



REPORT ON REMOVAL CENTER VISITS

(JANUARY – JUNE 2026)



Monitoring Reports | August 2026 | Mültecilerle Dayanışma Derneği

Report on Removal Center Visits (January – June 2026)

Mültecilerle Dayanışma Derneği

This report was first published in August 2026.

This report was made possible through the invaluable financial support of **The European Endowment for Democracy (EED)**. Association for Solidarity with Refugees bears sole responsibility for the views and opinions expressed herein, which do not necessarily reflect those of **The European Endowment for Democracy**.



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 Derneği/ Association for Solidarity with Refugees

Uğur 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.....	6
3. Methodology	7
4. Key Findings	8
4.1. Legal and procedural safeguards	8
Notification and language	8
Access to a lawyer	9
International protection and the risk of refoulement.....	12
4.2. Living conditions.....	13
4.3. Healthcare	15
4.4. Treatment by staff.....	17
4.5. Vulnerable groups.....	18
4.6. Contact with the outside world	20
5. Conclusion	21
5.1. Persisting issues.....	21
5.2. Emerging and escalating issues	22
Annex A. Monitoring visits	23
Annex B. Interviewed detainees	24

1. INTRODUCTION

Foreigners subject to removal proceedings in Turkey may be placed under administrative detention in Removal Centres (Geri Gönderme Merkezi - GGM) under the Law on Foreigners and International Protection (LFIP). An administrative detention decision must be taken within forty-eight hours of apprehension, is reviewed monthly and may not exceed six months, with a possible extension of a further six months¹. The law requires that deportation orders and administrative detention decisions be notified to the person concerned, together with information on their consequences and on appeal procedures. It also guarantees detainees the ability to meet their legal representatives, notary and UNHCR officials and sets out the services to be provided in removal centres, including access to emergency and essential health services free of charge. International protection applications may be lodged from detention. The establishment and operation of removal centres are further regulated by a dedicated regulation².

Conditions in removal centres and respect for procedural safeguards in administrative detention have been the subject of concern for several years, including by international monitoring bodies such as the Council of Europe's Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT)³.

This report presents the findings of thirteen visits carried out by lawyers working with Mülteci-Der between January and June 2026 to five removal centres: İzmir Harmandalı, Aydın, Antalya Döşemealtı, Ankara Akyurt and Çankırı. It documents living conditions, access to healthcare, legal and procedural safeguards, treatment by staff, the situation

¹ Law on Foreigners and International Protection (Law No. 6458, 2013) Art. 57 <https://en.goc.gov.tr/kurumlar/en.goc/Ingilizce-kanun/Law-on-Foreigners-and-International-Protection.pdf>

² Kabul Ve Barınma Merkezleri İle Geri Gönderme Merkezlerinin Kurulması, Yönetimi, İşletilmesi, İşletirilmesi Ve Denetimi Hakkında Yönetmelik, Resmi Gazete 22.04.2014/28980 (Regulation No 28980 on the Establishment and Operations of Reception and Accommodation Centres and Removal Centres, 22 April 2014) <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2014/04/20140422-5.htm>

³ European Committee for the Prevention of Torture (CPT), Report to the Turkish Government on the visit to Turkey, CPT/Inf (2020) 22 (visit 2015). <https://hudoc.cpt.coe.int/eng?i=p-tur-20170510-en-16>

of vulnerable groups and contact with the outside world, as reported by detainees and as observed by the visiting lawyers. It also records the support provided during the visits, including legal counselling, petitions for international protection and referrals to bar association legal aid units.

2. OVERVIEW

Between January and June 2026, lawyers of Mülteci-Der conducted thirteen visits: eight to İzmir Harmandalı, two to Aydın and one each to Antalya Döşemealtı, Ankara Akyurt and Çankırı. Individual interviews were held with 45 detainees; three detainees were seen twice, bringing the total number of interviews to 48. Detention files were reviewed where access was granted and the visiting lawyers recorded observations on entry procedures, waiting and interview areas and the outside of accommodation blocks. In several cases, requested interviews could not take place because the administration stated that the person was not present in the centre.

The most consistent finding across all five centres concerned notification of deportation and administrative detention decisions. Files repeatedly showed decisions and notification forms issued in languages the person did not speak or read. In several files, detainees denied signatures attributed to them or stated that they had never seen forms bearing a “refusal to sign” stamp.

