country's compliance with the Convention should be assessed only on the basis of the facts on the ground, which the delegation had presented in detail.

76. **A representative of Israel** said that Israel fully recognized the vital importance of providing humanitarian assistance to civilians in Gaza and continued to facilitate extensive cooperation with a wide range of international humanitarian actors. To do so required significant and daily engagement among all relevant parties and the maintenance of close interaction and ongoing dialogue with the international community, aid agencies and organizations to expand the flow of assistance to Gaza, address logistical and distribution challenges, coordinate infrastructure repairs and facilitate the rotation of humanitarian teams through Israeli territory. It was important to acknowledge that UNRWA had long ago ceased to be a neutral and impartial humanitarian agency. Israel had presented credible and detailed evidence that UNRWA continued to employ hundreds of officials affiliated with Hamas and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, including official members of their military wings. The interruption of coordination with UNRWA for that reason had not negatively affected the access of humanitarian agencies to, or their activities in, the Gaza Strip. Before and since the withdrawal of UNRWA, Israel had taken numerous steps, some unprecedented in the history of warfare, to mitigate the complex humanitarian challenges in Gaza and had continued and expanded cooperation with international organizations, United Nations entities and NGOs to provide for humanitarian needs there.

77. The Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and Israel was a manifestation of the institutional discrimination against Israel that existed in the Human Rights Council and the United Nations system more broadly. In May 2021, at a time when Israeli civilians were being attacked with thousands of rockets but no mention of Hamas terrorism had been made in any United Nations resolutions, the Commission had been established with unprecedented temporal, geographical and substantial scope, no review mechanisms and no sunset clause. Its mandate to identify the root causes of the conflict had repeatedly been abused to point to Israel as the source of all evil in the region, thereby delegitimizing the existence of a State Member of the United Nations and disregarding the human rights of Israelis. The fact that the Commission included three hand-picked critics of Israel and its head had formerly classified Israel as an apartheid State only confirmed its partiality. Any conclusions that it could reach about human rights violations by Israel were entirely predictable, regardless of the facts. Antisemitic comments made by one of its members confirmed the mechanism's irrelevance. Many countries and bodies had objected to the selection of the current Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967 owing to her antisemitic and anti-Israeli conduct.

78. **A representative of Israel** said that, under the applicable laws and regulations, detainees received three meals a day and had full access to drinking water. A petition that several NGOs had filed with the High Court of Justice based on the claims of lawyers about poor nutrition at a detention facility had been withdrawn after the Government had provided a detailed response. The indictment filed against the five soldiers for alleged abuse did not include allegations of rape or other sexual abuse, no evidence of which had been found. The

Israel Defense Forces placed great emphasis on the professional training, which was provided by its Military Police School, and ethical conduct of all personnel involved in detention operations.

79. **The Chair** said that the Committee's dialogue with Israel had been characterized by its frankness, good faith and respect. The Committee was not a court and did not hand down judgment in any form but wished to address issues pertaining to the Convention and to provide recommendations that would assist the State Party. Such a dialogue should be seen as an opportunity for Israeli society to examine itself critically and address the challenges that it faced, in keeping with its democratic values. While the Committee was aware that Israel had faced significant trauma and threats to its national security throughout its history – including the events of 7 October 2023, about which the Committee had heard moving statements at the previous meeting – there were fundamental problems that could not be denied and that, ultimately, only the State Party could address. The President of Israel himself had recently condemned the extreme violence that settlers were perpetrating against Palestinians in the West Bank. Other bodies had determined that, following the atrocities of 7 October 2023, there had been at least an excessive use of force against the civilian population of Gaza. He urged Israel to use its dialogue with the Committee to reconsider its approach to what the Committee understood was a difficult conflict. Furthermore, there needed to be a degree of accountability within a democratic State, including in the context of the peace plan signed on 13 October 2025. The Committee would welcome keeping the dialogue with the State Party open.

80. **A representative of Israel**, thanking the Committee for its engagement, said that Israel had demonstrated its full commitment to the Convention and had refuted slander fuelled by antisemitic narratives that distorted both law and reality. The delegation called on the Committee to condemn the atrocities committed by Hamas and to do everything within its mandate to support the immediate and unconditional release of all hostages. He urged the Committee to recognize his country's commitment to the Convention and ensure that its work remained objective, fact-based and free from political bias, which was essential to the Committee's credibility and integrity. Israel would provide further information in writing and would carefully consider all non-political recommendations.

*The meeting rose at 6 p.m.*