

Mandates of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders; the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances; the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions; the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism

Ref.: AL PAK 7/2025
(Please use this reference in your reply)

13 August 2025

Excellency,

We have the honour to address you in our capacities as Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders; Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances; Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions; Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression and Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 52/4, 54/14, 53/4, 52/9 and 58/14.

In this connection, we would like to bring to the attention of your Excellency's Government information we have received regarding the **alleged extra-judicial killings of journalist and human rights defender Abdul Latif Baloch on 24 May 2025 and of his son, Saif Baloch, found dead on 26 March 2025, in Awaran district, Balochistan province in Pakistan, and the targeting of members of Abdul Latif Baloch's extended family, as well as with regard to the arrest of human rights defender Gulzar Dost on 6 July 2025 in Kech district in Balochistan.**

Mr. **Abdul Latif Baloch** worked for many years as a journalist at The Daily Intekhab, an Urdu-language newspaper based in Balochistan, and regularly wrote about human rights violations occurring in the region. This included reporting on alleged enforced disappearances, extra-judicial killings and restrictions on freedom of movement due to military operations.

Mr. **Gulzar Dost** is a coordinator of the human rights forum Kech Civil Society in Kech District, Balochistan. He has a history of documenting and reporting human rights violations in Balochistan, including speaking out about enforced disappearances in the province.

In the past, we have raised numerous concerns about alleged extra-judicial killings and disappearances of human rights defenders and others, particularly in Balochistan, with your Excellency's Government. Most recently in February, we wrote to your Excellency's Government ([PAK 1/2025](#)) to renew our concerns about the impact of counter-terrorism measures on the Baloch minority and to highlight specific grave concerns, including the alleged arbitrary arrests, acts of violence and mistreatment in detention, enforced disappearances, and extrajudicial killings of Baloch people. We regret that no response to that communication was received.

We have further previously raised concerns about the arrest, arbitrary detention and mistreatment of human rights defenders in Balochistan, most recently on 9 May 2025 ([PAK 6/2025](#), [PAK 1/2025](#) and [PAK 6/2024](#)). We regret that no response to these

communications was received.

According to the information received:

Abdul Latif Baloch and family

On 24 May 2025 Mr. Abdul Latif Baloch was shot dead in his home in Mashkay town, Awaran district in Balochistan after four unidentified masked and armed men broke into his house at around 4 a.m. He was struck by four bullets. His wife and two daughters were also present at the time of his murder. They were not physically harmed.

Prior to his murder, Mr. Abdul Latif Baloch had been allegedly targeted by the Pakistani security agencies a number of times. In 2016 he was abducted and reportedly tortured by the Pakistani army and Frontier Corps, which had invited him to a military camp in Mashkay, on the pretence of having a story for him to report. He was subsequently detained and subjected to an enforced disappearance. He was released, with injuries, over a year later. He was abducted for a second time by the security forces from Mahwar, Mashkay on 9 March 2018 and released after being held for four days. In the years since, Mr. Baloch regularly received telephone calls and summonses from the military, questioning him on his activities and reporting.

Numerous members of Mr. Baloch's family have been allegedly detained or killed by the security forces over the past 15 years. These have included Mr. Baloch's brother, Rashid Ali Baloch, and Mr. Baloch's son, Saif Baloch. In August 2011, Mr. Rashid Ali Baloch, a political activist affiliated with the Baloch National Movement, was detained as he travelled to Karachi. His body was discovered in Khuzdar district in October 2011 and allegedly showed signs of torture. He had been shot in the head and chest.

On 28 February 2025, Mr. Saif Baloch, was reportedly detained during a raid on the family home in Mashkay, allegedly carried out by the Pakistani security forces. He was reportedly taken to Mashkay Nali Army Camp, where associates went to seek his release. They were allegedly told by an officer at the camp that Saif Baloch was in their custody but would be released. Saif Baloch was subsequently found dead on 26 March 2025.

Gulzar Dost

On 6 July 2025, Mr. Gulzar Dost was reportedly detained at his home in Turbat, Kech District, by plainclothes officers from the Counter-Terrorism Department (CTD). The arresting officials reportedly did not show a warrant for his arrest, nor did they provide Mr. Dost with information on the charges he was facing. He was held incommunicado for a number of hours before the CTD confirmed that Mr. Dost was in their custody at the CTD Headquarters in Turbat. Charges filed against Mr. Dost include terrorism-related offences. He was reportedly released on bail on 1 August 2025.

