



Report on İzmir Removal Center Visits

(July – December 2025)



Monitoring Reports | June 2026 | Mültecilerle Dayanışma Derneği

Report on İzmir Removal Center Visits (July – December 2025)

Mültecilerle Dayanışma Derneđi

This report was first published in June 2026.

This report was made possible through the invaluable financial support of **Förderverein PRO ASYL e.V.** Association for Solidarity with Refugees bears sole responsibility for the views and opinions expressed herein, which do not necessarily reflect those of **Förderverein PRO ASYL e.V.**



Cover image was created using Google's Gemini AI application.

© This report may be freely used, reproduced and distributed, provided that the source is cited.

Mültecilerle Dayanışma Derneđi/ Association for Solidarity with Refugees

Uđur Mahallesi 848 Sokak No:16 Konak / İzmir / Turkey

00 90 232 483 54 21

bilgi@multeci.org.tr

multeci.org.tr



The **Association for Solidarity with Refugees (Mülteci-Der)** is an independent, rights-based civil society organization established in 2008, dedicated to advocating for the rights of refugees, migrants, and asylum seekers in Turkey. As part of its mission, **Mülteci-Der** provides legal aid, supports vulnerable individuals, and works to ensure that Turkey's policies and practices align with international human rights standards. The organization is an active member of several national and international networks, including the **European Council on Refugees and Exiles (ECRE)** and **Turkey Mülteci Hakları Koordinasyonu (Turkey Refugee Rights Coordination)**.

Mülteci-Der has been providing crucial legal aid to detained migrants, asylum seekers, temporary protection status holders, and refugees across Turkey for more than a decade. Based in İzmir, the association's dedicated team of lawyers offers comprehensive legal support nationwide. These legal professionals are committed to ensuring that the rights of migrants and refugees are protected under Turkish and international law.

In addition to their office-based work, the lawyers of **Mülteci-Der** also conduct regular visits to **Removal Centers (Geri Gönderme Merkezleri)**, where migrants and asylum seekers are detained. During these visits, they provide direct legal services to detainees, assisting them in navigating complex legal processes such as appeals against deportation and applications for international protection. Furthermore, **Mülteci-Der** uses these visits to assess the living conditions and treatment of detainees within the centers, helping to highlight and address any human rights violations or inadequate standards of care.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	5
2. Overview	8
3. Methodology	9
4. Key findings	10
4.1. Access to Legal Assistance	10
4.2. Detention Conditions	11
4.3. Healthcare Access	13
4.4. Treatment by Staff	14
4.5. Access to Communication	15
4.6. Procedural Safeguards and Information	15
4.7. Vulnerable Groups	16
5. Conclusion	17
5.1 Persisting Issues	17
5.2 Emerging and Escalating Issues	18
Annex: List of interviewed detainees	20

1. Introduction

Turkey continues to host one of the largest migrant and refugee populations in the world. According to figures published by the Presidency of Migration Management (PMM), as of September 2025 there were approximately 3.9 million foreign nationals on Turkish territory, of whom around 2.8 million were seeking international protection, the majority Syrians granted temporary protection status¹. Syrians under temporary protection remain the largest single group, although their number has declined sharply since the fall of the Assad regime on 8 December 2024; by the end of 2025, Turkish officials reported that more than 500,000 Syrians had returned to Syria from Turkey under voluntary return procedures since the fall of Assad². Turkey's "go-and-see" visit policy, which entered into effect in January 2025 and was due to terminate on 1 July 2025, allowed one member of each Syrian household to make up to three short visits to Syria before deciding whether to return permanently³. While Turkish authorities described the resulting returns as voluntary, civil society organisations and international bodies including UNHCR have cautioned that the situation in Syria does not meet the requirements for cessation of refugee status, that refugees should not have their status revoked on the basis of a change in government alone, and that some host states' practices risk pushing refugees into danger⁴.

