Tunisia: One-man rule setback for human rights and rule of law
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Introduction

Tunisian President Kais Saied’s exceptional measures announced on July 25 marked a major turning point in the course of the human rights situation in Tunisia. The measures included sacking Prime Minister, Hisham Mechichi, suspending the Parliament, and lifting its members' immunity for an extendable period of 30 days. The president took over the executive power, appointed a prime minister himself, and assumed the presidency of the Public Prosecution. These measures left adverse consequences on the human rights situation in the country since all powers have been concentrated in the office of the President, who opened the floodgates for massive illegal security practices. A number of members of the House of Representatives were arrested under military court decisions. The freedom of movement of dozens was confiscated, as they were banned from traveling without judicial permission. About 70 Tunisians, including a group of judges, were placed under house arrest without informing the Supreme Judicial Council or rejecting the appeals related to the imposition of house arrest. The security practices included...
attacks on the freedom of the press, as offices of local and Arab news channels were closed, and a number of journalists were arrested while practicing their job. These and other practices raised great fears that the authorities would use exceptional measures to retaliate against opponents and activists and confiscate freedoms in the country that had witnessed a rare democratic experience in the region.

Methodology

The report reviews the human rights violations Tunisia witnessed following the exceptional measures announcement and their impact on the political and civil rights of Tunisians. The report is based on more than three months of observation, research, and documentation. Euro-Med Monitor’s researchers interviewed a number of victims of violations or their lawyers. The team also continued to follow up on official statements issued by Tunisian officials since the start of the crisis.

In addition to primary sources, Euro-Med Monitor’s team used reports from reliable local authorities, including the Supreme Judicial Council, the Monitoring Unit of the Professional Safety Center of the National Syndicate of Tunisian Journalists, and the Association of Tunisian Judges. The report presents a legal reading of the exceptional measures’ impact on the rights and freedoms in the country, from national legal rules and international covenants’ point of view.
General view of the human rights situation after July 25

The human rights situation in Tunisia deteriorated on July 25, after the president issued a set of exceptional decisions relying on Article 80 of the Tunisian Constitution of 2014. The president suspended the parliament, lifted parliamentary immunity, dismissed the prime minister, and appointed himself as head of the Public Prosecution Office. Plenty of violations followed the decisions, including arrest campaigns, travel bans without judicial warrants, house arrests, and security attacks on media outlets and journalists.

The Tunisian presidency issued instructions to tighten control over airports and border crossings and prevent the travel of heads of parties, political figures, and parliamentarians. Security forces were deployed at the entrances to Tunis–Carthage International Airport and border checkpoints to verify the identities of arrivals and departures from the country.
Later, the speaker of Tunisia’s parliament, Rached Ghannouchi, and members of parliament were stopped from entering the parliament building based on the president’s decision. The president made decisions to suspend work in central administrations, local groups, and administrative public institutions for an extendable period of two days. In addition, a curfew was imposed during night hours, with exceptions for emergency cases. Successive decisions were made to dismiss many regional governors and ministers without clear reasons. These include the dismissals of the governor of Sfax, Anis Oueslati, governor of Monastir, Akram Sebri, governor of Medenine, Habib Chouat, governor of Zaghouan, Saleh Matiraoui, and Secretary General of the National Anti-Corruption Authority, Anwar Ben Hassan. On August 23, the president announced the extension of the exceptional measures related to the suspension of parliament and lifting immunity until further notice to maintain the legislative and constitutional vacuum. The power to issue decisions under exceptional measures extended to the designated Minister of Interior, Rida Gharslawi. By his decisions, the security services arrested a number of MPs and political and human rights activists who spoke up against the president’s procedures. The most recent arrests, until this writing, were against MP Abdel-Latif Al-Alawi and journalist Amer Ayyad, an anchor at the local Al-Zaytouna channel. The Minister of Interior took restrictive measures against judges, lawyers, and public figures, including house arrests and travel bans on others, by oral (unwritten) decisions, as the security authorities do not present judicial or security orders. On September 22, the country entered a new phase of exceptional measures after the president issued Decree No. 2021-117. Its preamble and chapters reject the results of the 2019 legislative elections and contravene the texts and principles of the constitution.
Key violations committed since enacting the exceptional measures

This part of the report reviews the most flagrant violations of the rights of individuals and entities since July 25. The violations were focused on restricting the freedom of opinion, expression, travel, and movement; attacking journalists; and trying civilians before military courts. This section also addresses the authorities’ duties towards applying the constitution and laws and the safeguarding human rights.

