

Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on violence against women and girls, its causes and consequences

Ref.: AL QAT 1/2026

(Please use this reference in your reply)

11 May 2026

Excellency,

I have the honour to address you in my capacity as Special Rapporteur on violence against women and girls, its causes and consequences, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 59/20.

In this connection, I would like to bring to the attention of your Excellency's Government information I have received concerning **allegations of intersecting discrimination on the basis of sex, gender, and disability against a sixty year old woman in the context of divorce proceedings, which have reportedly resulted in her denial of security of tenure and subsequent forced eviction, as well as a failure to adequately address gender-based domestic violence in this context.**

According to the information received:

Ms. Carrie Dupont, a 60-year-old US-born woman, holding dual citizenship of the United States and Qatar, from 1991 to 2025, was married to a Qatari man; who reportedly subjected her to abusive behaviour and threats. They got married in the United States in 1991 and moved to Qatar in 1993, where Ms. Dupont is continuing to live with her adult son who has a learning disability. She has two other sons, one of them lives in Qatar and a third one resides in the United States.

For the duration of their marriage, she contributed financially to the household, and in 2007, her husband reportedly gave her a letter stating that everything he bought would be shared with her.

Her husband allegedly worked in Qatar petroleum industry which allowed him to exercise leverage. Ms. Dupont reportedly acquired Qatari citizenship in 1996. Since 2001, Ms. Dupont suffers from the Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease, a progressive neuromuscular condition affecting balance, mobility and strength in hands, arms, and legs. She is a licensed professional counsellor who has worked for a research center affiliated with Qatar University and as adjunct faculty member at universities in Canada and the United States.

In March 2025, the husband unilaterally divorced Ms. Dupont through *talaq*, which is a form of non-court-based divorce in Islamic law whereby the husband can unilaterally dissolve the marriage by pronouncing "talaq" three times, and which does not require the wife's consent.

Conflict over property, including the residential apartment

In 1997, Ms. Dupont decided to purchase an apartment, and, on 22 April 1997, she contracted a mortgage from the Qatar Islamic Bank for the purchase of an

apartment that was 900 m² for a total value of 850,000 riyals and that belonged to a private citizen. The property was mortgaged to the bank for the duration of the loan.

Over the payment period, she first paid a one-time amount of 180,000 Qatari Riyals in 2002 and, then, a monthly amount over a 60-month period (which amounts to the remaining 670,800 Qatari Riyals). The last instalment for the apartment was reportedly paid on the 27 April 2022. Upon full repayment, the bank issued a discharge of the mortgage on 4 May 2022.

When she paid the first instalment, Ms. Dupont had moved into the house where she lived until 2025.

In 2024, Ms. Dupont had a conflict with her then husband after she discovered that the ownership deeds for the apartment she had paid were titled exclusively in her former husband's name, to whom she was still married. The property deed reportedly documents the sale of the apartment from the previous owner to her former husband. Her own name never appeared on the ownership document. Her former husband had also reportedly produced a document that showed that she had handed over her right to the property to him and that she had given him a power of attorney to represent her in all matters relating to the apartment mortgage and ownership issues. Ms. Dupont admitted that her former husband had convinced her that she needed to issue him a power of attorney since she was originally a foreigner and did not speak Arabic, but that she did it assuming he would act in good faith, which he reportedly did not do.

On 27 January 2025, Ms. Dupont's learned that her husband had gifted the house to a son he had with his second wife from Morocco whom he secretly married in 2024.

Subsequently, in 2025, Ms. Dupont filed a complaint with the Investment and Trade Court against the original owner of the apartment for issuing the property certificate for the apartment in her husband's name in 1997, despite the fact that it was her that made the payments. She also filed a lawsuit in the same year against the Qatari Islamic Bank for failing to respect the correct procedure when discharging the mortgage. She asked for the full amount she paid to be returned to her adjusted to inflation, in addition to damages incurred as a result of the mismanagement of the case.

