



Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment

Distr.: General
17 December 2024

Original: English

Committee against Torture

Decision adopted by the Committee under article 22 of the Convention, concerning communication No. 1099/2021**, ***

<i>Communication submitted by:</i>	X (not represented by counsel)
<i>Alleged victim:</i>	The complainant
<i>State party:</i>	Sweden
<i>Date of complaint:</i>	3 October 2021 (initial submission)
<i>Document references:</i>	Decision taken pursuant to rules 114 and 115 of the Committee's rules of procedure, transmitted to the State party on 27 October 2021 (not issued in document form)
<i>Date of adoption of decision:</i>	8 November 2024
<i>Subject matter:</i>	Deportation of the complainant to the Russian Federation
<i>Procedural issue:</i>	Level of substantiation of claims
<i>Substantive issue:</i>	Risk of torture upon return to country of origin (non-refoulement)
<i>Article of the Convention:</i>	3

1.1 The complainant is X, a national of the Russian Federation¹ born in 1966. At the time of the initial submission, her request for asylum in the State party had been rejected, and she was facing deportation to the Russian Federation. The complainant claims that, if the State party were to proceed with her deportation, it would be in violation of its obligations under article 3 of the Convention. The State party has made the declaration pursuant to article 22 (1) of the Convention, effective from 26 June 1987. The complainant is not represented by counsel.

1.2 On 27 October 2021, pursuant to rule 114 (1) of its rules of procedure, the Committee, acting through its Rapporteur on new complaints and interim measures, requested the State party not to deport the complainant to the Russian Federation while her complaint was being considered by the Committee.

* Reissued for technical reasons on 23 January 2025.

** Adopted by the Committee at its eighty-first session (28 October–22 November 2024).

*** The following members of the Committee participated in the examination of the communication: Todd Buchwald, Jorge Contesse, Claude Heller, Erdogan Iscan, Peter Vedel Kessing, Liu Huawen, Maeda Naoko, Ana Racu and Abderrazak Rouwane.

¹ While the Swedish authorities assessed that the complainant was a national of the Russian Federation, the complainant declares that it was not possible for her to obtain Russian citizenship after the dissolution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.



Factual background

2.1 The complainant was born in Grozny in Chechnya in the Russian Federation. In 1994, after her studies, she worked in the administration of the President of Chechnya, Dzhokhar Dudayev. Her duties involved planning meetings for people who wanted to see the President.² She had no political duties. She travelled to Ingushetia at the end of 1994, and then to Moscow in March 1995. The Russian authorities did not allow her to register in Moscow because she was Chechen.³ She was helped by a Syrian man to leave Moscow in July 1997 and travel to the Syrian Arab Republic via Ukraine. In 1998, the complainant left the Syrian Arab Republic and travelled to India. From India, she travelled to different places, including Cambodia, Malaysia, Thailand and the United Arab Emirates. When she needed a new passport, she contacted the Russian embassy in India, but was denied a passport because she was Chechen. She was nonetheless able to buy a fake passport that was not registered with the Russian authorities, which was valid from 1998 to 2003.

2.2 In 2001, the complainant moved to Thailand, where she remained until 2013, with the exception of one trip to Malaysia to obtain a Thai visa. In 2003, the complainant tried to obtain a new passport from the Russian embassy in Bangkok, but was once again refused on the grounds that she was from Chechnya.⁴ The Russian passport that she had obtained in India was later confiscated by staff at the Canadian embassy in Bangkok, when she applied for a visa.⁵ In Thailand, in late 2003 or early 2004, the complainant obtained a fake Spanish passport, with which she travelled to Sweden and which she allegedly destroyed upon arrival.

2.3 The complainant arrived in Sweden on 28 January 2013 and applied for asylum. She claimed a risk of being subjected to persecution by the Russian authorities on grounds of ascribed political views because she had worked in President Dudayev's administration. She declared that she also risked being subjected to honour-based violence from relatives upon return to Chechnya because, as an unmarried woman, she had had relationships with various men. According to her brother,⁶ who allegedly lived in France, all her relatives in Chechnya were against her and they would kill her if she returned. She submitted that people from Chechnya were treated badly and that she could not register as a resident in the Russian Federation because she had already been refused a passport by the Russian authorities.