- **First: Freedom of Expression**

  Since July 25 (1), security services have carried out numerous attacks on freedom of expression and publication under security pretexts. They arrested and

---

1 Presidential Decree No. 692021- issued on July 26 relating to the dismissal of the head of government and members of the government.
prosecuted a number of parliamentarians and political and human rights activists for speaking up against the president’s measures and dealing with the crisis. The authorities have used punitive provisions in the Telecommunication Code to suppress freedom of expression and restrict publishing opinions opposing the presidential decisions under the pretext of the disturbance offense in Article 86, which stipulates that “intentionally offending or disturbing others through public telecommunication networks is punishable by imprisonment for a period ranging between one to two years and a fine ranging between one hundred and a thousand dinars.” The authorities also resorted to Article 49 of the Constitution to restrict freedom of expression in a way that contravenes the national legal texts and relevant international charters and norms (2).

Making capital of these laws, the Military Judiciary Directorate filed a complaint against MP Yassin al-Ayari, by order of the military judiciary on July 30. The complaint came a few days after he published a post on Facebook speaking out against the exceptional measures that he described as a “military coup.” Al-Ayari criticized suspending the parliament and

“Freedom of opinion, thought, expression, information and publications shall be guaranteed. These freedoms shall not be subject to prior censorship.”

Article 31 of the Tunisian Constitution

---

2 Article 49 of the Tunisian Constitution: “The limitations that can be imposed on the exercise of the rights and freedoms guaranteed in this Constitution will be established by law, without compromising their essence. Any such limitations can only be put in place for reasons necessary to a civil and democratic state and with the aim of protecting the rights of others, or based on the requirements of public order, national, public health or public morals, and provided there is proportionality between these restrictions and the objective sought. Judicial authorities ensure that rights and freedoms are protected from all violations. No amendment may undermine the human rights and freedoms guaranteed in this Constitution.”
said Public Prosecution is independent and the president should preside over it. He added that the president is entitled to dismiss the cabinet and that there is no constitutional text that allows these procedures. Al-Ayari went on an open hunger strike on September 7 in his cell in Mornaguia Prison, over a month after his arrest, before being released later on September 22.

On July 29, the security forces arrested activist and blogger, Hamza Ben Mohamed in the capital, Tunis, after publishing posts criticizing the decisions of the president.

On July 31, the security forces arrested political activist, Rida Radaya, in the city of Mahdia on charges of inciting violence and insulting the president after he published a video on Facebook criticizing presidential decisions.

On August 4, 2021, the security forces arrested two young men for publishing blogs condemning the president’s directions after the exceptional measures were announced in the country.

Malik Ben Omar, the lawyer defending MP Yassin Al-Ayari, told Euro-Med Monitor that the MP was imprisoned for two months on charges of participating in “an act aimed at destroying the morale of the army to harm the [state] defense and the dignity and morale of the national army.”

«The Military Judiciary Directorate filed the complaint against Al-Ayari after he criticized the president’s exceptional decisions. At the beginning of the detention, Al-Ayari was denied communication..."
with the outside world. He suffers a severe stomach ulcer, and the food served in the prison did not suit his situation. He went on hunger strike until his demands regarding food and communication with the outside world were fulfilled.”

“In the Tunisian law, anyone who has served half the sentence has the right to apply for a conditional release, but the judge refused the conditional release of my client despite the expiration of half the sentence, and his obvious health and psychological conditions.”

The authorities released Al-Ayari on September 22 after serving his sentence, but he is still under investigation for seven other complaints. Two of them were filed after announcing the exceptional procedures.

On October 15, the Court of Appeals in Tunis opened an investigation against former President Moncef Marzouki, following media statements in which he criticized President Kais Saied’s actions. This was one day after President Saied slashed Marzouki, announcing the withdrawal of his diplomatic passport and hinting that he would be prosecuted for conspiring against state security. “Those who conspire against Tunisia abroad must be charged with conspiring against state security at home and abroad,” President Saied said.

Guaranteeing the rights to expression and publication, the constitution stipulates, “Freedom of opinion, thought, expression, information, and publication shall be guaranteed. These freedoms shall not be subject to prior censorship.”