Access to lawyers was constrained by short time limits, repeated interruptions, interview quotas and following renovation works at İzmir Harmandalı, a physical redesign of interview rooms that makes confidential communication and interpretation difficult. Healthcare complaints centred on infirmaries reportedly responding to most requests with painkillers, hospital referrals that were not carried out, and, in individual cases, chronic medication reportedly confiscated on admission and not replaced.

Material conditions varied considerably between centres. Detainees described overcrowding, people sleeping on the floor, recurrent water cuts, limited or no hot water and insufficient food in several centres, while some detainees at Çankırı described

adequate food and treatment alongside visibly deteriorated container units. In two cases at Aydın, detainees were reportedly removed or faced imminent removal, shortly after meeting a lawyer and despite expressed international protection claims. If confirmed, such practices raise serious concerns about compliance with the principle of non-refoulement and the right to an effective remedy.

Two further visits at the end of June 2026 documented the detention of families with young children at İzmir Harmandalı. No educational activity, teaching staff or play area for children was reported to exist in the centre and the daily routine of the children was described as limited to going to canteen for meals and a return to the rooms.

3. METHODOLOGY

The findings in this report are based on thirteen monitoring visits conducted between January and June 2026 (Annex A). The visits were carried out by lawyers working with the Association, in most cases following referrals from UNHCR field offices, from family members or from detainees who reached Mülteci-Der by telephone. During each visit, lawyers submitted interview request forms for detainees identified in advance, reviewed detention files where permitted, conducted individual interviews and recorded observations. Where detainees requested it, the lawyers submitted petitions on their behalf, including petitions for the registration of international protection applications, for hospital referrals and for family unity and sent referrals to the legal aid units of bar association.

Interviews were held with 45 detainees of sixteen nationalities, including nationals of Afghanistan, Pakistan, Syria, Iraq, Iran, Somalia, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Sierra Leone, Angola, Tajikistan, Russia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Palestine. Particular attention was paid to vulnerable individuals, including lone women, persons with disabilities and chronic illnesses, LGBTI+ detainees, young adults and families with children. Interpretation was provided through the telephone interpretation line of the Union of Turkish Bar Associations (TBB) where available. During one visit to Aydın, Urdu

interpretation could not be obtained through the line and interpretation was instead provided by other detainees; this limitation is itself recorded as a finding.

All testimonies have been anonymised. Detainees are referred to by codes (D-001 to D-045; Annex B) and identifying details have been removed. Quotations have been lightly edited for clarity. Statements made by detainees could not always be independently verified. They are reported as testimonies and attributed as such.

The findings reflect the centres visited and the individuals interviewed during this period. They are not statistically representative of the situation of all persons held in administrative detention in Turkey. Access constraints also shaped what could be observed: interviews were limited to 15 or 20 minutes in most centres and were repeatedly interrupted. Some requested interviews could not take place and file access was partial in some centres.

4. KEY FINDINGS

4.1. LEGAL AND PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS

NOTIFICATION AND LANGUAGE

In every centre visited, files were found in which deportation orders, administrative detention decisions or the related notification forms had been issued in a language the person concerned did not speak or read. At İzmir Harmandalı, four Gambian detainees who, according to their own statements and to official records drawn up during the visit, speak only local languages of Gambia had decisions recorded with French as the communication language and notification forms issued in English (D-004 to D-007). A Somali woman who communicates only in Somali had forms drawn up in Arabic (D-037), as did a Somali man who speaks Somali and English (D-038). At Aydın, several Urdu-speaking detainees had been notified in English or Arabic (D-010, D-011, D-023, D-026), and an Eritrean detainee who neither speaks nor reads Arabic had all decisions and

forms in Arabic (D-012). In the latter file, monthly review forms recorded that notification had been made “using a translation application”; the detainee stated that no such application had been used and that he had never seen the forms.