2.4 On 16 July 2013, the Swedish Migration Agency rejected the complainant's application for a residence and work permit and decided to expel her to the Russian Federation. It first considered that she had not plausibly demonstrated her identity because she had given a name that could only be found on a birth certificate, a difficult-to-read copy of an expired national passport and a Thai visa. The Migration Agency also considered it unlikely that after living for 12 years in Thailand, the complainant would have no documentation of her life there. Therefore, since the documents produced could not be linked to her, they were not used as a basis for her grounds for asylum. The Migration Agency noted in the country profile that people who were legally resident in the Russian Federation on 6 February 1992 had automatically received Russian citizenship under article 13 of the Russian citizenship law that entered into force on that date.

2.5 The Migration Agency then noted that the complainant had not submitted any evidence to corroborate her allegations. The Migration Agency observed that, although she had declared that she was wanted by the Russian authorities, she had lived in Moscow from 1995 until she left the Russian Federation legally in 1997 and had visited Russian diplomatic missions in India and Thailand thereafter on a number of occasions. The Migration Agency therefore questioned her claim for protection linked to her collaboration with the Dudayev administration. Even if she indeed had worked for the Dudayev administration, she had not had a prominent political role, but an administrative position. In the assessment of the Migration Agency, there were no grounds to believe that the complainant would be of any

² No evidence was provided.

³ No evidence was provided.

⁴ No evidence was provided.

⁵ As mentioned in paragraph 2.1, that passport was fake.

⁶ No evidence of the alleged statement was provided.

interest to the Russian authorities, particularly since almost 20 years had passed since she was in Chechnya.

2.6 The Migration Agency also noted that during the hearing of 25 March 2013, the complainant had been asked several times who would kill her owing to her lifestyle, but she had not able to give any details. She had declared that her parents were dead and that her brother was residing in France. Given that she had not plausibly demonstrated her identity, the Migration Agency expressed doubt about both her family in Chechnya and her civil status. It further noted that the complainant's account of how her relatives supposedly had found out about her lifestyle – her uncle's wife's sister had allegedly spread the information after she saw the complainant in Dubai – was both second-hand information and the complainant's own speculation. Her relatives' reaction was also primarily second-hand information. The Migration Agency concluded that the complainant had not plausibly demonstrated that she risked persecution upon return to Chechnya.

2.7 On 12 December 2013, the Stockholm Administrative Court rejected the complainant's appeal and her request for an oral hearing. It noted that the complainant had not submitted any written evidence concerning her individual need for protection. As to the lack of identity documents, the Court found that there was nothing to indicate that the complainant had been stripped of her Russian citizenship. Her claim that two Russian diplomatic missions had denied her a new international passport was not deemed to be a circumstance that would amount to persecution on ethnic grounds. As to threats from relatives, the Court found plausible the complainant's allegation that she could not receive protection from the Chechen authorities against threats from her relatives, which meant that she might risk being subjected to honour-based violence by her relatives in Chechnya. The Court therefore considered that she could not return there, so it examined whether she had any possibility to seek protection in another part of her country of origin, known as internal flight. Based on country information, the Court concluded that a large city in a republic outside the Caucasus, such as Moscow or Saint Petersburg, were relevant and reasonable internal flight alternatives for her.

2.8 On 28 March 2014, the Migration Court of Appeal refused leave to appeal. The case was referred to the Swedish Police Authority on 18 July 2014. On 3 February 2015, the decision was made to detain the complainant between 4 February and 28 April 2014. She then submitted two applications for a residence permit or a new examination of the issue, citing impediments to the enforcement of the expulsion order, which were rejected.⁷ On 28 March 2018, the decision to expel her became statute-barred. She reapplied for asylum on 16 April 2018 and produced a medical certificate dated 26 May 2016 attesting to mental health problems, including post-traumatic stress disorder. On 7 May 2018, she submitted a new psychiatric certificate confirming symptoms of anxiety, headaches and heart palpitations. At an asylum hearing on 21 May 2019, the complainant stated that she was not very well and that she would submit a medical certificate. However, she did not produce any new medical certificates.

2.9 On 18 March 2020, the Swedish Migration Agency rejected the complainant's application for a residence and work permit. It maintained that the complainant still had not plausibly demonstrated her identity. While it did not question that the complainant suffered from mental health problems, it noted that nothing had emerged to suggest that her state of health was life-threatening or that she would lack possibilities to receive care in the Russian Federation.

2.10 On 24 November 2020, the Luleå Administrative Court rejected the complainant's appeal. It noted that she had not plausibly established her identity or demonstrated that she was stateless. She also had not shown that she had taken the necessary measures to obtain travel documents from the Russian Federation or that she would not be able to obtain necessary documents in the Russian Federation. It therefore considered both reasonable and relevant the internal flight alternative. On 22 January 2021, the Migration Court of Appeal refused leave to appeal.