According to PMM data, 36,861 migrants in an irregular situation were apprehended in the first quarter of 2025, 36,974 in the second quarter and 40,020 in the third quarter,

¹ IOM Displacement Tracking Matrix, Migrant Presence Monitoring – Situation Report (Türkiye), Q3 2025 (figures sourced from the Turkish Presidency of Migration Management). <https://dtm.iom.int/report-product-series/migrant-presence-monitoring-situation-report>

² Briar Stewart, "Some Syrians are going home a year after the fall of Assad. Others are cautious about a one-way trip," CBC News, 8 December 2025. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/world/turkey-syrians-refugees-9.7004727>

³ Heinrich Böll Stiftung Turkey, "'Go and see' to return: Turkish policy and Syrian reality," 15 April 2025. <https://tr.boell.org/en/2025/04/15/go-and-see-to-return-turkish-policy-and-syrian-reality>

⁴ "Syria: Don't Force Refugees Back After Assad's Fall," Foreign Policy, 15 January 2025. <https://foreignpolicy.com/2025/01/15/syria-refugees-return-assad-security-asylum-europe-lebanon-turkey-jordan/>

an upward rather than downward trend⁵. Afghans continue to constitute the single largest nationality among those apprehended for irregular migration, followed by Syrians, with significant numbers of Egyptians, Palestinians, Turkmen, Moroccans, Uzbeks, Iraqis and Iranians⁶. Many of those apprehended in Turkey originate from countries affected by ongoing armed conflict (such as Sudan, the Occupied Palestinian Territory and Yemen) or by political repression and severe insecurity and a substantial proportion are intercepted not on entry but during attempts to leave Turkey irregularly through its western and southwestern coast.

The Aegean Sea has been a central axis of irregular movement out of Turkey for more than a decade and in 2025 it remains one of the most active and most dangerous migration routes in Europe. At its narrowest, the maritime gap separating the Turkish coast from the eastern Greek islands of Lesbos, Chios, Samos, Kos and Rhodes is only a few nautical miles, and the islands are often visible from the Turkish mainland. Departure points toward Greece cluster along the western Turkish provinces, including Çeşme, Ayvalık, Bodrum and Didim, and the Turkish Coast Guard reported intercepting or rescuing 58,097 migrants at sea in 2024, with the leading nationalities among those intercepted being Afghan, Syrian, Sudanese, Palestinian, Egyptian, Yemeni, Iraqi, Iranian, Congolese and Somali⁷. This nationality profile closely mirrors the profile of detainees encountered during the visits documented in this report, placing İzmir Harmandalı Removal Centre at the heart of the administrative response to apprehensions at sea.

The human cost of these crossings has continued to be severe throughout 2025. The Turkish Coast Guard recorded 37 fatalities during maritime incidents in 2024⁸ and

⁵ IOM Displacement Tracking Matrix, Migrant Presence Monitoring – Situation Report (Türkiye), Q3 2025 (figures sourced from the Turkish Presidency of Migration Management). <https://dtm.iom.int/report-product-series/migrant-presence-monitoring-situation-report>

⁶ AIDA / ECRE, Country Report: Turkey – Access to the Territory and Push-backs, 2024/2025 update. <https://asylumineurope.org/reports/country/turkiye/asylum-procedure/access-procedure-and-registration/access-territory-and-push-backs/>

⁷ IOM 2024 Annual Migrant Presence Monitoring Situation Report; <https://dtm.iom.int/sites/g/files/tmzbd1461/files/reports/Türkiye%20—%20Overview%20of%20Migrant%20Situation%20-%20Annual%20Report%20%28Jan-Dec%202024%29.pdf>

⁸ IOM 2024 Annual Migrant Presence Monitoring Situation Report; <https://dtm.iom.int/sites/g/files/tmzbd1461/files/reports/Türkiye%20—%20Overview%20of%20Migrant%20Situation%20-%20Annual%20Report%20%28Jan-Dec%202024%29.pdf>

successive incidents in 2025 indicate that the trend has not decreased. According to Refugee Support Aegean, at least 58 people were recovered dead and a further 40 remain missing in 28 fatal incidents, including 16 shipwrecks, at Greece's maritime borders in 2025⁹ while the NGO Collective Aid recorded that at least 96,913 people, including 24,876 children, experienced "border incidents" in the Aegean Sea over the same year¹⁰.

This reality is shaped not only by sea conditions and smuggling practices, but also by the policy environment on both sides of the border. Independent monitors including the Aegean Boat Report have continued to document systematic violent pushbacks by Greek authorities at the maritime border, including incidents in which groups of people were forced back into Turkish waters in violation of the principle of non-refoulement¹¹. Frontex confirmed in April 2025 that it was investigating 12 cases of potential human rights violations by Greece, two of which related to incidents in 2025 with the agency indicating that failure to implement recommendations could result in a reduction of co-financing for Greek coast guard assets¹². On the Turkish side, attempts to cross are met by interception, transfer to a Removal Centre and administrative detention pending deportation or return, placing facilities such as İzmir Harmandalı at the operational core of the response as mentioned above.