Concerns also arose from signature and date records. Several detainees, when shown their files, denied signatures attributed to them on statement records, administrative fine records or notification forms (D-003, D-014, D-021, D-037, among others). Others stated that forms bearing a “refusal to sign” stamp had never been shown to them at all (D-001, D-012, D-019, D-021, D-031). One detainee reported that he had been made to place a fingerprint on a notification form by force (D-033). In one file, the deportation decision was dated 27 May 2026 while the notification was recorded as having taken place on 1 January 2026 (D-037). In other files, decisions carried no date at all or the dates on statement records did not match the dates of the events they described. Individually, each of these records could have an explanation. Taken together, they raise concerns about whether notification requirements are met in practice and whether “refusal to sign” records reliably reflect what occurred. In one case at İzmir Harmandalı, a woman detained together with her nine-year-old son was apprehended on 30 April 2026 while the deportation decision in her file was dated 4 May 2026, beyond the forty-eight-hour period foreseen in the law (D-020). At the time of the visit, the decisions had reportedly not yet been notified to her. A referral was made and a legal aid lawyer from the bar association was assigned.

ACCESS TO A LAWYER

Interview time limits of 15 minutes were applied at İzmir Harmandalı, Antalya Döşemealtı and, at times, Aydın. At Ankara Akyurt center, the limit communicated was 20 minutes. At Harmandalı, staff interrupted every interview to warn that the limit had been exceeded, even when the visiting lawyer was the only lawyer present in the centre. Interview quotas of three persons in the morning and three in the afternoon were applied at Aydın and Çankırı, with reference made to a protocol between the TBB and the Presidency of Migration Management (PMM). At Ankara Akyurt, registration was accepted

for a maximum of three detainees at a time, requiring the lawyer to return to the gate and re-register for further interviews; combined with a late start and the midday break, this reduced the second round of interviews to thirty minutes. At Aydın, interviews began between one and one and a half hours after the request forms had been submitted, although no other lawyers were waiting.

Physical arrangements increasingly separate lawyer and client. At İzmir Harmandalı, renovation works observed in March 2026 resulted in interview rooms divided by a wall or a transparent plastic panel with a small number of holes for sound. The visiting lawyers found that speech through the panel was difficult to hear, that the interpretation telephone was located on the lawyer's side only and that documents could no longer be shared across a common table. The corridor from which lawyers could previously see the outdoor yard was closed off and bars were fitted to the inside of the corridor windows. At Antalya Döşemealtı, interviews took place through a glass partition with a microphone; the parties had to speak loudly and conversations could be heard from outside. At Çankırı, interview rooms had no sound insulation and officials, including a person identified by a detainee as the centre director, were observed looking through the interview room window during interviews. In several centres, staff insisted on keeping interview room doors open.

File and registry practices also gave rise to concern. At Antalya, files may be examined only in the reception area and detainees are not permitted to see their own files. At Çankırı, files were found with missing documents and papers not arranged in date order. At Harmandalı, the files of two detainees who had previously been visited did not contain the lawyer request forms and interview records that are normally added to the file; official reports were drawn up on both occasions. During a visit in Aydın, petitions submitted to the administration were not given registry numbers and interview forms were photographed by staff with personal mobile telephones, a practice that raises data protection concerns. At Ankara Akyurt, an official stated that petitions submitted by lawyers would be accepted into the file only if bar stamp and fee payments were made. As a result, an international protection petition prepared for one detainee could not be placed in his file and was instead handed to him with detailed counselling on how to apply himself (D-033).

Responses that a requested person was "not present" were a recurring obstacle. At Harmandalı in March, a detainee was declared not present on the basis of a first request form. A second, more detailed form, submitted with a copy of the detainee's passport, produced the same response, although another detainee interviewed the same day stated that the two shared a room. In June, a detainee was declared not present because one element of a five-part name was missing from the request form, despite the inclusion of other identifying details. At Çankırı, a request for a signed certificate that a person was not present was initially refused on the ground that the lawyer had no power of attorney; a notation was eventually added to the request form. By contrast, at Aydın in March, absence certificates were issued upon petition and a security officer was observed checking a person's presence informally by telephone even before request forms had been completed, which points to inconsistent practice rather than a uniform rule. The visit of 25 June 2026 illustrates how such responses may arise. A certificate of absence had been issued for D-037 during an earlier visit, on the basis of the name recorded in the deportation and administrative detention decisions. A check of the registry list during the June visit showed that the name and surname of the detainee are spelled differently in that list than in the decisions themselves. The identity details held by the administration are therefore not consistent across its own records.