⁷ No further details or copies of decisions were provided.

2.11 On an unknown date, the complainant requested a new examination of the question of a residence permit, invoking impediments to enforcement. She claimed that she had become involved in events linked to the opposition leader Alexei Navalny.⁸ She submitted that she had visited the Russian embassy in Stockholm to apply for Russian citizenship, but the embassy had rejected her application because she did not have access to the necessary documents. She also had a meeting to apply for a temporary travel document to allow her to return to the Russian Federation, but the embassy informed her that it was not possible for her to apply for such a document because she did not have the necessary documents. The complainant had also been in contact with the Chechen authorities to get them to verify that she was registered as a resident in Grozny in February 1992, but they informed her that the infrastructure had been destroyed in the war and that it was impossible to verify that. She therefore claimed that she had no legal possibility to return to the Russian Federation. She did not submit any documents in support of her application.

2.12 On 24 September 2021, the Swedish Migration Agency decided not to grant the complainant a residence permit and not to undertake a new examination of the question of a residence permit. It noted that the circumstances invoked in respect of her citizenship and her possibilities to return to the Russian Federation had already been examined as part of the final and non-appealable expulsion order. It recalled that within the framework of impediments to enforcement, it was not possible to reassess circumstances that had already been examined. While it admitted that her claim of being involved in events linked to the opposition leader Alexei Navalny was a new circumstance, the Migration Agency noted that that circumstance was entirely based on the complainant's own account, and that no supporting evidence had been submitted or cited.

2.13 On 7 October 2021, the Luleå Administrative Court rejected the complainant's appeal. As to the question of the internal flight alternative, the Court noted that it had previously been examined, most recently within the framework of the latest asylum process, and that it was therefore not a new circumstance. It further noted that the complainant had not submitted any supporting evidence for her claims in that regard.

Complaint

3.1 The complainant submits that, if returned to the Russian Federation, she faces a real risk of being tortured and suffering cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, in violation of article 3 of the Convention. She notes that the State party's authorities have admitted that she cannot get protection from the Chechen authorities against potential honour-related violence from her relatives.

3.2 The complainant contests the findings of the Swedish migration authorities, in particular regarding the internal flight alternative. She submits that the Chechen law enforcement officials have easy access to any part of the Russian Federation, and she therefore risks being detected, abducted and forcibly returned to Chechnya, where she may become a victim of enforced disappearance or be killed. The complainant gives the example of two brothers being abducted by the local police in February 2021 in the centre of Novgorod and then handed over to Chechen security forces, who put them in jail in Chechnya and tortured them on fabricated charges.⁹ Also in June 2021, a Chechen woman was abducted by the Chechen police from a women's shelter where she was hiding, brought back to Chechnya and disappeared, being a possible victim of gender-based persecution.¹⁰ The complainant therefore considers that, as the Russian Federation does not have secure control over its territory, the internal flight alternative is not a reasonable option to apply in her case.

3.3 The complainant also invokes obstacles to enforcement, claiming that on at least two occasions, the Russian authorities had refused to readmit her to the Russian Federation, confirming that she does not have Russian citizenship.¹¹ The refusals to admit her were

⁸ No evidence was provided.

⁹ No further details or reference were provided.

¹⁰ No further details or reference were provided.

¹¹ No evidence was provided.

official replies from the Russian authorities issued in response to requests from the Swedish authorities.¹²

State party's observations on admissibility and the merits

4.1 In its observations of 27 April 2022, the State party challenges the admissibility of the complaint, arguing that it is manifestly unfounded because it fails to rise to the minimum level of substantiation.

4.2 On the merits, the State party recalls that the Russian Federation is a party to the Convention and to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. While not wishing to underestimate the concerns that may legitimately be expressed regarding the human rights situation in Chechnya, the State party recalls that the situation in the country does not in itself suffice to establish that the complainant's expulsion would be contrary to article 3 of the Convention.

4.3 The State party notes that the complainant never claimed in the domestic asylum proceedings that the Chechen authorities were complicit in the threat emanating from her relatives. However, in her complaint to the Committee, she claimed that an internal flight alternative was not an option since honour killings were approved by the Chechen leader, and that security agents in Chechnya had full access to the territory of the Russian Federation. She claimed that she was at risk of being detected, abducted and forcibly returned to Chechnya. The State party notes that the complainant has in no way substantiated her claim that she risks being abducted and forcibly returned to Chechnya by State agents, nor has she explained why she would have withheld this fundamental aspect of her claim during her domestic asylum proceedings. Against this background, this claim appears to be an escalation of her asylum account before the Committee. The State party therefore holds that the complainant has not plausibly demonstrated that there is a real and personal threat against her emanating from the Chechen authorities.

