



Ref: 15/1/4/11 & 15/1/4/21 - 18/2026

The Permanent Mission of Lebanon to the United Nations Office and to other International Organizations in Geneva presents its compliments to the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, and with reference to the letter number UA LBN 4/2025 that has been addressed to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Emigrants of Lebanon on 24/11/2025, would like to transmit herewith the answer of the Ministry of Justice regarding the case of Mr. Abdel Rahman Youssef EL KARADAWI.

The Permanent Mission of Lebanon remains available for any further clarification.

The Permanent Mission of Lebanon in Geneva avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights the assurances of its highest consideration.

Geneva, January 28, 2026

**Office of the High Commissioner  
for Human Rights  
Palais Wilson, Geneva**



*(Translated from Arabic)*

**Permanent Mission of Lebanon  
to the United Nations Office and other international organizations  
Geneva**

The following reply concerns the joint communication in which the Special Procedures Division of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) requests information regarding the case of Egyptian-Turkish national Mr. Abdulrahman Yusuf al-Qaradawi.

The Lebanese Republic and the United Arab Emirates are both members of the League of Arab States. In that context, Lebanon cooperates with other Arab nations in accordance with its legal and international obligations.

The following facts have been established in relation to the case in question:

1. A provisional arrest warrant against Mr. Abdulrahman Yusuf al-Qaradawi was issued by the secretariat of the Council of Arab Ministers of the Interior [REDACTED] on 29 December 2024. It was based on an international arrest warrant issued by the United Arab Emirates Prosecution Office for Combating Rumour-mongering and Cybercrimes [REDACTED], dated 29 December 2024.
2. The provisional arrest warrant made reference to an earlier provisional arrest warrant, [REDACTED], dated 6 February 2018, which had been issued against the same person [REDACTED]. That was based on a communication from the Arab and International Criminal Police Department in Cairo, [REDACTED], dated 5 February 2018.
3. The prosecution case against the person in question in the requesting State concerns the offence of disseminating false and inflammatory news and rumours among the public via the Internet, thereby undermining public safety, stirring up sectarian tensions and harming the interests and security of the State.
4. According to a summary of the case, on 17 December 2024, the individual whose extradition is being sought appeared on the Internet in a video in which he referred to the United Arab Emirates and certain other Arab countries as evil regimes that plan and conspire against the oppressed Arab peoples, including Syrians, Libyans, Yemenis, Egyptians and Tunisians. He described them as regimes of Arab ignominy, characterized them as “Arab Zionists” and claimed that the United Arab Emirates is at the forefront of the States that conspire against Arab peoples who are seeking freedom and that oppose any policy of change in the Arab nations. This attitude suggests an intent to confront the existing order and to threaten the stability of the State.

5. The extradition request duly cited the applicable legal provisions, which are articles 1, 52 and 71 of Federal Decree-Law No. 34 of 2021 on combating rumour-mongering and cybercrime, as amended; articles 21, 217 and 227 of Federal Decree-Law No. 31 of 2021 promulgating the Criminal Code, as amended; and articles 1 and 7 of Federal Decree-Law No. 34 of 2023 on combating discrimination, hate and extremism.
6. The offences detailed in the extradition request are also envisaged and penalized under article 317 of the Lebanese Criminal Code, according to which any act or written or oral communication that instigates, or is intended to instigate, confessional or racial bigotry or provoke conflict among the various communities and component elements of the nation is punishable with a term of imprisonment of between 1 and 3 years, with a fine and with a prohibition from exercising the rights envisaged in article 65 (2) and (4) (i.e., the right to hold office and serve in the administration of the civil community or trade union to which the person concerned belongs, and the right to vote or stand for election on any State council). The court may also order its verdict to be made public. The charges against the individual being sought for extradition do not concern mere expression of opinion, as protected under domestic and international law, they concern acts that actually constitute a criminal offence, the purpose of which was to spread rumours and incite the overthrow of Arab regimes, as evinced by the time and place at which the act occurred.
7. According to the extradition request, the Office of the Public Prosecution in the United Arab Emirates had initiated an investigation into the case and was still in the process of completing its inquiries.
8. The request also included an undertaking on the part of the Office of the Public Prosecution to apply the principle of reciprocity in cases and matters similar to those detailed in the extradition request.
9. According to article 52 of Decree-Law No. 34, under which the person in question is being prosecuted, anyone who uses a computer network or any other means of information technology to broadcast, publish, republish, circulate or recirculate false news, statements, reports or rumours that are malicious, misleading or defamatory, or that contradict official pronouncements; or to broadcast inflammatory propaganda likely to incite or agitate public opinion, undermine public security, terrorize the population or harm the public interest, the national economy, public order or public health is liable to a term of imprisonment of 1 year and a fine. The penalty increases to a term of imprisonment of 2 years and a fine if any of the acts mentioned in paragraph 1 of article 52 cause public opinion to be aroused against any State authority or institution, or if such acts are committed in time of epidemic, crisis, emergency or catastrophe. According to article 71 of the Decree-Law, the offences envisaged in a certain number of articles – one of them being article 52 – are to be

considered as crimes against State security. Moreover, any offence envisioned in the Decree-Law is to be considered as a crime against State security if committed on behalf of or in the interest of a foreign State, a terrorist group, gang or organization, or any other unlawful entity.