Access to legal aid remained uneven. Some detainees had had no lawyer contact at any point in their detention (D-007, D-042) or only a single meeting months earlier (D-010). Following the visits, the Association sent referrals to the bar associations of İzmir, Aydın, Antalya, Çankırı and Ankara and legal aid lawyers were assigned in a number of cases. Annulment cases against deportation orders were subsequently filed in several of them. Two allegations concerning lawyers were recorded: one detainee stated that a legal aid lawyer had taken money from them and continued to request payments (D-013) and another stated that they had paid 2,000 euros to a person presented to them as a lawyer who then took no action (D-040). These allegations could not be verified and are recorded as reported.

Many of the detainees interviewed expressed a fear of return and asked to apply for international protection. During the reporting period, Mülteci-Der team submitted petitions for the registration of international protection applications at Aydın and İzmir Harmandalı on behalf of at least eleven detainees. Furthermore, the team provided counselling to others on how to apply in their own language and followed up applications that had reportedly not been registered. In one case, a detainee's application petition, which was submitted more than a month earlier was followed by a request from the administration that the detainee should rewrite the same petition, which they did (D-008). In another, a detainee reported that their application had still not been registered several weeks after their request. A further petition with supporting documents was submitted during the June visit (D-021).

Two sequences of events at Aydın raise particular concern. D-009, an Afghan detainee interviewed on 25 March 2026, had no record of any lawyer visit in their file; a referral for a legal aid assignment was prepared the same day. The following day, according to information detainees's mother later provided from Kabul, person was deported to Afghanistan despite, as reported, having signed no documents. According to the same information, all Afghan nationals held in the centre were deported on the same date. On 1 April 2026, D-010, a Pakistani detainee interviewed during the same visit, telephoned Mülteci-Der and reported that staff had told them that they would be deported and had tried to have them sign removal documents. The bar association was contacted urgently to secure a lawyer visit. At Antalya Döşemealtı, on the day of the visit, staff informed the lawyer on arrival that Afghan detainees would be transferred at 11:00; two of the five Afghan detainees on the interview list were on the transfer list and three others were recorded as not present.

One detainee at Çankırı described an earlier deportation attempt by air that was abandoned after the group informed the pilot that they would resist if the aircraft moved (D-043). Another detainee at Ankara Akyurt stated that he had been deported to Afghanistan in 2024 and had since returned (D-033).

4.2. LIVING CONDITIONS

Detainees in four of the five centres described overcrowding. At İzmir Harmandalı, accounts ranged from thirteen persons in a room earlier in the year to nine persons with four sleeping on the floor in May; one detainee estimated that around 190 men were held in the single-male section (D-001). At Antalya Döşemealtı, one detainee described 22 persons in a room with four or five sleeping on the floor without mattresses (D-013) and others confirmed that newly arrived persons sleep on the floor until transfers free up beds. At Aydın, detainees reported twelve to seventeen persons per room and one reported sleeping on boards (D-009). At Çankırı, most rooms reportedly held six persons in six-person containers, but one detainee reported eight persons in their room with two on the floor (D-042). Windows of accommodation blocks at Harmandalı were observed to be heavily used for drying clothes and at Ankara Akyurt windows were observed covered with black plastic bags, apparently in the absence of curtains. During the visits of 25 June 2026 detainees at İzmir Harmandalı described five and six persons in small rooms, inadequate ventilation and high temperatures (D-037, D-044).

Access to water was a recurring problem. At Harmandalı, official notices instructing users to fill buckets “because of frequent water cuts” were observed in the toilets in March and were still in place in May, which suggests a chronic problem rather than temporary. Detainees at Harmandalı described cold showers and frequent cuts. At Antalya, hot water was reportedly available only in the afternoon and for short periods, at Çankırı, three of five detainees interviewed stated that hot water was never available while one stated that they could shower with hot water. Daily drinking water was reported at around 1.5 litres per person at Antalya and Harmandalı and around 2 litres at Çankırı; several detainees described this as insufficient, including one whose doctor had advised a high fluid intake (D-032).