4.4 As regards the invoked threat from the complainant's relatives in Chechnya, the State party notes that she left her home village in 1994. She has never been contacted or wanted by her relatives during this time, and they have never shown any interest in her whereabouts. The threat allegedly comes from the complainant's brother, who has stated that she will be punished by her relatives upon return to Chechnya. She has claimed that her brother lives in France, but he has not been heard from since 2010 and he has not sought her in Sweden in order to carry out the threat. Therefore, for the State party, the complainant has failed to present an arguable claim establishing that the alleged threat is foreseeable, real and present outside Chechnya.

4.5 As to the internal flight alternatives in a large city in the country outside the Caucasus, such as Moscow or Saint Petersburg, the State party considers them to be reasonable and relevant for the complainant. It notes that according to relevant country of origin information, the Russian authorities have control over those regions, including Moscow and Saint Petersburg, and hence are not unable or unwilling to protect the complainant against potential threats emanating from her relatives. The complainant is not at risk of being persecuted by non-State entities over which the State has no de facto control.

4.6 The State party submits that the lack of protection for the complainant is not generalized, and she will not be exposed to a further risk of serious harm if relocated to the aforementioned cities.¹³ Although resettlement outside Chechnya would constitute a considerable hardship for the complainant, the mere fact that she may not be able to return to her home village does not as such amount to torture or other ill-treatment. In this regard, the State party notes that the complainant lived in Moscow for two years between 1995 and 1997, and that she has not had any contact with her home village in Chechnya since 1994 or 1995.

4.7 The State party further notes that the complainant has neither been under the threat of arrest or torture, nor arrested or ill-treated by the Russian or Chechen authorities. She

¹² No further details or copies were provided.

¹³ *M.K.M. v. Australia* (CAT/C/60/D/681/2015), para. 8.9; and *I.A. et al v. Sweden* (CAT/C/66/D/729/2016), para. 9.6.

remained in the Russian Federation several years after her employment in the Dudayev administration ended without being approached by the authorities, and she was later able to leave the country freely with her own passport without any incident. Furthermore, it has been 26 years since her employment in the Dudayev administration ended and she has not been wanted or sought during this time.

4.8 Finally, the State party notes that the complainant's claim regarding her identity and citizenship was thoroughly examined by the domestic migration authorities and that she had ample opportunities to argue her case. The authorities considered that her account concerning her identity documents lacked reliability and held that she had not made sufficient efforts to clarify her identity or to submit valid identity documents, which had a negative impact on her general credibility. Furthermore, the Swedish authorities found that it was clear from the Russian citizenship law that persons residing in Russian territory on 6 February 1992 automatically obtained Russian citizenship. Thus, the migration authorities concluded in two separate asylum proceedings that the complainant had failed to plausibly demonstrate her identity and her lack of Russian citizenship. Her alleged lack of citizenship has also been the subject of a number of proceedings concerning impediments to enforcement, in which she was unable to present any valid identity documents in support of her claim. The complaint to the Committee does not contain any further information that provides a reason to make an assessment other than those made by the Swedish Migration Agency and the Migration Court of Appeal. The State party notes that those authorities had the benefit of evaluating the statements made by the complainant during oral hearings and directly assessing all documents submitted by her in the domestic proceedings.

4.9 The State party concludes that the complainant has failed to demonstrate that the domestic migration authorities failed to take into account relevant facts, written evidence or risk factors in their assessments and has not shown that the authorities' assessments were arbitrary or amounted to a manifest error or a denial of justice.

Complainant's comments on the State party's observations on admissibility and the merits

5.1 On 21 June 2022, the complainant submitted comments on the State party's observations, arguing that the internal flight alternative is not reasonable in her case. The Chechen leader Ramzan Kadyrov openly approved honour killings as being a part of necessary measures directed to Chechen women who step out from their traditional behaviour. Chechen authorities and law enforcement agents can act throughout the territory of the Russian Federation, get access to all the necessary information and bring by force anybody back to Chechnya from other parts of the Russian Federation. Moreover, Chechen society is built on clans with strong networks of contacts with Chechen people in other parts of the Russian Federation, so any information about the complainant can easily be transmitted to her relatives who live in Chechnya.