In May and June 2025, the Courts rejected Ms. Dupont's claim on the grounds that the property title was registered under the name of her former husband, ignoring the findings of the court-appointed expert that had issued an expert opinion confirming her reported allegations including that there was no proven request in writing from her to her husband asking for the property documents for the apartment to be issued in his name only. Also, the expert stated that the Islamic Bank had not confirmed officially that she was the one who paid all the dues for the apartment when they discharged the mortgage, nor confirmed the subsequent transfer of the apartment to her since she paid the total amount.

Despite the expert's report, the Civil Court also rejected her case against the Bank in 2025 on the grounds that the statute of limitation for bringing complaints had expired. She has appealed the decision, with the final decision still pending.

Ms. Dupont also claims that she had loaned before 2020 an additional 400,000 Riyals to her husband which he used to acquire other property registered in his own name. Her former husband had reportedly provided her with two checks in 2014 and 2015 as confirmation and proof of agreement to pay. Ms. Dupont has taken legal action to reclaim the loan she provided to her husband.

In total, her husband reportedly owns eight housing properties- none of them are owned or co-owned with her. Ms. Dupont reports that she had contributed financially to the purchase of these eight properties over 34 years of marriage. He had reportedly often put pressure on her to finance the acquisition of these properties. Ms. Dupont stated that her husband had provided her with a letter in which he committed to including her as a co-owner. Her former husband later claimed that Ms. Dupont had forged the letter.

Ms. Dupont also claims that her husband had manipulated other property belonging to her sons. He reportedly also holds the power of attorney over property that belongs to two of his three sons that he has with Ms. Dupont. Using that authority, he reportedly sold the shares belonging to the son living in the United States and the son with a learning disability living in Qatar. He was unable to sell the share of the son residing in Qatar, as that son retains his own authority. One of her sons challenged this in court, but the case was dismissed in early 2025.

Complaint regarding the failure to pay due financial entitlements

In September 2024, Ms. Dupont filed a case with the family court to seek financial support and the return of her house.

According to information received, article 47 of the Law No. 22 of 2006 promulgating the "The Family Law" provides that "if during wedlock or after separation, the spouses dispute over household belongings that are more suited to one of them than the other, then each of them who establishes proof shall be decreed the owner, even if the disputed belongings are of a kind fitting the other" and that "if they both fail to adduce evidence, then the property that is suited to women shall be decreed for the wife on her oath, and that which is suited to men shall be decreed for the husband on his oath." Furthermore, article 114 provides that "after pronouncement of divorce, the Judge shall make an order as to the amount of alimony for the wife during her Iddat, children support and the rights to Child custody and visitation" and article 115 provides that "divorced woman shall be entitled to enjoyment compensation if the divorce is made by the husband without any fault on her part."

Ms. Dupont won the right to be paid an alimony on the 12 November 2024. More precisely, Ms. Dupont's former husband was obligated to pay the amount

of 5,000 per month, and to make a car and a driver available for her. Of that, he paid only 3,000 riyals a month for three months as spousal support, as well provided a driver and a car to Ms. Dupont. However, he did that for three months only, paying 9,000 rials in total.

After the divorce, Ms. Dupont additionally received 18,000 riyals. However, she has not obtained the 100,000 riyals deferred dowry stipulated in the marriage contract, which is silent on the issue of joint property.

Harassment and pressure to leave the apartment of habitual residence

Following her legal complaint, her husband reportedly started to subject Ms. Dupont to increased abusive behaviour, threats, and judicial harassment. He reportedly threatened Ms. Dupont to divorce her unilaterally, so the law would unconditionally support him retaining all assets.

She refused to leave the house, and in September 2024, he reportedly came to her house in the evening and pounded on doors and windows with such force that Ms. Dupont was afraid they would break. Reportedly, the area's local police was within visual distance but did not intervene.

In August 2025, Ms. Dupont's former husband filed criminal charges against Ms. Dupont for occupying the disputed house illegally. Since November 2024, Ms. Dupont's husband reportedly broke into Ms. Dupont's home, threatened her, and took documents, including a copy of her marriage contract, and belongings away at least three times. He had also reportedly withdrawn funds from her bank accounts and sold stock shares in her name.