Food was a frequent complaint, although accounts differed. At Antalya, detainees consistently described portions that did not satisfy hunger and said that those who could

afford it bought food from the canteen. At Aydın, one detainee reported that in the week before the March visit worms had been found in the food and that detainees, including infants, had suffered vomiting attributed to it (D-008, as reported). During Ramadan, one detainee at Harmandalı stated that only bread was provided for sahur (the pre-dawn/fast) meal (D-007). At Çankırı, two detainees described the food as good while two others described it as inedible or very poor, one of them relying on packaged food from the canteen. Hygiene items were reportedly provided only once on admission at Antalya, and in small, poor-quality packages at intervals of one or two weeks at Çankırı. Detainees at Harmandalı and Çankırı reported bedbugs and insect bites; in two cases the visiting lawyers observed numerous small marks on a detainee's body (D-021's fellow detainee at Harmandalı; the May visit) and a swollen, reddened hand following an insect bite (D-042). Detainees also described mosquitoes entering through open windows in warm weather with no effective measures taken. At İzmir Harmandalı in June, D-044 stated that the bedding was mouldy and was not changed, that there were insects in the room and that the smell of mould prevented sleep. On the night before the visit, D-044 had been unable to sleep or breathe properly. D-037 stated that the rooms were cleaned once a week, no cleaning materials were provided, the toilets gave off a strong odour and that insects in the room bit the occupants. D-037 described the food as rice, soup and occasionally salad, and stated that hot water was available six days a week.

The physical state of the Çankırı centre stood out. The centre consists of container units located on the Ankara motorway, around 15 kilometres from the city centre with no settlement or business nearby. During the visit, which took place in rain, water was observed leaking into containers with rot visible in floors and ceilings. Detainees stated that the rooms could not be used comfortably and that they spent the day in the yard, which is open from morning to evening. One detainee said: "Even animals could not stay in these conditions." (D-042)

The same detainee compared the centre unfavourably with Ankara Akyurt where they had previously been held. Daily routines also varied; at Harmandalı, detainees described being let out of locked rooms three times a day for meals with 15 to 20 minutes of yard time after each meal and no books, activities or occupation of any kind. At Antalya, yard time was reported at one hour per day and at Çankırı, the yard was reportedly open all

day. A prayer room was reported to exist by some detainees at Çankırı and denied by others, who prayed in their rooms.

4.3. HEALTHCARE

Accounts from all five centres describe a similar pattern: requests for medical attention are handled by the infirmary, examinations are cursory or absent, painkillers are dispensed in response to most complaints and requests for hospital referral are not acted upon. The law requires that detainees have access to emergency and essential health services free of charge⁴.

Individual cases illustrate the pattern. At Harmandalı, the visiting lawyer observed that most of the teeth of D-019 were decayed with a gum infection visible from the outside. The detainee stated that they could not breathe properly at night and that their repeated requests for hospital referral had been answered only with medication at the infirmary. D-038, who stated that they had entered Turkey lawfully in March 2026 on a health visa for kidney surgery was detained before treatment could begin. They described difficulty obtaining their medication and showed worn petitions they had submitted requesting surgery. A petition for urgent hospital referral was submitted on their behalf and given a registry number. At Çankırı, D-039, who requires orthopaedic surgery, stated that repeated infirmary visits had not produced a referral. When the visiting lawyer raised the case at the infirmary, the doctor present did not know why no referral had been made and a second staff member stated that seventeen other detainees were waiting for an orthopaedic appointment at the state hospital. At Antalya, D-017 described ongoing lung problems following a serious surgery and tuberculosis and stated that the infirmary provided painkillers without examination. A hospital approval

⁴ Law on Foreigners and International Protection (Law No. 6458, 2013) Art. 59/1
<https://en.goc.gov.tr/kurumlar/en.goc/Ingilizce-kanun/Law-on-Foreigners-and-International-Protection.pdf>

for a cardiology examination was found in the file of D-016 although the visit had not yet taken place.

The situation of detainees living with certain chronic diseases raised particular concern. D-032 stated that approximately six months' supply of their medication was taken from them on admission to Harmandalı and about four months later, neither their own medication nor a substitute had been provided. They described loss of appetite and stated that a painkiller they requested on a Monday had still not been provided by the Thursday of the interview. They declined a formal health application for fear that their status would become known to staff and other detainees which points to the absence of a confidential channel for medical care. In an earlier case at the same centre, D-003 stated that their medication had for a period been distributed to them by another detainee, who disclosed their status to others. The detainee described exclusion, stigmatisation and pressure connected with a “contagious disease” restriction code in their file. They stated that they were shouted at when they briefly lowered the face mask they were required to wear. In addition, D-010 has a severe visual impairment for which no medical report exists in their file and D-031 has a diagnosis of depression. One detainee at Aydın reported being ill for a week without winter clothing (D-009), another stated that medication other than paracetamol was not provided (D-040).