5.2 The complainant further mentions that she does not have a Russian passport, so it would not be possible for her to register in any place or at any address in the Russian Federation. She will not be able to obtain an internal passport of the Russian Federation because she does not have Russian citizenship. Renting a house or accommodation in the Russian Federation will not be possible for her because she does not have an internal passport. She will also not have access to the labour market and to the healthcare system. The complainant considers that since she has not received Russian or any other citizenship since the dissolution of the Soviet Union, she is stateless. The complainant therefore submits that the Swedish authorities failed to make a proper assessment regarding her documents and citizenship.

Issues and proceedings before the Committee

Consideration of admissibility

6.1 Before considering any complaint submitted in a communication, the Committee must decide whether it is admissible under article 22 of the Convention. The Committee has ascertained, as it is required to do under article 22 (5) (a) of the Convention, that the same

matter has not been and is not being examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

6.2 In accordance with article 22 (5) (b) of the Convention, the Committee shall not consider any communication from an individual unless it has ascertained that the individual has exhausted all available domestic remedies. The Committee notes that, in the present case, the State party has not challenged the admissibility of the complaint on these grounds. Accordingly, the Committee considers that it is not precluded by article 22 (5) (b) from examining the communication.

6.3 The Committee notes that the State party challenges the admissibility of the complainant's claims under article 3 on the basis that they are manifestly unfounded, given that the complainant has not substantiated the existence of substantial grounds for believing that she would face a foreseeable, present, personal and real risk of torture if returned to the Russian Federation. The Committee considers, however, that the complainant has sufficiently substantiated her claims for the purposes of admissibility, on the basis of article 3 of the Convention, regarding her risk of being subjected to torture and ill-treatment if returned to the Russian Federation. Accordingly, it declares the communication admissible and proceeds with its consideration of the merits.

Consideration of the merits

7.1 The Committee has considered the communication in the light of all the information made available to it by the parties, in accordance with article 22 (4) of the Convention.

7.2 In the present case, the issue before the Committee is whether the return of the complainant to the Russian Federation would constitute a violation of the State party's obligation under article 3 of the Convention not to expel or to return (*refouler*) a person to another State where there are substantial grounds for believing that he or she would be in danger of being subjected to torture.

7.3 The Committee must evaluate whether there are substantial grounds for believing that the complainant would be personally in danger of being subjected to torture upon return to the Russian Federation. In assessing that risk, the Committee must take into account all relevant considerations, pursuant to article 3 (2) of the Convention, including the existence of a consistent pattern of gross, flagrant or mass violations of human rights. However, the Committee recalls that the aim of such determination is to establish whether the complainant would be personally at a foreseeable and real risk of being subjected to torture in the country to which he or she would be returned. It follows that the existence of a pattern of gross, flagrant or mass violations of human rights in a country does not as such constitute sufficient reason for determining that a particular person would be in danger of being subjected to torture on return to that country; additional grounds must be adduced to show that the individual concerned would be personally at risk. Conversely, the absence of a consistent pattern of flagrant violations of human rights does not mean that a person might not be subjected to torture in his or her specific circumstances. Moreover, the Committee notes that, since the Russian Federation has made the declaration provided for in article 22 (1) of the Convention, in the event of a violation of the complainant's rights under the Convention in that country, she would have the legal option of recourse to the Committee for protection of any kind.

7.4 The Committee recalls its general comment No. 4 (2017) on the implementation of article 3 of the Convention in the context of article 22, according to which the risk of torture must be assessed on grounds that go beyond mere theory or suspicion. Although the risk does not have to be shown to be highly probable, the burden of proof is upon the author of the communication, who must present an arguable case, that is, submit substantiated arguments showing that the danger of being subjected to torture is foreseeable, present, personal and real (para. 38).¹⁴ The Committee also recalls that, in accordance with the same general comment, it gives considerable weight to findings of fact made by organs of the State party concerned, but it is not bound by such findings and instead has the power, under article 22

¹⁴ See, for example, *A.R. v. Netherlands* (CAT/C/31/D/203/2002), para. 7.3; and *Dadar v. Canada* (CAT/C/35/D/258/2004), para. 8.4.

(4) of the Convention, to make a free assessment of the information available to it, taking into account all the circumstances relevant to each case (paras. 11, 39 and 50).