On 25 December 2025, her husband filled a civil case against her for staying in the house and for removing belongings from the property. This case was dismissed. He also filed two other claims against Ms. Dupont for forging documents and stealing a car; charges that were dropped due to the lack of evidence. He also accused her falsely of removing personal documents that belonged to him.

In January 2026, the police, reportedly searched the new home of Ms. Dupont in which she had moved at the end of December 2024, acting under a warrant issued by the Public Prosecutor. During the search, Ms. Dupont was informed that she should either allow the police to remove items that belong to her former husband or permit him to enter the house to identify items he claimed belonged to him. The police removed two computer screens, an electric scooter that had previously been given to the son, and several documents bearing her ex-husband's name. Her ex-husband was also reportedly allowed to come into the house and take other items that he claimed belonged to him, despite Ms. Dupont's expression of concerns about her safety.

As of 26 January 2026, there was a felony criminal charge pending against her for allegedly and illegally removing some personal items that reportedly did not belong to her. In 2025, she was initially fined 3,000 Qatari Riyal which was then reduced to 500 Qatari Riyal.

According to information received, Ms. Dupont's former husband had exhibited aggressive behaviour already in 1996, which she states she had reported to the Protection and Social Rehabilitation Center (AMAN) in Qatar. Unfortunately, and according to Ms. Dupont, the Center subsequently contacted her husband without prior consent from her, after which he escalated his threats against her. More recently, she had reported the coercive and threatening behaviour to the Protection and Social Rehabilitation Center, but she did not receive the expected assistance. During the interaction, Ms. Dupont felt that she was being blamed for not speaking Arabic, being a foreigner, and for reporting the abuse. Ms. Dupont also did not receive the required assistance from the police, to whom she had reported her concerns about safety. She attributes this to the very good relationship that her former husband has with the police. In this particular case, the police had informed her that since there was no physical harm, they could not assist her.

Due to the threat of the criminal charges as her former husband had filed a case to evict her, the break-ins into the home; aggression against her and her disabled son, threats to evict her, and her fear it may affect her employment, she felt pressured to move out together with her disabled son, which she did at the end of 2024. Fortunately, her employer, the university where she is teaching found her an apartment. Moreover, as her disability progressed resulting in loss of balance, mobility and strength in hands, arms, and legs, stable and familiar housing was essential to reduce risks related to falls, fatigue, and limited dexterity and was a necessary condition for her safety, independence, and ability to live autonomously.

Threats to be deported from Qatar

More recently, and since the conflict over property escalated, her former husband threatened to have her deported. In July 2025, an immigration officer summoned her for questioning regarding her prior stay in the United States. She explained that she had been in the U.S. from 2021 to 2024 during the COVID-19 pandemic, while her son with a disability was studying there. She further stated that her other sons were also studying abroad and that, under Qatari law, she had the right to leave Qatar. Following this questioning, Ms. Dupont allegedly contacted the United States Embassy, but they refused to get engaged in what they described as a matter internal to Qatar.

Disproportionate cumulative impact on her due to her disability

Ms. Dupont has argued that the cumulative violations of her rights she was subjected to, including her loss of her home and the resulting severe financial hardship, had disproportionate cumulative impact on her due to her disability. Consequently, she has to also take on multiple jobs despite it creating additional hardship due to her disability.

While I do not wish to prejudge the accuracy of these allegations, I am concerned that the above-mentioned court decisions not to restore the ownership rights of Ms. Dupont on the disputed house – against the findings of the court-appointed

expert – and in the context of divorce proceedings may amount to sex- and gender-based discrimination and the failure to protect Ms. Dupont from the economic abuse to which she has allegedly been subjected by her former husband.

I am also concerned that the dismissal of the evidence that Ms. Dupont had fully paid for the disputed house and has been financially independent from her husband may stem from deep-rooted patriarchal attitudes and gender stereotypes regarding the roles and responsibilities of women and men in the family and, in particular, regarding property ownership. Ms. Dupont's former husband appears to be stripping her of her lawful ownership of her house and weaponizing her status as a foreign woman and a woman with disability against her as a tool of coercive control a woman of American origin who does not speak Arabic after the dissolution of the marriage. Under article 16 (h) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, States Parties shall take all appropriate measures to eliminate discrimination against women in all matters relating to marriage and family relations and in particular shall ensure, on a basis of equality of men and women, inter alia, "the same rights for both spouses in respect of the ownership, acquisition, management, administration, enjoyment and disposition of property, whether free of charge or for a valuable consideration."