Not all accounts were negative. One detainee at Çankırı stated that they could visit the infirmary and obtain medication when needed (D-043) and one at Aydın reported receiving medication from the infirmary while ill (D-009). Overall, however, the testimonies point to hospital referral operating as the main bottleneck in access to healthcare with the infirmary functioning in practice as a barrier rather than a gateway.

The visits at the end of June 2026 produced further accounts of the same pattern. D-037 stated that a doctor attended the centre perhaps once a week and that no referral had been made for stomach problems requiring hospital treatment, while D-045, detained with three children, uses regular medication for a chronic condition and was awaiting test results for a further serious health concern at the time of apprehension.

4.4. TREATMENT BY STAFF

Testimonies on the conduct of staff were mixed and differed between centres and between individuals in the same centre. At Çankırı, three of the five detainees interviewed described staff conduct as good or without problems. One described it as mixed and one described it as very poor, adding that they felt as if they were in prison. At İzmir Harmandalı, detainees described shouting, swearing and dismissive responses. One recounted being shouted at while eating on the stairs and stated that gendarmerie personnel swore at detainees in the accommodation areas (D-001) and another described officers responding to requests with raised voices and the words “Go, go”. Positive practices were also observed; at Harmandalı, officers provided free telephone cards to two detainees at the lawyers' request and at Aydın, visitors were reportedly allowed daily with long visits permitted when the centre was not busy. D-044 stated that a member of staff responded by shouting when informed that the smell in the room prevented sleeping and breathing.

One account concerned the response to a protest. D-012 stated that in early March 2026 twelve detainees at Aydın held a hunger strike, in the belief that this would lead to their transfer and earlier release. According to the detainee's account, they were taken to hospital on the fourth day, on the fifth day the group was taken to the football pitch at night and kept in the cold and staff reportedly told them: “End this strike or we will keep you here until morning.” (D-012, as reported)

The group reportedly ended the strike around midnight. During the same visit, staff in the waiting area were overheard asking whether the detainees were “going to riot again”. At Çankırı, two detainees independently referred to an incident in which one of them fainted after an insect bite. The detainee concerned stated that the centre director visited them in the infirmary and told not to speak about the incident because they would be released the following day (D-042, as reported). During the interview itself, a person identified by the detainee as the director was observed looking into the interview room.

Conduct towards lawyers also gave rise to concern. At Harmandalı in March, a gendarmerie officer at the gate described a nail clipper found in a lawyer's bag as a knife, stated in a raised voice that “this is a prison” and maintained this tone when reminded that a removal centre is not a penal institution. At the end of the May visit to the same centre, after the visiting lawyers had criticised the practice of keeping interview room doors open, a second X-ray search of the lawyer's bag was requested on exit, on the basis of an unsubstantiated suspicion, although no issue had been identified on entry. The visiting lawyers assessed this as connected to the concerns they had raised during the visit. During the visit of 30 June 2026, the visiting lawyer entered the centre while a gendarmerie officer at the gate was shouting remarks hostile to detainees of a particular national and ethnic origin.

4.5. VULNERABLE GROUPS

The visits documented a number of situations involving vulnerable individuals for whom no consistent identification or protection procedure was apparent. Lone adults with no accompanying family members were interviewed in several centres. A young detainee who cannot read or write in any language stated that they had fled a marriage arranged by the family in exchange for money. Their international protection application had reportedly not been registered weeks after the request and a further petition was submitted in June. D-002, an unregistered lone adult, had no telephone card and could initially communicate only through gestures, a free card was obtained during the visit so that they could reach UNHCR's Arabic-language lines.

Children and young people were present in and around detention. D-020 was detained at Harmandalı together with a nine-year-old child. At Antalya, a detainee reported that a seventeen-year-old was held in the same room with adult detainees, while other family members were held elsewhere in the same facility (D-013, as reported). At Aydın, D-023 was detained together with a fifteen-year-old sibling and petitions were submitted for the registration of international protection applications for

both, the referral to the bar association was renewed to reflect the presence of a child. A family with three children aged between three and seven (D-028, D-029) was detained at Aydın following apprehension in May; petitions were submitted for the family to be accommodated together, for the prompt medical examination and treatment of a child with a reported health condition and for the registration of the family's international protection applications.