Tunisia has also ratified the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which states, «The value placed by the Covenant upon uninhibited expression is particularly high in the circumstances
of public debate in a democratic society concerning figures in the public and political domain (3).»

- **Second: Right to travel and freedom of movement**

The July 25 decisions and the subsequent procedures did not consider the citizens’ right to freedom of movement and travel, imposing travel and movement restrictions on many judges and activists of the various political parties. Since that date, the authorities placed 13 Tunisians under house arrest and imposed travel bans on others without presenting clear judicial notes. The individuals included parliamentarians, judges, senior public officials, and businessmen.

On July 30, the authorities imposed house arrest on the former Attorney General for the Court of First Instance, Al-Bashir Al-Akrimi, banning him from leaving his residence for an extendable period of 40 days. Contact with him was prohibited except through means authorized by those in charge of carrying out the decisions of the public authority.

“Every citizen has the right to choose their place of residence, to free movement within the country, and the right to leave the country.”

Article (24) of the Tunisian Constitution

Imposing house arrest on Al-Akrimi without informing the Supreme Judicial Council is an encroachment on its powers as a constitutional institution entrusted with ensuring the proper functioning of the judiciary and respecting its independence. The Council is the only body authorized to consider and decide...
on disciplinary actions against judges. On August 6, the authorities banned Iman Al-Obeidi from traveling. She learned this when she went to the Tunis-Carthage Airport to travel to Turkey. The border police asked her to wait until the result of the border test S17 arrived. About an hour later, the border police informed Al-Obeidi that she was under the S17 travel restriction.

On September 27, the Administrative Court accepted an appeal submitted by Al-Obeidi against the travel ban and decided to stay the decision.

On July 30, the security forces raided the house of MP Rashed El-Khiari. The authorities opened an investigation against MPs Khaled El-Krichi, Mabrouk Korchid, and Saif El-Din Makhlouf for allegedly engaging in a quarrel at the Tunis-Carthage International Airport. They were all informed of being under a travel ban.

On August 6, former minister, Anwar Maarouf, was placed under house arrest without clear justifications. Ten days later, the designated interior minister issued a decision to impose house arrest on two MPs, Zuhair Makhlouf and Muhammad al-Latifi.

On September 10, MP Ziad Al-Hashemi said that he had tried more than once to travel to France, but he was surprised to be banned from traveling without any judicial order. When he asked about the reason for the ban, he was told that it was due to higher orders.

Human rights activist and former head of Tunisia’s Anti-Corruption Committee, Shawqi al-Tabib, spoke to the Euro-Med Monitor about his placement under house arrest.

He said, “A group of security personnel informed me in the middle of the night of August 20 that there was a decision from the Minister of Interior to place me under house arrest. I learned this when I went to the Tunis-Carthage Airport to travel to Turkey. The border police asked me to wait until the result of the border test S17 arrived. About an hour later, the border police informed me that I was under the S17 travel restriction.

On September 27, the Administrative Court accepted an appeal submitted by me against the travel ban and decided to stay the decision.

On July 30, the security forces raided the house of MP Rashed El-Khiari. The authorities opened an investigation against MPs Khaled El-Krichi, Mabrouk Korchid, and Saif El-Din Makhlouf for allegedly engaging in a quarrel at the Tunis-Carthage International Airport. They were all informed of being under a travel ban.

On August 6, former minister, Anwar Maarouf, was placed under house arrest without clear justifications. Ten days later, the designated interior minister issued a decision to impose house arrest on two MPs, Zuhair Makhlouf and Muhammad al-Latifi.

On September 10, MP Ziad Al-Hashemi said that he had tried more than once to travel to France, but he was surprised to be banned from traveling without any judicial order. When he asked about the reason for the ban, he was told that it was due to higher orders.

Human rights activist and former head of Tunisia’s Anti-Corruption Committee, Shawqi al-Tabib, spoke to the Euro-Med Monitor about his placement under house arrest.

He said, “A group of security personnel informed me in the middle of the night of August 20 that there was a decision from the Minister of Interior to place me under house arrest. I learned this when I went to the Tunis-Carthage Airport to travel to Turkey. The border police asked me to wait until the result of the border test S17 arrived. About an hour later, the border police informed me that I was under the S17 travel restriction.

On September 27, the Administrative Court accepted an appeal submitted by me against the travel ban and decided to stay the decision.