I am concerned about the alleged lack of guarantees for the equal division of marital property upon dissolution of the marriage, which has allegedly resulted in the denial of property rights severe economic hardship, and ultimately pushed Ms. Dupont and her son out of her home out of fear in which they had lived for over 15 years., d. Security of tenure constitutes an important element of the right to adequate housing. The right to adequate housing must also be enjoyed by everyone without any form of discrimination. I am concerned that Ms. Dupont was discriminated on ground of sex and nationality states in the context of the proceedings related to her divorce and to the ownership of their previous home, resulting in the loss of her home, including her ownership rights related to her home. Her disability and that of her son also exacerbated the consequences of this experience. violating her right to adequate housing which is protected under article 11 of the International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights.

I am also seriously concerned about the alleged failure to effectively address the threats, intimidation and other forms of psychological violence, economic abuse and judicial harassment to wish Ms. Dupont has been subjected and continue to be subjected by her former husband, and which may amount to gender-based domestic violence resulting in extreme psychological violence and compounding her fragile physical health situation. According to information received, the national legislation does not provide for the criminalization of domestic violence and marital rape.

Under article 2 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, States Parties shall condemn discrimination against women in all its forms. In its general recommendation No. 19, the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women clarified that gender-based violence is "violence that is directed against a woman because she is a woman or violence that affects women disproportionately" and that it "includes acts that inflict physical, mental or sexual harm or suffering, threats of such acts, coercion and other deprivations of liberty, including acts that occur within the family or domestic unit within any other

interpersonal relationship.” Furthermore, the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women notes the responsibility of States to “exercise due diligence to prevent, investigate and, in accordance with national legislation, punish acts of violence against women, whether those acts are perpetrated by the State or by private persons.” To this end, States should “develop penal, civil, labour and administrative sanctions in domestic legislation to punish and redress the wrongs caused to women who are subjected to violence.” Women who have been subjected to violence must be provided with access to justice to seek redress for the harm that they have suffered. I am gravely concerned that, in some instances, the local police and the prosecutor have allegedly rejected the complaints of the alleged victim, and have, instead, facilitated the perpetrator’s continuous violence.

Furthermore, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, which Qatar acceded to CEDAW on 29 April 2009, obliges States to eliminate all forms of discrimination against women, including intersecting discrimination based on nationality, migration or legal status, and disability, as clarified by the CEDAW Committee. It further guarantees women’s equality before the law, including equal legal capacity and property-related rights—such as ownership, administration and disposition of property (art. 15), and equality in marriage and family relations, including property rights (art. 16)—as well as access to effective remedies and justice on an equal basis with men.

These obligations require States to remove legal and practical barriers so that all women can claim and enforce their rights without discrimination.

In addition, Ms. Dupont’s constant appearances before the Public Prosecutor office has also had disproportionate impacts due to her disability. Each summons requires Ms. Dupont to take time off work and to navigate significant physical and logistical barriers because of the lack of reasonable accommodation for her medical condition. For example, the Public Prosecutor’s office has limited parking requiring long walking distances, prolonged standing, and hours of sitting and waiting. These repeated demands produces instability and psychological pressure, which affects her disproportionately given her disabling medical condition, despite the fact that Law No. 22 of 2025 prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability and provides for accessibility and reasonable accommodation to ensure full participation of persons with disabilities in social, economic, and public life. The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which your Excellency’s Government signed and ratified on the 13 May 2008, guarantees women with disabilities equality and non-discrimination (arts. 5–6), effective access to justice (art. 13), and equal legal capacity, including in matters relating to property and financial affairs (art. 12).