A year prior to his arrest and in alleged response to his human rights activism, Mr. Dost had reportedly been placed under the Fourth Schedule in August 2024. In addition, he had been placed under house arrest to prevent him from participating in the civil society-organised Baloch National Gathering in July 2024. The gathering was convened to draw attention to human rights abuses in Balochistan.

Without wishing to prejudge the accuracy of the above-mentioned allegations, we express grave concern at the apparent extra-judicial killing and previous torture of human rights defender Mr. Abdul Latif Baloch. We express further concern at the detention and apparent extra-judicial killing of his son, Saif Baloch, in February/March 2025, and brother, Rashid Ali Baloch, in 2011; as well as at the arrest of Gulzar Dost in July 2025. In addition, we express concern about the reported misuse of administrative measures against human rights defenders, and more specifically against Mr. Dost.

We note with great concern that the killings, enforced disappearances, arrests and detentions described above appear to have been carried out by security forces and taken place in direct retribution for the victims' exercise of the right to freedom of expression and their human rights defence work.

We would like to remind your Excellency's Government of its duty to investigate, prosecute, and punish all violations of the right to life. We recall your Excellency's Government in line with the Principles on Effective Prevention and Investigation of Extra-legal, Arbitrary and Summary Executions, in particular principle 9, that there must be thorough, prompt, independent and impartial investigations of all suspected cases of extra-legal, arbitrary and summary executions.

We further recall the absolute and non-derogable nature of the prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. This obligation is enshrined, inter alia, in article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, articles 7 and 10 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), and articles 1, 2 and 16 of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT), which Pakistan ratified on 23 June 2010.

We would also wish to remind your Excellency's Government that article 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, acceded to by Pakistan on 23 June 2010, guarantees the right not to be subjected to arbitrary arrest or detention, and that the prohibition of arbitrary detention is absolute.

We take this opportunity to reiterate the concerns expressed in communication AL PAK 1/2025, in which Special Procedures mandate holders raised serious issues regarding, inter alia, the misuse of administrative and legal counter-terrorism measures against Baloch activists and organizations; the adverse impact of such measures on the enjoyment of fundamental rights and freedoms; the vague and overly broad definition of terrorism under the 1997 Anti-Terrorism Act; and the incompatibility of the listing and delisting procedures under the Fourth Schedule of the Act with international human rights standards.

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 our responsibility, under the mandates provided to us by the Human Rights Council, to seek to clarify all cases brought to our attention, we 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 as to steps taken by your Excellency's Government to ensure a full and effective investigation into the killing of Mr. Abdul Latif Baloch, in compliance with its obligations under international human rights law, in particular article 6, read alone and in conjunction with article 2(3), of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Please also provide information as to the current status, or, where available, the results of any such investigation, along with any steps towards prosecution which may have resulted from it.
3. Please clarify whether any investigation has been conducted into the detention in February 2025 and subsequent death of Mr. Saif Baloch, presumed to have occurred in March 2025. Please indicate in detail the results of this investigation. If no investigation has been initiated, please explain the reason.
4. Please clarify whether any investigation has been conducted into the detention in August 2011 and subsequent death of Mr. Rashid Ali Baloch in October 2011. Please indicate in detail the results of this investigation. If no investigation has been initiated, please explain the reason.
5. Please provide the factual and legal grounds for the arrest and subsequent detention of Mr. Gulzar Dost and explain how this detention is in compliance with international human rights and standards.
6. Please provide detailed information on the measures being undertaken to reform Pakistan's counter-terrorism laws to ensure full compliance with the principle of legality, necessity, proportionality and non-discrimination as required under international human rights standards and as set out in previous communications (see AL PAK 1/2025). In particular, please explain how these reforms will address concerns about overly broad definitions and the potential misapplication of such laws to activities that do not constitute genuine acts of terrorism.
7. Please clarify the legal and factual grounds for placing Mr. Gulzar Dost under the Fourth Schedule of the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA). In this regard, we would also appreciate information on the administrative and judicial remedies available to Mr. Dost to challenge this designation, including any procedural safeguards in place to ensure compliance with

international human rights standards.

This communication and any response received from your Excellency's Government will be made public via the communications reporting [website](#) within 60 days. They will also subsequently be made available in the usual report to be presented to the Human Rights Council.

While awaiting a reply, we 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.

We may publicly express our concerns in the near future as, in our view, the information upon which the press release will be based is sufficiently reliable to indicate a matter warranting immediate attention. We also believe that the wider public should be alerted to the potential implications of the above-mentioned allegations. The press release will indicate that we have been in contact with your Excellency's Government's to clarify the issue/s in question.