Within this context, the present report presents findings from three monitoring visits conducted to İzmir Harmandalı Removal Centre between July and December 2025. The visits were carried out by lawyers providing assistance to detained migrants, refugees and asylum seekers, the majority of whom had been apprehended while attempting to cross the Aegean to Greece. The report documents detention conditions, access to rights and procedural safeguards based on direct observations, individual interviews and case

⁹ At least 98 refugees dead or missing at Greece's maritime borders in 2025, RSA, 16 March 2026, <https://rsaagean.org/en/at-least-58-refugees-dead-and-40-missing-refugees-at-greeces-maritime-borders-in-2025/>

¹⁰ "Mediterranean: Many dead and missing following spate of tragedies. European Council on Refugees and Exiles (ECRE) Weekly Bulletin, April 2026. <https://ecre.org/mediterranean-many-dead-and-missing-following-spate-of-tragedies-%E2%80%95-new-detention-facility-opens-in-cyprus-%E2%80%95-ngo-report-highlights-pushbacks-and-deaths-in-aegean-sea-%E2%80%95-aut/>

¹¹ Aegean Boat Report, ongoing monitoring of maritime arrivals, distress incidents and pushbacks at the Greece–Turkey sea border. <https://aegeanboatreport.com/>

¹² Frontex investigating allegations of pushbacks by Greece, ECRE Weekly Bulletin, 17 April 2025. <https://ecre.org/mediterranean-fall-in-recorded-crossings-in-first-quarter-of-2025-%E2%80%95-greece-redesignates-turkiye-as-safe-third-country-%E2%80%95-frontex-investigating-allegations-of-pu/>

file reviews. It aims to identify systemic issues affecting detainees and to contribute to ongoing advocacy efforts concerning immigration detention practices in Turkey, building on earlier reporting cycles.

2. Overview

This report is based on three visits that were conducted to Izmir Harmandalı Removal Centre between July-December 2025. Across these visits, in-depth interviews were conducted with eleven detainees and case files were reviewed where accessible. The eleven interviewees, referred to throughout this report as D-001 to D-011, included nationals of Palestine, Egypt, Sudan, Yemen and Eritrea. The interviewee group covered a range of profiles: elderly persons, young adults, individuals with diagnosed chronic illnesses, single women and detainees apprehended at the sea border while attempting to cross to Greece. Interpretation support was frequently required and most often provided via the Union of Turkish Bar Associations (TBB) translation hotline, in a smaller number of cases, interviews were conducted directly in English.

Access to detainees was limited by administrative restrictions imposed at the facility itself rather than by the legal framework. A consistent rule limiting legal professionals to six daily inquiries, interviews or file reviews remained in force across all visits, with three permitted in the morning and three in the afternoon. The quota is administered through a numbered queue system: lawyers must obtain a separate ticket for each half-day and queries left unfinished in the morning cannot be carried over without obtaining a new ticket in the afternoon. Importantly, the quota is applied even when the person concerned is not present in the facility; for example, where the detainee has been transferred to another removal centre, released or where the name on the inquiry form does not exactly match the spelling recorded in the facility's registry. In effect, this means a lawyer can exhaust a half-day's quota without ever meeting a client. According to a notice posted in the lawyers' waiting room, lawyers without a power of attorney are additionally limited to a maximum of three meetings with the same detainee, ,

In addition to the formal quota system, lawyers reported the strict enforcement of a fifteen-minute time limit on each interview with facility staff repeatedly entering the consultation room to demand that the meeting be terminated. When asked for the written legal basis of this limit, staff stated only that it was an internal "instruction." Taken together, these access restrictions structurally reduce both the quantity and the quality of assistance that can be provided.

3. Methodology

The monitoring relied on face-to-face interviews with detainees, conducted in private or semi-private spaces and following a structured format. In parallel, lawyers conducted environmental and procedural observations within accessible areas, including the entry checkpoint, the lawyers' waiting area, the interview rooms, the courtyard and the visible portions of the outdoor yard of the Izmir Harmandalı Removal Centre. Administrative practices affecting access to detainees were systematically reviewed, including the queue and quota system, identity verification procedures and the handling of files; testimonies regarding treatment, accommodation, food, water, hygiene and staff conduct were documented and findings were cross-referenced against information obtained in earlier reporting cycles to identify persisting versus emerging trends. Where procedural irregularities were observed in the file (for example, a mismatch between decision date and notification date or service of a decision in a language the detainee cannot read) formal records (tutanak) were drawn up and copies transmitted to the related department of the İzmir Bar Association.