I am also concerned about the disproportionate impact of the court decisions that seem to indicate that she did not have access to a fair legal process and was subjected to judicial harassment on Ms. Dupont’s health, wellbeing and livelihood owing to a disabling medical condition and her role as caretaker of an adult son who has a learning disability and requires support. I am also concerned about the lack of accessibility measures to ensure access to courts for women with disability. According to article 4 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, States Parties “shall take appropriate measures to ensure to persons with disabilities access, on an equal basis with others, to the physical environment, to transportation, to information and

communications, including information and communications technologies and systems, and to other facilities and services open or provided to the public, both in urban and in rural areas. These measures, which shall include the identification and elimination of obstacles and barriers to accessibility, shall apply to, inter alia, buildings, roads, transportation and other indoor and outdoor facilities, including schools, housing, medical facilities and workplaces.”

These allegations raise concerns regarding international human rights standards relating to the right to equality under the law, the right to equality and non-discrimination, including denial of the right to reasonable accommodation; the right to safety and security; the right to adequate housing and the security of tenure; and the right to access justice and remedies, including access to information, legal assistance, translation and interpretation.

In connection with the above alleged facts and concerns, please refer to the **Annex on Reference to international human rights law** attached to this letter which cites international human rights instruments and standards relevant to these allegations.

As it is my responsibility, under the mandates provided to us by the Human Rights Council, to seek to clarify all cases brought to my attention, I would be grateful for your observations on the following matters:

1. Please provide any additional information and/or comment(s) you may have on the above-mentioned allegations.
2. Please provide information on the legal and factual basis for the decisions of the Civil Court and the Court of Appeal to reject Ms. Dupont’s claim to ownership rights on the disputed house.
3. Please provide information on the legal measures in place to ensure that all women, including foreign women and women with disability, can effectively enjoy all their rights on an equal basis with men, including equal legal capacity, property-related rights and equality in marriage, divorce and family relations, as well as access to effective remedies and justice.
4. Please provide information on the specific measures that have been adopted to ensure that women with disability have access to specific measures to protect and assist them, as well as to allow them to participate fully, including in the context of domestic violence and divorce, and have effective access to justice and equal legal capacity, including in matters relating to property and financial affairs.
5. Please provide information on legal and other measures taken to address all forms of gender-based violence against women, including physical, sexual, psychological, and economic abuse.
6. Please provide information on measures taken to ensure that victims of gender-based violence, including gender-based domestic violence, have effective access to justice, protective measures, appropriate support

services, rehabilitation and adequate redress and reparation, including compensation; and that perpetrators are held accountable.

7. Please provide information on the measures taken to enable judges, prosecutors, and police officers to respond effectively and in a gender-sensitive manner to cases of gender-based violence against women and girls, including cases of domestic violence, economic abuse, and judicial harassment.
8. Please provide information on the implementation of law No. 22 of 2025 on persons with disabilities, including on measures taken to remove barriers in terms of access to justice for women and girls experiencing intersecting forms of discrimination, including by providing reasonable accommodation, legal aid, and independent and professional translation and interpretation services, when needed.
9. Please provide information on measures taken to ensure that men and women have access to equal ownership rights in relation to housing and other property that was jointly used or owned?

This communication, and any response received from your Excellency's Government, will be made public via the communications reporting [website](#) at the 60 days mark. Should Your Excellency's Government respond within 60 days, both the communication and the response, may be published before the 60 days mark. The communications and responses will also be made available in the subsequent periodic report to be presented to the Human Rights Council.

While awaiting a reply, I urge that all necessary interim measures be taken to halt the alleged violations and prevent their re-occurrence and in the event that the investigations support or suggest the allegations to be correct, to ensure the accountability of any person(s) responsible for the alleged violations.

Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Reem Alsalem

Special Rapporteur on violence against women and girls, its causes and consequences
the independence of judges and lawyers

Annex

Reference to international human rights law

In connection with above alleged facts and concerns, I would like to refer your Excellency's Government to articles 3, 23 and 26 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), accessed to by Qatar on 21 May 2018, which establish the right of men and women to the equal enjoyment of all civil and political rights contained in the Covenant, the obligation of States Parties to ensure equality of rights and responsibilities of spouses as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution, and the right of all persons to equality before the law and the equal protection of the law. I also recall article 11 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), accessed to by Qatar on 21 May 2018, which recognizes the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living, including adequate housing.