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

Mary Lawlor

Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders

Gabriella Citroni

Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances

Morris Tidball-Binz

Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions

Irene Khan

Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression

Ben Saul

Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism

Annex

Reference to international human rights law

In connection with above alleged facts and concerns, we would like to draw the attention of your Excellency's Government to articles 6, 19 and 22, read alone and in conjunction with article 2(3), of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), acceded to by Pakistan on 23 June 2010 which guarantee the rights to liberty and security of person, freedom of opinion and expression, and freedom of association. These rights are also guaranteed under articles 3, 19 and 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR).

In particular, we would like to draw your attention to article 3 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which states that "Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person"; and article 6 (1) of the ICCPR, which provides that "Every human being has the inherent right to life. This right shall be protected by law. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his life".

We wish to stress that the right to life is the supreme right from which no derogation is permitted. It is most precious for its own sake as a right that inheres in every human being, but it also constitutes a fundamental right, whose effective protection is the prerequisite for the enjoyment of all other human rights and whose content can be informed and infused by other human rights.¹

Furthermore, we recall that an important element of the protection afforded to the right to life by the Covenant is the obligation on the States parties, where they know or should have known of potentially unlawful deprivations of life, to investigate and, where appropriate, prosecute the perpetrators of such incidents, including incidents involving allegations of excessive use of force with lethal consequences.² Investigations and prosecutions of potentially unlawful deprivations of life should be undertaken in accordance with relevant international standards, including the Minnesota Protocol on the Investigation of Potentially Unlawful Death, and must be aimed at ensuring that those responsible are brought to justice, at promoting accountability and preventing immunity. Investigations should explore, inter alia, the legal responsibility of superior officials with regard to violations of the right to life committed by their subordinates.³ Investigations must always be independent, impartial, prompt, thorough, effective, credible and transparent. In the event that a violation is found, full reparation must be provided, including adequate measures of compensation, rehabilitation and satisfaction. States parties are also under an obligation to take steps to prevent the occurrence of similar violations in the future.

We also wish to stress that that the absolute and non-derogable prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment is established in (at least) article 5 UDHR, article 7 ICCPR as well as in multiple articles of the United Nations Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman and Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT, acceded to by Pakistan on 23 June 2010).

¹ Human Rights Committee, General comment No.36, article 6: right to life (CCPR/C/GC/36): <https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/GC/36>

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

We stress that attached to the peremptory and absolute prohibition of torture are obligations to investigate all acts of torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, to prosecute or extradite suspects, to punish those responsible and to protect victims from reprisals and intimidation, and to provide remedies to victims.

States parties to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment have explicit treaty duties to establish all acts of torture as offences under domestic law (art. 4 CAT), to exercise jurisdiction over said offences (art. 5), to receive complaints and examine them promptly and impartially (art. 13), to take to ensure that the complainant and witnesses are protected against all ill-treatment or intimidation as a consequence of their complaint or any evidence given (art. 13), and to investigate those allegations promptly and impartially (art. 12).

Furthermore, we wish to refer to the right to freedom of opinion and expression, enshrined in article 19 in both the ICCPR and UDHR, respectively, which the Human Rights Committee asserts as integral to the enjoyment of the rights to freedom of association and assembly.⁴ Article 19 of the ICCPR protects, *inter alia*, political discourse, commentary on one's own and on public affairs, discussion on human rights, journalism, among others.⁵ In its general comment No. 34, the Human Rights Committee emphasized that under no circumstance can an attack on a person because of the exercise of his or her freedom of opinion or expression, including such forms of attack as arbitrary arrest, torture, threats to life and killing, be compatible with article 19.⁶

The Committee also noted that individuals who engage in the gathering and analysis of information on the human rights situation and who publish human rights related reports are frequently subjected to threats, intimidation and attacks because of their activities. According to the Committee, States shall put in place effective measures to protect against attacks aimed at silencing those exercising their right to freedom of expression and all such attacks should be vigorously investigated in a timely fashion, the perpetrators prosecuted, and the victims, or, in the case of killings, their representatives, be in receipt of appropriate forms of redress.⁷

We also wish to recall the report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders to the Human Rights Council on the subject of killings of and death threats against human rights defenders, in which she recommended that States intensify efforts to prevent excessive use of force by security forces, and emphasized that there is no more a direct attack on civil society space than the killing of human rights defenders.⁸ The report by the former Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders to the General Assembly on the subject of impunity for human rights violations committed against human rights defenders, notes with concern that the overwhelming majority of violations – with killings being one of the most prevalent –

⁴ Human Rights Committee, General comment No. 34, article 19: freedom of opinion and expression (CCPR/C/GC/34): <https://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrc/docs/gc34.pdf>