On July 30, the security forces raided the house of MP Rashed El-Khiari. The authorities opened an investigation against MPs Khaled El-Krichi, Mabrouk Korchid, and Saif El-Din Makhlouf for allegedly engaging in a quarrel at the Tunis-Carthage International Airport. They were all informed of being under a travel ban.

On August 6, former minister, Anwar Maarouf, was placed under house arrest without clear justifications. Ten days later, the designated interior minister issued a decision to impose house arrest on two MPs, Zuhair Makhlouf and Muhammad al-Latifi.

On September 10, MP Ziad Al-Hashemi said that he had tried more than once to travel to France, but he was surprised to be banned from traveling without any judicial order. When he asked about the reason for the ban, he was told that it was due to higher orders.

Human rights activist and former head of Tunisia’s Anti-Corruption Committee, Shawqi al-Tabib, spoke to the Euro-Med Monitor about his placement under house arrest.

He said, “A group of security personnel informed me in the middle of the night of August 20 that there was a decision from the Minister of Interior to place me under house arrest. I learned this when I went to the Tunis-Carthage Airport to travel to Turkey. The border police asked me to wait until the result of the border test S17 arrived. About an hour later, the border police informed me that I was under the S17 travel restriction.

On September 27, the Administrative Court accepted an appeal submitted by me against the travel ban and decided to stay the decision.

On July 30, the security forces raided the house of MP Rashed El-Khiari. The authorities opened an investigation against MPs Khaled El-Krichi, Mabrouk Korchid, and Saif El-Din Makhlouf for allegedly engaging in a quarrel at the Tunis-Carthage International Airport. They were all informed of being under a travel ban.

On August 6, former minister, Anwar Maarouf, was placed under house arrest without clear justifications. Ten days later, the designated interior minister issued a decision to impose house arrest on two MPs, Zuhair Makhlouf and Muhammad al-Latifi.

On September 10, MP Ziad Al-Hashemi said that he had tried more than once to travel to France, but he was surprised to be banned from traveling without any judicial order. When he asked about the reason for the ban, he was told that it was due to higher orders.

Human rights activist and former head of Tunisia’s Anti-Corruption Committee, Shawqi al-Tabib, spoke to the Euro-Med Monitor about his placement under house arrest.

He said, “A group of security personnel informed me in the middle of the night of August 20 that there was a decision from the Minister of Interior to place me under house arrest. I learned this when I went to the Tunis-Carthage Airport to travel to Turkey. The border police asked me to wait until the result of the border test S17 arrived. About an hour later, the border police informed me that I was under the S17 travel restriction.

On September 27, the Administrative Court accepted an appeal submitted by me against the travel ban and decided to stay the decision.

On July 30, the security forces raided the house of MP Rashed El-Khiari. The authorities opened an investigation against MPs Khaled El-Krichi, Mabrouk Korchid, and Saif El-Din Makhlouf for allegedly engaging in a quarrel at the Tunis-Carthage International Airport. They were all informed of being under a travel ban.
under house arrest. They asked me not to leave the house except in an emergency, provided that I inform the security 24 hours earlier, and I cannot go outside my neighborhood.”

“I asked for a paper copy of the house arrest decision, but the security personnel only showed me the decision on the phone and refused to hand me the paper or electronic copy. I looked at the electronic copy on the phone and found that the decision was based on Decree No. 49 of 1978 regarding the procedures during a state of emergency. The order did not include any reason, justification, or duration of the house arrest.”

“I think placing me under house arrest and denying me the freedom of movement and doing my job is revenge for my activity as the head of the National Anti-Corruption Authority. A malicious complaint was filed against me by the former Prime Minister, Elias Fakhfakh, and individuals the Authority submitted corruption files against. I filed an appeal against the house arrest decision with the Administrative Court in the capital, Tunis, and a request to suspend the decision temporarily until the appeal submitted to the court is decided.”

Al-Tabib said on Facebook on October 10 that the house arrest was revoked but did not reveal any more details.

Article 24 of the Tunisian Constitution guarantees the protection of the citizen’s right to freedom of movement and travel, as it states, “Every citizen has the right to choose their place of residence, to free movement within the country, and the right to leave the country.” (5)

**Third: Freedom of the press**

Freedom of opinion, thought, expression, information and publication shall be guaranteed. These freedoms shall not be subject to prior censorship.