10. The extradition request was issued by the judicial authorities of the United Arab Emirates for the purpose of conducting investigations and legal proceedings against the individual in question. The United Arab Emirates does not suffer from security or political unrest and has a functioning judicial system that guarantees fair trials.

11. The party concerned was arrested by the Directorate General of Public Security when entering Lebanon from Syria via the Masnaa border crossing on 28 December 2024. The arrest was based on the provisional arrest warrant which had been issued by the secretariat of the Council of Arab Ministers of the Interior and circulated locally. When questioned by the police on 30 December 2024, he stated that he had recorded a video at ██████████ Mosque in Damascus after the fall of the Syrian regime, congratulating the Syrian people and warning them that authoritarian Arab regimes – Egypt, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates – were colluding against their revolution. He then posted the video to his X account under the name of “Poet Abdulrahman Yusuf”, which has approximately 900,000 followers, most of whom are from Arab countries. A statement from this individual was also taken by the Office of the Public Prosecutor at the Court of Cassation, in the presence of his lawyer ██████████. According to the report of the Public Prosecutor, there was nothing to indicate or suggest that the charges being brought were political in nature or that the extradition request was being made for political purposes. It should also be noted that, in article 35 of the Criminal Code, legislators have acted to ensure that extradition procedures are subject to a decree to be issued at the proposal of the Minister of Justice. This clearly indicates that an extradition decision is not purely a judicial matter but a sovereign decision to be taken by the executive branch in the best interests of the State.

12. The record of the meeting of the Council of Ministers, held on 7 January 2025, indicates that the Lebanese Government received assurances from the authorities of the United Arab Emirates that the person whose extradition was being sought would be treated fairly and humanely. This was confirmed by the Deputy Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Emirates during a telephone conversation with the Lebanese Prime Minister on 6 January 2025.

- The fact that the United Arab Emirates has become, for the third time, a member of the United Nations Human Rights Council constitutes indisputable international recognition of the country’s efforts to promote and protect human rights nationally, regionally and internationally, and of the steady progress it has made in that regard. This is evident in the treaties it has signed; in its legislation, laws and regulations which uphold fundamental rights and ensure fair treatment for

citizens and residents; and in its specialized human rights protection mechanisms, namely the National Committee for Human Rights and the National Human Rights Institution.

- In addition, the United Arab Emirates ranked first for civil and criminal justice among countries of the Middle East and North Africa in the 2021 Rule of Law Index produced by the World Justice Project.

- In the light of the principles of international cooperation and reciprocity, in implementation of legal provisions regulating the grounds for extradition and in view of assurances that the person concerned would be treated fairly and humanely and allowed to exercise his rights as set forth above, the Council of Ministers decided to approve the issuance of a decree to extradite the Egyptian citizen who also holds Turkish nationality to the judicial authorities of the United Arab Emirates.

13. The United Arab Emirates provided all the aforementioned guarantees, which Lebanon was very careful to obtain before reaching a decision on the extradition. Furthermore, the conditions for extradition had been met and the authorities of the United Arab Emirates had undertaken to act on the basis of reciprocity. Also, the action in question is an offence in both countries, and the case documents contained no evidence to indicate that the person concerned might be subjected to inhumane treatment or subjected to enforced disappearance. There were no indications to that effect nor any evidence regarding allegations of human rights violations and, moreover, the penalty is limited to a fixed term of imprisonment. In the light of all that, the Lebanese authorities applied all relevant domestic and international legal principles governing extradition, verified to the fullest possible extent the fulfilment of the conditions, confirmed the absence of any impediment then proceeded with the extradition in accordance with the law. The Lebanese Republic and the United Arab Emirates, as members of the League of Arab States, follow the procedures established by the Council of Arab Ministers, particularly as regards the enforcement of provisional arrest warrants issued by the Council's secretariat, and they cooperate on extradition requests after having first verified that the legal conditions have been duly met.

14. In addition to the foregoing, the Lebanese authorities respected all the rights of the person whose extradition was being sought and treated him in a manner consistent with human rights standards. They permitted him to avail himself of the services of a lawyer and referred him to a forensic doctor who conducted a clinical examination then issued a report on 8 January 2025. The report showed that he was in good health and displayed no symptoms of communicable or infectious diseases, or any other signs of illness. There were no traces of bruises, signs of torture or similar marks on his body, and his mental and psychological state was good.