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ A/HRC/46/35

remain unpunished. The negative impact of such impunity is manifold, as it denies victims access to justice, but also generally weakens the organizational movement the human rights defender was affiliated with, as other individuals are discouraged from participating, as well as detrimentally impacting society itself, as it obstructs access to the truth and prevents measures being taken to avoid the recurrence of these events.⁹

We further refer to article 9 of the ICCPR, which provides that no one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest or detention or deprived of their liberty except on such grounds and in accordance with such procedures as are established by law. According to the Human Rights Committee in its general comment No. 35 (CCPR/C/GC/35), (paragraph 17) and the jurisprudence of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, arrest or detention of an individual as punishment for the legitimate exercise of the rights guaranteed by the ICCPR, including freedom of opinion and expression and freedom of association, is arbitrary.

Furthermore, the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention has reiterated that a deprivation of liberty is arbitrary when it constitutes a violation of international law on the grounds of discrimination such as inter alia based on birth, national, ethnic or social origin, language, religion, economic condition, political or other opinion, or any other status, that aims towards or can result in ignoring the equality of human beings. In this respect, the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention has concluded that being a human rights defender is a protected status under article 26 of the ICCPR.

We would like to draw your attention to the United Nations Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearances, which establishes that any person having knowledge or a legitimate interest who alleges that a person has been subjected to enforced disappearance has the right to complain to a competent and independent State authority and to have that complaint promptly, thoroughly, and impartially investigated by that authority (article 13).

In addition, the Guiding Principles for the Search for Disappeared Persons of the United Nations Committee on Enforced Disappearances establish in its principle 14 that during the search process, the competent authorities should ensure the protection of the victims at all times, regardless of the level of involvement that they choose to have in the search. Persons who give testimony, statements or support in the course of the search and/or investigation should benefit from specific protection measures that take account of the particular needs in each case. All protection measures should take account of the specific and individual characteristics of the persons requiring protection. Principle 14 also establishes that States should provide financial support to the victims who search for a disappeared person, bearing in mind the harm caused to the household income by the disappearance of a family member and the additional costs incurred during the search, such as transport, accommodation and loss of working hours, among others.

In its study on enforced or involuntary disappearances and economic, social and cultural rights ([A/HRC/30/38/Add.5](#)) the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances has highlighted the chilling effect of the disappearance of journalists and human rights defenders and called States to “ensur[e] the existence of and respect for cultural diversity and the existence of space where multiple opinions, positions and

⁹ A/74/159

interpretations of history can find their expression in the public sphere diminishes the level of vulnerability of those questioning in one way or another mainstream ideas and positions, and so prevents against targeting of human rights defenders”.

Article 19 of the ICCPR guarantees the right to freedom of opinion and the right to freedom of expression, which includes the right “to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media”. This right applies online as well as offline, protects the freedom of the press as one of its core elements and includes not only the exchange of information that is favourable, but also that which may criticize, shock, or offend. In its [general comment No. 34](#), the Human Rights Committee stated that States parties to the ICCPR are required to guarantee the right to freedom of expression, including “political discourse, commentary on one's own and on public affairs, canvassing, discussion of human rights, journalism, cultural and artistic expression, teaching, and religious discourse” (CCPR/C/GC/34, para. 11).

The Committee further asserts that there is a duty of States to put in place effective measures to protect against attacks aimed at silencing those exercising their right to freedom of expression (para. 23). Recognizing how journalists and persons who engage in the gathering and analysis of information on the human rights situation and who publish human rights-related reports, including judges and lawyers, are frequently subjected to threats, intimidation and attacks because of their activities, the Committee stresses that “all such attacks should be vigorously investigated in a timely fashion, and the perpetrators prosecuted, and the victims, or, in the case of killings, their representatives, be in receipt of appropriate forms of redress” (para. 23).

Any restriction on the right to freedom of expression must be compatible with the requirements set out in article 19(3) ICCPR. Under these requirements, restrictions must (i) be provided by law; (ii) pursue one of the legitimate aims for restriction, which are the respect of the rights or reputations of others and the protection of national security or of public order (*ordre public*), or of public health or morals; and (iii) be necessary and proportionate for those objectives. The State has the burden of proof to demonstrate that any such restrictions are compatible with the Covenant, proving “in specific and individualized fashion the precise nature of the threat, and the necessity and proportionality of the specific action taken, in particular by establishing a direct and immediate connection between the expression and the threat” (CCPR/C/GC/34, para. 35). The Human Rights Committee recalled that the relation between right and restriction and between norm and exception must not be reversed. In this regard, the Human Rights Committee stated that the restrictions must be “the least intrusive instrument among those which might achieve their protective function” ([CCPR/C/GC/34, para. 34](#)).