Interviews were conducted under significant time pressure. Facility staff repeatedly emphasised a "fifteen-minute limit per meeting" both before the interview began and during the consultation itself, creating a stressful environment for both lawyer and detainee and negatively affecting the quality and depth of consultations. Mülteci-Der lawyers reported that detainees broke down emotionally during the interview and could not be properly supported within the time allowed. The interview rooms themselves have recently been modified. The previously solid wooden doors have been replaced with

glass doors, reducing the confidentiality of the consultation and the lawyers' waiting space has been reduced from two rooms to one. The team also noted the application of frosted film to windows in the lawyers' corridor that previously offered a view of the courtyard and outdoor yard.

4. Key findings

4.1. Access to Legal Assistance

Access to legal assistance remains systematically restricted across multiple dimensions. The daily quota of six inquiries significantly limits lawyers' ability to meet clients, regardless of the number of detainees in need of representation. Furthermore, the quota is consumed even when detainees are not present, have been transferred or are not located through the facility's registry. As a result, a lawyer can exhaust a half-day's allocation without conducting a single meeting. The strict fifteen-minute time limit per interview, enforced by repeated staff interventions in the consultation room, creates pressure and stress and undermines effective legal support. The newly installed glass doors on interview rooms reduce the privacy of consultations and may inhibit detainees from speaking freely about sensitive matters such as ill-treatment or fear of persecution. The notice limiting lawyers without a power of attorney to three meetings with the same detainee further restricts continuity of representation for those most in need of pro bono support.

Across the visits, a number of detainees reported that no lawyer had been assigned despite ongoing procedures or that a lawyer had been assigned but no meeting had ever taken place. In one case, the team had to draw up a formal record to clarify that the detainee did in fact wish to be represented after a previous appointment had been miscommunicated. These practices, taken together, amount to serious barriers to the right to legal representation guaranteed by the Turkey's Law on Foreigners and International Protection (LFIP) and the European Convention on Human Rights.

4.2. Detention Conditions

Overcrowding and accommodation

Overcrowding is a consistent and severe issue. Rooms designed for eight persons were reported to hold between ten and sixteen individuals and multiple detainees described sleeping on the floor due to a lack of beds. D-002 stated that they were held in a room of sixteen, describing the room as "suffocating" and saying "we cannot breathe". He was visibly distressed when explaining the conditions. D-009, held with other single women, similarly described being in an eight-bed room shared by approximately fourteen people with those without beds sleeping on the floor. D-007 reported sleeping on the floor since arrival. Ventilation is inadequate throughout; room doors are kept locked at all times except during the short periods associated with meals and outdoor access and detainees who asked to have doors left open in order to air out the rooms, especially during the summer months, reported that security staff refused. D-006 described the resulting smell as foul, attributing it to a combination of overcrowding, water cuts and insufficient hygiene supplies.

Water, hygiene and sanitation

Access to water and hygiene is inconsistent and often insufficient. Drinking water provision ranged from 1.5 to 2.5 litres per day, frequently described as inadequate especially in summer. During the November visit the allocation was described by D-009 as three "half-litre bottles" distributed across the day, and several detainees reported drinking directly from the taps in the rooms to compensate for the rationing. Frequent water cuts were reported, ranging from approximately two-hour daily interruptions to longer periods in which running water was only available between 09:00 and 18:00. The water cuts contribute to poor sanitation and detainees described strong odours emanating from the toilets within the rooms. Detainees also reported a complete absence of toilet paper. Hot water for showering is intermittent in summer and reportedly more frequently unavailable in autumn and winter. Several detainees reported showering in cold water as the norm.

Hygiene products are either insufficient or irregularly distributed with one box of shampoo provided per room; a quantity that does not correspond to the actual number of occupants when rooms are overcrowded. Some detainees reported that they had not received any hygiene products at all. Reports of lice infestations and visible skin conditions were observed in at least two cases. D-006 and D-007 displayed clusters of small red lesions on their arms and shoulders consistent with bites and both attributed these to lice present in their rooms. Reports of food-related illness, including spoiled bulgur causing stomach upset and the presence of hair in served meals, were also recorded during the November visit.