Other situations of vulnerability included the two detainees living with a serious chronic health condition described in section 4.3. D-019 whose file category indicated that they should have been accommodated in a separate ward but were not. D-035, a parent separated from a child with no information about the child's whereabouts, who was in visible distress and stated that they would return to their country if reunited with the child. Detainees with disabilities, including D-007, who has a serious visual impairment in one eye and had had no lawyer contact and D-010, whose severe visual impairment is not reflected in any medical report on file. The absence of medical reports, of separate accommodation where foreseen and of registration of protection claims suggests that vulnerability screening is not functioning consistently across the centres visited.

The visits of 25 and 30 June 2026 documented further situations. D-044, a lone detainee of 58, stated that they had left their country of origin as a survivor of sexual violence and was apprehended during an irregular crossing. Following a referral by Mülteci-Der, a legal aid lawyer was assigned and a preliminary petition for the registration of an international protection application was submitted. D-045 was detained at İzmir Harmandalı with three children, all aged under thirteen, following an identity check in the street as the family travelled to the education activities of a civil society organisation. Four days after their admission, the file had reportedly not yet been prepared. D-045 and one child hold registered international protection status in another province; the two other children have no such status. D-045 stated that the centre provides no classes, teaching staff or play area for children and that the daily routine consists only going to canteen for meals and a return to the rooms.

4.6. CONTACT WITH THE OUTSIDE WORLD

Detainees' contact with the outside world depended largely on telephones and in some centres, on visits. At Harmandalı, telephones were reportedly available only after 18:00. Telephone cards must generally be purchased by detainees. In two observed cases at Harmandalı, cards were provided free of charge at the lawyers' request. At Çankırı, one detainee stated that they could hardly ever use the telephone because detainees of one nationality passed the queue among themselves (D-042). At Antalya, one detainee stated that pens and paper were not provided (D-015) which affects the ability to prepare petitions. At Aydın, by contrast, visits appeared comparatively accessible: staff stated that visitors may come every day and a detainee was observed meeting their spouse for around two hours.

Several detainees described being held, before admission to the removal centre, in adjacent GÖKSEM⁵ units (temporary accommodation facilities for irregular migrants). One detainee stated that at a GÖKSEM they spent a night sleeping on the floor with all detainees held together regardless of gender and that no information was provided on the reason for or duration of the stay (as reported at Harmandalı). At Aydın, staff stated that persons held at the local GÖKSEM cannot meet anyone during the first 48 hours, after which lawyer interviews are possible. At Harmandalı, constant loud noise from the GÖKSEM located immediately above the centre was noted as a source of pressure on detainees' rest. Mülteci-Der teams were not able to visit GÖKSEM units during this period and these accounts are recorded as reported.

⁵ For detailed information, see; Mülteci-Der, *InfoNote: GÖKSEM – Referral Centers for Irregular Migrants* (10 June 2026) <https://multeci.org.tr/en/2026/06/10/infonote-goksem/>

5. CONCLUSION

The thirteen visits documented in this report present a consistent picture across five removal centres. Detainees are routinely notified of decisions in languages they do not understand, files contain signature and date records that detainees dispute, access to lawyers is limited in time, interrupted and increasingly conducted through physical barriers, healthcare beyond the infirmary is difficult to reach and material conditions in several centres fall short of basic standards.

5.1. PERSISTING ISSUES

Most of the findings in this report repeat findings from Mülteci-Der's previous reporting cycles⁶ with no evidence of meaningful improvement. Notification in languages detainees do not speak or read was documented in every centre visited and throughout the period, as were "refusal to sign" records that detainees state do not reflect what occurred. The 15-minute interview limit and the practice of interrupting interviews persisted at İzmir Harmandalı and elsewhere. Healthcare remained gated by infirmaries that, according to consistent testimonies, respond to most complaints with painkillers and do not act on referral requests. Overcrowding, sleeping on the floor and recurrent water cuts, the latter documented by the administration's own notices at Harmandalı, continued to be reported. Responses that requested persons were "not present", issued in circumstances that other information contradicted, remained an obstacle to legal assistance. Access to legal aid remained uneven, and several detainees had spent months in detention without any lawyer contact.