Article 31 of the Tunisian Constitution

As the legislative authority was suspended

---

5 The Tunisian Constitution of 2014
due to political disputes, hundreds of journalists and press institutions may remain vulnerable to security and judicial prosecution, especially when official bodies use punitive texts in the Communications Code, the Penal Code, and the Military Penal Code to punish and censor the opposing press.

As the president’s decisions entered into force, the security services carried out numerous attacks on local and Arab media institutions, and other serious violations, sometimes physical assault, detention, or conviction on vague charges against journalists. The authorities’ behavior makes it clear they tend to tighten censorship on media discourse and restrictions on journalists and opposition media outlets, given the violations they committed against journalists.

On July 26, the Tunisian security forces stormed the office of the Qatari Al-Jazeera channel, ordered the employees to leave the place, and closed the office without giving any reasons or justifications.

On the same day, Tunisian security forces prevented the Al Araby TV team from broadcasting from Bardo Square in the capital, preventing them from filming the protesters demanding an end to the disruption of parliament’s work.

On September 1, five male and female journalists were injured after security forces attacked a group of journalists on Avenue Habib Bourguiba downtown Tunis when they tried to cover a demonstration.

“Freedom of opinion, thought, expression, information and publication shall be guaranteed. These freedoms shall not be subject to prior censorship.”

Article 31 of the Tunisian Constitution
calling for revealing the circumstances of the political assassinations in the country. Aside from attacking journalists while on duty, the authorities began carrying out arrests and directing charges. On September 21, journalist Arwa Barakat was referred to the Court of First Instance in Tunis for “assaulting a public official while on duty.” On October 3, a security force arrested journalist Amer Ayyad, the anchor of the Hassad 24 program on the Al-Zaytouna channel, after he hosted MP Abdul Latif Al-Alawi in an episode that included criticism of the president. Two days later, the military judiciary issued a detention warrant against Ayad for “criticizing the president and the army and harming their dignity.”

On October 5, the Indictment Chamber of the Court of Appeal in Sousse issued arrest warrants against four people, including a female journalist. The case was known as the “Instalingo case,” which is a company specialized in creating digital media content. The four individuals were charged with “committing a monstrosity against the president” and “conspiring against internal state security.” Security forces in civilian clothing raided Instalingo, without showing a judicial warrant, then confiscated the company’s equipment. Haitham Al-Kahili, the founder of the company, said in a Facebook statement that the raid came “after months of incitement and intimidation.”

On October 6, a Tunisian security force stormed the headquarters of the Al-Zaytounia TV and sabotaged its studios and equipment. The channel’s director, Sami Essid, said during a press interview that the decision to close the channel, storm its headquarters, and seize its broadcasting equipment came by decisions and instructions from those he described as “putschists.” He added that the allegations that the channel is unlicensed are incorrect.

Since 2013, the channel’s management submitted a request for a broadcast

6 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YWvUOxSfe9s
license to The Independent High Authority for Audiovisual Communication, but it declined for “unacceptable and unreasonable” considerations.

- **Guarantees of natural justice**

Since July 25, eight civilians were tried before the military courts, including MP Maher Zaid, who was arrested by a military court order on July 30 in connection with a case that was settled in 2018. On September 2, the first investigative judge at the Permanent Military Court of Tunis issued a deposit card against lawyer Mahdi Zagrouba in the investigation case known as the “airport storming Tunis-Carthage International Airport incident.”

Issuing a committal warrant before the defendant’s statements are heard is a violation of the law and a violation of the presumption of his innocence and right to defend himself, not mentioning trial before a military court.

It is noteworthy that the Indictment Chamber of the Court of Appeal in Tunis decided on September 15 to release Zagrouba for lack of jurisdiction of the military judiciary. This case is an example of civilians being tried before a military court.

“Every individual is entitled to a fair trial within a reasonable period. Litigants are equal before the law.”

Article 108 of the Tunisian Constitution

The Tunisian constitution of 2014 guarantees the citizens the right to litigation before a natural judge. Since all those who have been detained or arrested following exceptional presidential procedures are civilians, the constitution obliges the authorities to submit them to the civilian judiciary to verify the validity of the decision.