I additionally recall articles 2, 15 and 16 (c) and (h) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), accessed to by Qatar on 29 April 2009, which establish the obligation of States Parties to condemn discrimination against women in all its forms and to adopt all appropriate means and without delay a policy of eliminating discrimination against women, the right of equality of women and men before the law, and the equal right of men and women to the same rights and responsibilities during marriage and at its dissolution, and to the same rights to own, acquire, manage, administrate, enjoy and dispose of property.

I also refer to Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), which was ratified by Qatar on 13 May 2008, in particular to article 2 which states that the denial of reasonable accommodation amounts to discrimination on the basis of disability; to articles 5 which prohibits all discrimination on the basis of disability and guarantee to persons with disabilities equal and effective legal protection against discrimination on all grounds; to article 6 which provides for the recognition that women and girls with disabilities are subject to multiple discrimination; article 12 which provides for equal recognition before the law; as well as to article 13 according to which States Parties "shall ensure effective access to justice for persons with disabilities on an equal basis with others, including through the provision of procedural and age-appropriate accommodations, in order to facilitate their effective role as direct and indirect participants, including as witnesses, in all legal proceedings, including at investigative and other preliminary stages;" and, to this end, States Parties "shall promote appropriate training for those working in the field of administration of justice, including police and prison staff."

I recall the recommendations from the Human Rights Committee in its general comment No. 28 (CCPR/C/21/Rev.1/Add.10), where it stated that 'States parties must also ensure equality in regard to the dissolution of marriage, which excludes the possibility of repudiation. The grounds for divorce and annulment should be the same

for men and women, as well as decisions with regard to property distribution, alimony, and the custody of children' (para. 26).

The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, in its general recommendation No. 35 (CEDAW/C/GC/35) reminds that under article 2 of the Convention, 'it is indicated that the obligations of States are to respect, protect and fulfil women's rights to non-discrimination and the enjoyment of de jure and de facto equality'. Additionally, it is confirmed that discrimination against women is inextricably linked to other factors that affect their lives and 'because women experience varying and intersecting forms of discrimination, which have an aggravating negative impact, the Committee acknowledges that gender-based violence may affect some women to different degrees, or in different ways, meaning that appropriate legal and policy responses are needed' (paras. 11 and 12).

The Committee additionally established in the general recommendation No. 29 that States Parties should 'Revise provisions linking grounds for divorce and financial consequences in order to eliminate opportunities for husbands to abuse these provisions and thereby to avoid any financial obligations towards their wives', and that 'States parties should eliminate any procedural requirement for payments to obtain a divorce that does not apply equally to husbands and wives' (CEDAW/C/GC/29, paras. 40 and 41). In CEDAW's general recommendation No. 33 (CEDAW/C/GR/33) on women's access to justice recognizes that stereotypes and gender prejudices in the judicial system impede the access to justice and may particularly affect women and victims and survivors of violence.

I would like to bring your attention to the Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women, particularly to articles 1 and 3, where violence against women is defined as 'any act of gender-based violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or psychological harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or in private life', and where it is stated that 'women are entitled to the equal enjoyment and protection of all human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural, civil or any other field'.

I also recall the report from the Special Rapporteur on violence against women on reparations for violence in contexts of peace and post-conflict (A/HRC/14/22), which showed that 'obstacles that women encounter when trying to obtain damages against perpetrators through courts include: statutes of limitations; inter-spousal and intrafamilial tort immunity rules; overly strict or inadequate rules and interpretations of the causality link in the assessment of harms; and inadequate evidence standards and procedures for quantifying damages which may have a negative disparate impact on women'. The report additionally pointed out that 'reparations for women cannot be just about returning them to the situation in which they were found before the individual

instance of violence but instead should strive to have a transformative potential. This implies that reparations should aspire, to the extent possible, to subvert instead of reinforce pre-existing patterns of cross-cutting structural subordination, gender hierarchies, systemic marginalization and structural inequalities that may be at the root cause of the violence that women experience before, during and after the conflict.’ (paras. 73 and 85)