⁶ See previous reports here; <https://multeci.org.tr/en/category/publications>

5.2. EMERGING AND ESCALATING ISSUES

Several developments during this period point to a worsening pattern rather than isolated incidents. First, the renovation of İzmir Harmandalı produced a structural change in lawyer-client contact; interview rooms divided by walls or panels, interpretation equipment on one side only, the loss of sight lines to outdoor areas and barred corridor windows. These are design choices and their combined effect is to reduce both the confidentiality of interviews and the observability of the centre. Second, in two cases at Aydın, removal reportedly followed within days of a lawyer interview and despite expressed protection claims. In one of these cases, an entire national group was reportedly removed on the same date, a transfer of Afghan detainees at Antalya also coincided with a planned visit. If confirmed, this timing raises serious concerns about non-refoulement and about whether legal interviews are being used as a trigger for accelerated removal.

Third, new administrative obstacles to petitions appeared; a stamp and fee requirement at Ankara Akyurt as a condition for accepting lawyers' petitions into the file, the non-issuance of registry numbers at Aydın and the photographing of interview forms by the staff with their personal telephones. Fourth, the reported confiscation of medication for chronic conditions, if confirmed, places life-sustaining treatment at risk. Finally, the physical deterioration of the container units at Çankırı, observed directly during the visit, indicates that conditions in some centres are declining below the level documented in earlier periods.

Finally, the visits at the end of the reporting period documented the detention of families with young children at İzmir Harmandalı, in a centre where no educational, play or developmental provision for children is reported to exist. This indicates that children continue to be held in conditions that are not adapted to them and that alternatives to detention are not applied to families.

ANNEX A. MONITORING VISITS

No	Date	Removal Centre
1	6 March 2026	İzmir Harmandalı
2	13 March 2026	İzmir Harmandalı
3	25 March 2026	Aydın
4	17 April 2026	Antalya Döşemealtı
5	7 May 2026	İzmir Harmandalı
6	21 May 2026	Aydın
7	21 May 2026	İzmir Harmandalı
8	4 June 2026	Ankara Akyurt
9	11 June 2026	İzmir Harmandalı
10	18 June 2026	İzmir Harmandalı
11	19 June 2026	Çankırı
12	25 June 2026	İzmir Harmandalı
13	30 June 2026	İzmir Harmandalı

ANNEX B. INTERVIEWED DETAINEES

Names and identifying details have been removed. Three detainees (D-011, D-021 / D-032 and D-037) were interviewed on two dates.

Code	Centre	Sex
D-001	İzmir Harmandalı	M
D-002	İzmir Harmandalı	F
D-003	İzmir Harmandalı	F
D-004	İzmir Harmandalı	M
D-005	İzmir Harmandalı	M
D-006	İzmir Harmandalı	M
D-007	İzmir Harmandalı	M
D-008	Aydın	F
D-009	Aydın	M
D-010	Aydın	M
D-011	Aydın	M
D-012	Aydın	M
D-013	Antalya Döşemealtı	M
D-014	Antalya Döşemealtı	M
D-015	Antalya Döşemealtı	M
D-016	Antalya Döşemealtı	M
D-017	Antalya Döşemealtı	M
D-018	Antalya Döşemealtı	M
D-019	İzmir Harmandalı	M
D-020	İzmir Harmandalı	F

Code	Centre	Sex
D-021	İzmir Harmandalı	F
D-022	Aydın	M
D-023	Aydın	M
D-024	Aydın	M
D-025	Aydın	M
D-026	Aydın	M
D-027	Aydın	M
D-028	Aydın	M
D-029	Aydın	F
D-030	İzmir Harmandalı	F
D-031	İzmir Harmandalı	F
D-032	İzmir Harmandalı	F
D-033	Ankara Akyurt	M
D-034	Ankara Akyurt	M
D-035	Ankara Akyurt	F
D-036	Ankara Akyurt	M
D-037	İzmir Harmandalı	F
D-038	İzmir Harmandalı	M
D-039	Çankırı	M
D-040	Çankırı	M
D-041	Çankırı	M
D-042	Çankırı	M
D-043	Çankırı	M
D-044	İzmir Harmandalı	F
D-045	İzmir Harmandalı	F

Mltecilerle Dayanıřma Derneęi / 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.



Mltecilerle Dayanıřma Derneęi
Association for Solidarity with Refugees

Address: Uęur Mahallesi 848 Sokak No:16

Konak / İzmir / Turkey

Tel : 0090 232 483 54 21

E-mail: bilgi@multeci.org.tr

Web: multeci.org.tr