7.5 In the present case, the Committee notes that the complainant maintains that she fears for her life, should she be returned to the Russian Federation, because she considers that she will be targeted by her family for having had extramarital relationships. In particular, she claims that the internal flight alternative is not reasonable in her case, in spite of the findings of the Swedish migration authorities, because, on the one hand, she risks being found by the Chechen authorities and brought back to Chechnya, where she may risk being subjected to honour-based violence by her relatives or be killed, and on the other, she does not have and cannot obtain Russian citizenship.

7.6 The Committee notes that the State party's authorities have not called into question that the complainant cannot receive protection from the Chechen authorities against threats from her relatives, and thus she may risk being subjected to honour-based violence by her relatives in Chechnya. The Swedish authorities considered that an internal flight alternative with a relocation in Moscow or Saint Petersburg would be reasonable for the complainant. With respect to the internal flight alternative, while in its general comment No. 4 (2017), it made a general assumption that the internal flight alternative is not reliable or effective (para. 47), the Committee notes that the jurisprudence referred to in support of that assumption mentions that the internal flight or relocation alternative does not represent a reliable and durable alternative, where the lack of protection is generalized and the individual concerned would be exposed to a further risk of persecution or serious harm.¹⁵ The Committee also notes that in her asylum proceedings, the complainant mentioned that the risk was posed by her Chechen relatives, not by the Chechen authorities.

7.7 In the present case, the Committee notes that the complainant refers to two abductions in 2021 – without providing any reference to the actual facts of the alleged incidents – to claim that the Russian Federation does not have secure control over its territory. However, the Committee cannot accept such an allegation as a demonstration that the lack of protection is generalized in the Russian Federation. It notes that the alleged facts did not occur either in Moscow or in Saint Petersburg. It also notes the State party's arguments that the complainant left Chechnya in 1994 and has never been contacted by her relatives, nor is there evidence that they tried to find her or showed interest in her whereabouts; that since 2010, she has not had any news from her brother who allegedly threatened her with punishment and who seems to live in France; and that she already lived in Moscow for two years between 1995 and 1997. The Committee notes that the complainant has not provided arguments to refute the argument that she can safely relocate in other parts of the Russian Federation, such as Moscow or Saint Petersburg or any other large city. In this sense, the Committee reiterates that the occurrence of human rights violations in a complainant's country of origin is not, of itself, sufficient for it to conclude that a complainant would face a personal risk of being tortured there.

7.8 The Committee further notes the argument of the State party that the complainant had not made sufficient efforts to clarify her identity or to submit valid identity documents. The Swedish authorities also assessed that the complainant had not demonstrated that she was stateless or that she had taken the necessary measures to obtain travel documents from the Russian Federation or that she would not be able to obtain necessary documents in the Russian Federation.¹⁶ The Committee observes that the complainant has provided no evidence to challenge these specific arguments put forward by the Swedish authorities.

7.9 The Committee notes that the complainant was given the opportunity to substantiate and clarify her claims before the domestic authorities in several sets of proceedings. However, on the basis of the evidence provided, it has not been possible to confirm the complainant's allegations or to determine the existence of a personal, foreseeable, real and present risk of her being subjected to torture in the event of her return to her country of

¹⁵ *M.K.M. v. Australia* (CAT/C/60/D/681/2015), para. 8.9.

¹⁶ The Committee notes, for example, that the complainant did not provide any documents from the embassies or consulates of the Russian Federation confirming that the complainant does not have Russian citizenship.

origin¹⁷ if she relocates in other parts of the Russian Federation or that the Russian authorities would not be able to offer her protection against an alleged risk of violence coming from members of her family. The complainant also does not specify which family member is threatening her.

7.10 In the light of the above considerations, and on the basis of all the information submitted to it by the complainant and the State party, including on the general situation of human rights in the Russian Federation, the Committee considers that, in the present case, the information on file does not allow it to conclude that the complainant's return to the Russian Federation – as suggested by the Swedish asylum authorities – would expose her to a real, foreseeable, personal and present risk of being subjected to torture or that the authorities of the State party failed to conduct a proper investigation into her allegations.

8. The Committee, acting under article 22 (7) of the Convention, concludes that the deportation of the complainant to the Russian Federation would not constitute a violation by the State party of article 3 of the Convention.

¹⁷ See, for example, *M.K. v. Switzerland* (CAT/C/60/D/662/2015), paras. 7.8 and 7.9; and *D.R. v. Switzerland* (CAT/C/63/D/673/2015), paras. 7.8 and 7.9.