Food

Three meals per day are provided but quality is frequently described as poor. D-004 declined to comment on taste because he was not eating, explaining that he did not intend to remain in the facility and therefore saw no purpose in consuming meals. He explicitly stated that this was not a hunger strike but the pattern suggests psychological distress rather than a deliberate protest. Some meals are reported to be barely sufficient in quantity. Economic barriers prevent many detainees from accessing supplementary food. The canteen was reported as being open for only short windows during the day (in some cases approximately thirty minutes coinciding with lunch) with prices that many detainees described as expensive. Detainees without financial means are effectively excluded from the canteen and rely entirely on the facility's meals. During the most recent visit, detainees reported a collective punishment in which an entire wing was denied a meal following an altercation between two detainees and security staff. The use of food as a disciplinary measure, if confirmed, raises particular concern.

Outdoor access

Outdoor access is limited and inconsistent. Detainees reported typically three short periods per day, ranging from fifteen to thirty or forty minutes after each main meal. Variations across accounts indicate a lack of consistency in practice rather than a stable

schedule communicated to detainees; in some accounts, total daily outdoor time amounted to no more than forty-five minutes. The recent application of frosted film to corridor windows that had previously permitted visual contact with the courtyard further compounds the sense of confinement, both for those inside and for monitoring teams attempting to observe the outdoor area.

4.3. Healthcare Access

Access to healthcare is reported to be inadequate and inconsistent. Detainees with chronic illnesses, visible injuries or urgent needs repeatedly reported being denied timely or adequate medical treatment. D-002, who lives with diagnosed heart disease and severe varicose veins, lifted his trouser leg during the interview to show one leg abnormally more swollen than the other. He stated that he could not see a doctor or obtain medicine and described the conditions through tears. D-011, who lives with a medically documented cardiac condition, reported that the facility's medical service had been effectively unavailable for the two months preceding the interview, despite his repeated requests. He stated that the meals provided did not correspond to the dietary requirements indicated by his condition. D-007 reported that he had requested both medical attention and medication for headaches and flu-like symptoms but had been unable to obtain either.

A woman living with a serious health issue could not be interviewed during one of the visits despite her presence in the facility being confirmed. The team was informed that a discrepancy in the spelling of her name on the registration documents prevented the interview from proceeding. According to information she had previously communicated, her medication had been arranged following intervention by UNHCR but clinical follow-up and treatment were not accessible inside the facility. Detainees living with the documented lice infestation reported that no treatment had been provided.

Mental health concerns are significant. Multiple detainees expressed psychological distress, hopelessness and emotional breakdowns during interviews. Prolonged uncertainty regarding detention duration, combined with the impossibility of meaningful

communication with the outside world for those without funds for phone cards, exacerbates mental health deterioration. No psychosocial support structures were reported to be in place.

4.4. Treatment by Staff

Reports on staff behaviour are mixed but include serious allegations. Verbal abuse, humiliation and discriminatory behaviour were reported in multiple interviews, particularly attributed to gendarmerie personnel and, in some accounts, to private security staff. D-002 said through tears that the gendarmerie "treat us like creatures" and that officers ran to wash their hands after touching detainees, describing the conduct as deeply humiliating. D-005 reported that he had personally witnessed private security staff using physical force against other detainees and stated that he was therefore afraid; he also described what he experienced as ongoing discrimination.

D-001 recounted that, approximately two months prior to the interview, he had been taken by gendarmerie to the infirmary — an area without camera coverage — where he was beaten; he stated that the gendarmerie subsequently filed a complaint against him for assaulting the doctor, on the basis of which he was transferred to Şakran Prison for one month. D-008, who had previously been held in Kayseri removal centre, behaved cautiously throughout his interview and declined to elaborate when asked about staff conduct, stating only that some staff were good and some bad — a pattern consistent with fear of reprisal. D-009 reported that, due to the lack of an interpreter, meaningful communication with staff regarding her situation was not possible at all.

These accounts indicate a lack of consistent oversight and accountability, particularly in unmonitored spaces such as the infirmary, and point to a culture of impunity in areas not covered by cameras. The absence of a meaningful internal complaints mechanism, combined with detainees' dependence on the same staff for daily needs, makes the reporting of incidents structurally difficult.