---

7 The details of the “airport storming incident” date back to March 15, when representatives from the Dignity Coalition went to Tunis-Carthage International Airport to protest against the decision to prevent a Tunisian citizen from traveling.
of the accusations against them. Chapter 110 of the Constitution regulates the classification and jurisdiction of courts and prohibits the creation of exceptional courts or the enactment of exceptional procedures that would prejudice the principles of fair trial and has limited the jurisdiction of military courts to crimes marked as military crimes. (8)

Legal position

The Tunisian President’s exceptional measures and the subsequent decisions and orders included serious violations of the constitution and infringed on the inherent rights of Tunisians, especially the right to self-determination. The most prominent legal violations were manifested in the following:

**Announcing of exceptional measures**

President Kais Saied based his declaration of emergency and decrees of exceptional measures on Article 80 of the Tunisian Constitution. He dismissed the Prime Minister, Hisham Al-Mashichi, suspended the Parliament, and lifted the immunity of parliamentarians, following an emergency meeting that brought together military and security leaders at Carthage Palace.

Article 80 states, “In the event of imminent danger threatening the nation’s institutions or the security or independence of the country, and hampering the normal functioning of the state, the President of the Republic may take any measures necessitated by the exceptional circumstances, after consultation with the Head of Government and the Speaker of the Assembly of the Representatives of the People and informing the President of the Constitutional Court. The President shall announce the measures in a statement to the people. The measures shall guarantee a return to the normal functioning of state institutions.

---

8 Article 108: “The different categories of courts are established by law. No special courts may be established, nor any special procedures that may prejudice the principles of fair trial. Military courts are competent to deal with military crimes. The law shall regulate the mandate, composition, organization, and procedures of military courts, and the statute of military judges.”
and services as soon as possible. The Assembly of the Representatives of the People shall be deemed to be in a state of continuous session throughout such a period. In this situation, the President of the Republic cannot dissolve the Assembly of the Representatives of the People, and a motion of censure against the government cannot be presented.” (9)

The Tunisian president committed a constitutional violation when he granted himself powers that he does not legally have. The president is not entitled to dissolve the parliament or disrupt its work. Article 80 stipulates that the president taking any action that is considered as a declaration of a state of emergency is conditioned with consulting the head of government and the convention of the permanent parliament.

Despite the clarity of the constitution in terms of the state of emergency, the Tunisian president applied part of the text (related to granting him the authority to declare a state of emergency, which is a protocol matter as he is the highest authority in the country) but ignored that this power does not include suspending the parliament and dismissing the government. If the constitution gave the president such dangerous powers, it would have mentioned them in a separate article within the president's constitutional powers in emergency situations.

The third paragraph of Article 80 of the Constitution states, “Thirty days after the entry into the force of these measures, and at any time thereafter, the Speaker of the Assembly of the Representatives of the People or thirty of the members thereof shall be entitled to apply to the Constitutional Court with a view to verifying whether or not the circumstances remain exceptional.” (10)

Given the current situation, and in light of failing to form a Constitutional Court due to political disputes, the authorities that

9 Article 80 of the Tunisian Constitution
10 The Tunisian Constitution of 2014
run the country in emergency situations are the presidency and the executive body represented by the government and parliament, according to the constitution. The constitution did not say that it is possible for the president to declare a state of emergency and have all the powers. It stipulated the complete opposite by conditioning deciding whether or not the state of emergency should continue with the convention of the permanent parliament and rule of the Constitutional Court.

On August 24, the president issued a decision to extend the exceptional measures before the expiration of the month period stipulated in the first decision. But he did not specify a date for the expiration of the measures, despite the lack of a legal mechanism that gives the president the authority to extend the exceptional measures indefinitely.

Recently, as part of the exceptional measures, a new government headed by Najla Boden was sworn in. This was about three months after the president announced the exceptional measures and dismissed the previous government headed by Hisham Al-Mashishi.

**Decree No. 117-2021**

On September 22, the president issued Decree No. 117-2021, which included a serious violation aimed at legalizing the disruption of state institutions and imposing presidential guardianship on all authorities.

The decree stripped the people's eligibility to express their opinion and gave the president himself the authority to make decisions for the people. This was clear in the preamble of the decree which says, “Since the principle is that the rule is for the people, if the principle conflicts with the procedures related to its application, this requires the priority of the principle on forms and procedures.”

The decree challenges the constitution, as it allows abiding by the constitution only when it agrees with the exceptional
measures. Article 20 in the final provisions of the decree states, “The preamble of the Constitution, Title One and Title two thereof, and all constitutional provisions that do not conflict with the provisions of this Presidential Decree are still valid.” (11)

The constitution is the highest level of national legislation and must be superior to all other legislation and orders, which should agree with it and not the other way around.