We would like to bring to your attention the fundamental principles set forth in the Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, also known as the UN Declaration on Human Rights Defenders. In particular we would like to refer to articles 1 and 2 of the Declaration, which state that everyone has the right to promote and to strive for the protection and realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms at the national and international levels and that each State has a prime responsibility and duty to protect, promote and

implement all human rights and fundamental freedoms. Additionally, we would like to bring to the attention of your Excellency's Government the following provisions of the UN Declaration on Human Rights Defenders:

- Article 5(b) and (c), which provides for the right of all persons to form, join and participate in non-governmental organizations, associations and groups; and to communicate with non-governmental or intergovernmental organizations;
- Article 6 (a), which provides for the right to know, seek, obtain, receive and hold information about all human rights and fundamental freedoms;
- Article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3, which provides that the State shall take all necessary measures to ensure the protection of everyone against any violence, threats, retaliation, de facto or de jure adverse discrimination, pressure or any other arbitrary action as a consequence of his or her legitimate exercise of the rights referred to in the Declaration.

We respectfully refer your Excellency's Government to the many resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly, Security Council and Human Rights Council reaffirming that any measures taken to combat terrorism and violent extremism must comply with the obligations of States under international law, in particular international human rights law, refugee law and international humanitarian law.¹⁰ Counter-terrorism measures must conform to fundamental requirements of legality, proportionality, necessity and non-discrimination. The wholesale adoption of security and counterterrorism regulations without due regard for these principles can have exceptionally deleterious effects on the protection of fundamental rights, particularly for minorities, historically marginalized communities, and civil society.

We remind your Excellency's Government that States must ensure that measures to combat terrorism and preserve national security do not hinder the work and safety of individuals, groups and organs of society engaged in promoting and defending human rights.¹¹

We would further like to refer to Human Rights Council resolution 22/6, which urges States to ensure that measures to combat terrorism and preserve national security are in compliance with their obligations under international law and do not hinder the work and safety of individuals, groups and organs of society engaged in promoting and defending human rights. We would also like to bring to your Excellency's Government's attention that in his report to the General Assembly on the impact of counter-terrorism measures on civil society, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism urged States to ensure that their counter-terrorism legislation is sufficiently precise to comply with the principle of legality, so as to prevent the possibility that it may be used to target civil society on political or other unjustified grounds (A/70/371, para. 46(c)).

¹⁰ Security Council resolutions 1373 (2001), 1456 (2003), 1566 (2004), 1624 (2005), 2178 (2014), 2242 (2015), 2341 (2017), 2354 (2017), 2368 (2017), 2370 (2017), 2395 (2017) and 2396 (2017); Human Rights Council resolution 35/34; and General Assembly resolutions 49/60, 51/210, 72/123 and 72/180, among others.

¹¹ See A/HRC/RES/22/6, para. 10(a).

We respectfully refer your Excellency's Government of the Human Rights Principles Applicable to Watchlisting,¹⁶ which require: (i) a fair and accountable legal process that offers a reasonable and legally-based opportunity for listed persons to administratively and judicially challenge the basis of their inclusion on the list; (ii) a person's inclusion on the list to be a necessary and proportionate response to an actual, distinct, and measurable terrorism threat that is consistent with the definition of terrorism found in the international counter-terrorism conventions and United Nations Security Council resolution 1566 (2004); (iii) consideration of the human rights implications that arise from watchlisting, including for freedoms of movement, association, expression and religion, the rights to privacy, property, health, due process and family life, and social and economic rights, including the right to work; and (iv) non-discrimination based on any protected attribute under international human rights law, which relevantly include political opinion and religious belief.

We recall that the designation of "terrorist" individuals or organizations must meet the requirements of due process and judicial protection under international human rights law, as set out by the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism. Specifically: (a) there must be reasonable grounds to believe that the person or entity has knowingly engaged in terrorism, as properly defined according to international standards, including the requirement of legality; (b) a listed person or entity must be promptly informed of the listing and its factual grounds, the consequences of such listing and the applicable procedural rights; (c) there must be a right to apply for de-listing and to have it reviewed within a reasonable time, and a right to judicial review of any resulting decision, in both cases affording due process, including sufficient disclosure of evidence and access to a lawyer; and (d) listings must lapse automatically after 12 months unless renewed afresh; and reparation, including compensation, must be available for any wrongful listing (A/HRC/16/51, para. 35).