4.5. Access to Communication

Communication with the outside world is limited. Phone access depends on the purchase of prepaid phone cards from the facility's canteen, which many detainees cannot afford. D-003 explicitly stated that he had no money to purchase a phone card and was therefore unable to contact anyone, including family members abroad. Some detainees rely on borrowing cards from others, which is not a sustainable solution and reinforces dependence within the detainee population. International communication is restricted in practice, both by cost and by the technical limitations of the available cards, with the result that individuals without financial means are effectively cut off from family contact for extended periods. This is particularly grave given that many detainees have relatives in active conflict zones such as Gaza, Sudan and Yemen and would benefit psychologically from contact: D-007, for example, has close family trapped in Gaza, and was located by his spouse abroad only through the indirect efforts of a third party who alerted Mülteci-Der. The combination of restricted phone access, the prohibition on mobile devices and the absence of any structured psychosocial support compounds the isolation of detainees during prolonged administrative detention.

4.6. Procedural Safeguards and Information

Significant procedural concerns were identified across the reporting period. Many detainees had never accessed registration or international protection procedures prior to detention, in some cases despite having been in Turkey for years; in others, they had recently arrived from active conflict zones and were apprehended at or near the Aegean coast before any opportunity to seek protection. Some detainees reported a complete lack of interpretation during the notification of legal decisions, in particular deportation orders and administrative detention decisions, and in certain cases, including that of D-003, detainees relied on other detainees who happened to speak Turkish and Arabic to translate critical documents.

D-009 and D-010 whose schooling had been conducted in English and who understand only basic spoken Arabic, were served deportation and administrative detention decisions in written Arabic, a language they cannot read. In one of these files, the deportation decision dated 3 November 2025 and the administrative detention decision dated 4 November 2025 were both served on the detainee only on 11 November 2025, a seven-day delay between issuance and notification, with direct implications for the calculation of appeal deadlines; a formal record was drawn up and transmitted to the assigned legal aid lawyer. Prolonged detention periods, in some cases of six months or longer, were reported without any meaningful clarity as to the prospects for release, return or continued detention. Detainees consistently reported that they had no information about the reasons for their detention, the duration anticipated, the rights available to them while detained, or the basic procedures and operations of the facility. These findings indicate that the procedural safeguards formally provided by the LFIP; including the right to be informed of the reasons for detention in a language one understands, the right to legal assistance, and the right to challenge detention before a Court, are systematically undermined in practice.

4.7. Vulnerable Groups

The presence of vulnerable individuals raises serious concerns. The reporting period included testimonies and observations relating to families with children detained for extended periods: during one visit, the team observed approximately ten children and ten adults waiting in an open area within the GGM compound for approximately two hours, surrounded by gendarmerie, with no information made available as to the procedure being applied. Elderly detainees such as D-002, with diagnosed heart disease and severe varicose veins, were unable to access prescribed treatment. Chronically ill detainees faced compounded barriers to medical care. Detainees exhibiting psychological distress, including D-004, who had stopped eating despite explicitly not identifying as being on hunger strike, progressively disengaged from consultations. Potential age assessment concerns, including reports of individuals registered as adults despite indicators of minor age, also fell within the period .

These groups face heightened risks due to inadequate physical conditions, the absence of targeted safeguards, the lack of specialist healthcare, the absence of mental health services, and the failure of the facility to systematically identify vulnerability at the point of admission. The cumulative effect is that the persons least able to bear the conditions of detention are subject to those conditions without effective mitigation.

5. Conclusion

The findings from the July – December 2025 monitoring visits to Harmandalı Removal Centre reveal systemic and recurring deficiencies in detention conditions and procedural safeguards. Despite repeated documentation across successive monitoring cycles, little evidence suggests that meaningful reforms have been implemented to improve detainees' living standards or to ensure compliance with basic rights. On the contrary, the present reporting period documents the introduction or strengthening of several practices that further constrain detainees' access to legal counsel and external monitors' ability to observe conditions inside the facility.

5.1 Persisting Issues

A number of structural problems documented in earlier reporting cycles continue without meaningful improvement. Overcrowding remains one of the most visible concerns: rooms designed for eight detainees were repeatedly reported to hold between ten and sixteen individuals, with some detainees sleeping on the floor, mirroring the findings of previous reporting periods and showing no sign of being addressed despite consistent documentation. Inadequate healthcare access likewise persists. Detainees with chronic illnesses, continued to experience untreated or poorly managed symptoms, often receiving nothing beyond generic medication. The reported absence of the facility's medical service for an extended period in late 2025, described by D-011, indicates a deepening rather than a resolved problem.