**Extending to lift the immunity of parliamentarians**

The president's extension of lifting the immunity of parliament members appears to aim to deny them their constitutionally guaranteed legal cover. This way, any MP who rejects the presidents' policies remains vulnerable to security and judicial prosecutions. Some MPs were arrested already on old complaints or new complaints related to their criticism of presidential measures. Such prosecution appears retaliatory against political opponents through a set of measures that explicitly violate the constitution. All decisions of house arrest, travel ban, or arrest by the Minister of Interior are based on the presidential exceptional measures, not on the provisions of the constitution since the parliamentary immunity still exists according to the constitution. Accordingly, there is a clear legal flaw in all these procedures that may pave the way for serious violations of the rights and freedoms of individuals and political and societal entities.

**Restriction of public rights and freedoms**

The president's suspending the parliament and sacking the Prime Minister was accompanied by a set of measures to prevent peaceful gatherings and legalize the security and judicial prosecution of political and human rights figures.

---

11 Presidential Decree No. 172021- issued by the Tunisian President on September 22, 2021.
These measures included arbitrary arrests for expressing opinion, travel bans on political and academic figures, and house arrests by a decision by the Minister of Interior at the time, Reda El Gharslawi. These practices constituted grave violations of the provisions of the Constitution.

Since the president relied on Article 80 of the Constitution and the declaration of a state of emergency, all the public authorities' practices were based on that declaration.

Since Article 24 of the constitution obligated the state to protect the rights of persons, the sanctity of homes, and the right to freedom of movement and travel, the declaration of a state of emergency is tainted with clear constitutional violations such as raiding the homes and restricting freedom of travel and movement of citizens.

The article states, “The state protects the right to privacy and the inviolability of the home, and the confidentiality of correspondence, communications, and personal information. Every citizen has the right to choose their place of residence, to free movement within the country, and the right to leave the country.”

The authorities violating individual freedoms and the freedom of the press clearly violates Article 31 of the Constitution, which stipulates that “Freedom of opinion, thought, expression, information, and publication shall be guaranteed.”

The authorities’ practices not only violated the Constitution, which is considered the most important instrument for the protection of human rights, but also violated Tunisia’s international legal obligations, specifically the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The national law should be compatible with the provisions of the Covenant, emphasizing its mechanisms for the protection and preservation of those rights. However, the practices carried out by the authorities after July 25 violate articles of the Covenant, most notably Article 9, which stipulates “Everyone has
the right to liberty and security of person. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest or detention.”

It also violated Article 19, which stipulates, “1. Everyone shall have the right to hold opinions without interference. 2. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers.”

In addition, the arbitrary practices of the Ministry of the Interior violated the rights guaranteed under Article 12 of the Covenant, which affirms that “1. Everyone lawfully within the territory of a State shall, within that territory, have the right to liberty of movement and freedom to choose his residence. 2. Everyone shall be free to leave any country, including his own. 3. The above-mentioned rights shall not be subject to any restrictions except those which are provided by law, are necessary to protect national security, public order (ordre public), public health or morals or the rights and freedoms of others, and are consistent with the other rights recognized in the present Covenant.”
Recommendations

In light of the major constitutional violations in the Tunisian President’s declaration on July 25 and the successive legal and human rights crises that arose after that declaration, Euro-Mediterranean Human Rights Monitor recommends:

- Abolishing the exceptional measures announced on July 25, and all orders and decisions ensuing therefrom.
- Separating the executive, legislative, and judicial powers in accordance with Tunisia’s 2014 constitution. Powers should not be concentrated in the hands of a single person or body.
- Respecting the International human rights standards and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, ratified by Tunisia.
- Protecting parliamentarians and political and human rights activists from security and judicial prosecutions for expressing their views and guaranteeing them the right to publish without restriction.
- Opening a comprehensive national dialogue based on a reformist vision within a specific time table to guarantee the participation of all political blocs and civil sectors.
- Reviewing the legislative texts that create a state of exception and aligning them with international human rights standards and the rights stipulated in the Tunisian Constitution of 2014.
- Refraining from trying civilians before military courts and adopting laws to punish opponents.
- Activating the role of civil society institutions in protecting the democratic system, human rights, and personal freedoms.
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