Hot water shortages, insufficient hygiene supplies and restricted outdoor time remain ongoing concerns. Procedural barriers are similarly entrenched: deportation and detention decisions continue to be delivered in languages that the affected detainees do not adequately understand, often without interpretation or effective legal assistance, and requests for lawyers continue to go unanswered or to result in formal assignments that do not produce a meeting in practice. Vulnerable groups, including elderly detainees, persons with chronic illnesses, persons living with HIV and single women, remain without targeted support, specialist healthcare or adapted accommodation.

5.2 Emerging and Escalating Issues

Beyond these persisting issues, the present monitoring period documents a number of emerging and escalating concerns that warrant immediate attention. The most significant of these is the cumulative restriction of access to legal representation. The strict enforcement of a fifteen-minute time limit on lawyer-client consultations, justified by facility staff only as an internal "instruction" without identifiable legal basis, is incompatible with the right to effective legal assistance. Combined with the replacement of wooden interview-room doors by glass doors which compromises confidentiality, the reduction of the lawyers' waiting rooms from two to one, the rigidly enforced ticket-and-quota system and the posted notice limiting non-mandated lawyers to three meetings with the same detainee, this constitutes a multi-layered narrowing of the conditions under which legal counsel can be provided.

A second escalating concern relates to the physical opacity of the facility. The application of frosted film to windows that previously allowed observation of the courtyard and outdoor yard removes a basic element of transparency for visiting monitors. This change coincided with the team's observation, during one visit, of approximately ten children and ten adults held in an open area of the compound surrounded by gendarmerie for approximately two hours, without any information provided as to the procedure being applied.

A third escalating concern is the documented deterioration of hygiene and food safety. Clusters of skin lesions consistent with lice bites observed during the interviews, reports of spoiled bulgur causing digestive illness, hair found in food, dirty toilets without paper, daily water cuts and the rationing of drinking water to as little as 1.5 litres per person indicate a facility operating below the minimum standards required to safeguard health. Reports of a collective punishment by withholding a meal from an entire wing, if confirmed, raise additional concerns regarding the use of food as a disciplinary measure.

A fourth concern is the situation of women and persons living with chronic or infectious illnesses. The inability of the legal team to interview a woman living with a serious health issue due to a clerical discrepancy in her name and the reported absence of clinical follow-up for her condition, demonstrate how administrative practices can compound exclusion from medical care. The detention of D-009 and D-010 without interpretation services in any of the languages they can read, combined with the service of decisions in a language they cannot understand, illustrates the intersecting gendered and linguistic dimensions of procedural exclusion.

Finally, allegations of physical violence in unmonitored spaces, reported in detail by D-001 and corroborated by the account of D-005 of physical force used by private security staff witnessed first-hand, point to a culture of impunity in spaces not subject to electronic oversight. The subsequent transfer of D-001 to prison on the basis of a counter-allegation by the perpetrators further illustrates the structural difficulty of reporting ill-treatment from within detention.

Taken together, the findings indicate that detention practices at Harmandalı GGM raise serious human rights concerns, particularly with respect to dignity, access to justice and the protection of vulnerable individuals. The cumulative restriction of legal access, combined with the reduction of physical transparency and the deterioration of basic conditions, suggests that the trajectory of the facility is one of contraction rather than reform.

Annex: List of interviewed detainees

D-001 Male İzmir Harmandalı

D-002 Male İzmir Harmandalı

D-003 Male İzmir Harmandalı

D-004 Male İzmir Harmandalı

D-005 Male İzmir Harmandalı

D-006 Male İzmir Harmandalı

D-007 Male İzmir Harmandalı

D-008 Male İzmir Harmandalı

D-009 Female İzmir Harmandalı

D-010 Female İzmir Harmandalı

D-011 Male İzmir Harmandalı

Mültecilerle Dayanışma Derneđi / Association for Solidarity with Refugees is a civil society organization that has been carrying out rights-based work since 2008 to ensure asylum seekers, refugees, and migrants affected by forced migration can access their rights and services with dignity, in line with universal human rights, as well as international and national law.

Mültecilerle Dayanışma Derneđi
Association for Solidarity with Refugees

Address: Uđur Mahallesi 848 Sokak No:16

Konak / İzmir / Turkey

Tel : 0090 232 483 54 21

E-mail: bilgi@multeci.org.tr

Web: multeci.org.tr

