

Institute for the Advancement of Justice & Human Rights

1968 S. Coast Hwy #3919, Laguna Beach, California 92651, United States of America

Date: 24 August 2026

To: UPR Branch, Human Rights Council and Treaty Mechanisms Division, Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Palais des Nations, CH-1211 Geneva 10

Via: ohchr-uprsubmissions@un.org; uprsubmissions@ohchr.org

Cc: Office of the President of the Human Rights Council (geneva@mission-indonesia.org and ohchr-hrcouncil@un.org); ohchr-InfoDesk@un.org; ohchr-hrcngo@un.org

Subject: Universal Periodic Review – United States of America, 53rd session: stakeholder information window

Dear Sir or Madam,

I write on behalf of the Institute for the Advancement of Justice & Human Rights, an independent non-governmental organization registered in the United States, concerning the arrangements for stakeholder information in the fourth-cycle review of the United States of America, scheduled for consideration on 10 November 2026.

This letter is copied to the Office of the President of the Human Rights Council because the arrangement in question appears to arise from the Council's decision A/HRC/DEC/OM/19/101, "Non-cooperation of a State under review with the universal periodic review mechanism," adopted 7 November 2025, by which the review was rescheduled to the fifty-third session and the President was requested to urge the United States to resume cooperation. I also note the earlier decision bearing the same title, A/HRC/DEC/60/115, adopted on 6 October 2025 in relation to Nicaragua's non-cooperation with the completion of its UPR process. I cite it as a procedural precedent concerning non-cooperation, not as a decision concerning the United States. If the authority to vary the arrangement rests with the Council or its President rather than with the Office, we would be grateful to be told so.

We note the arrangement recorded on the OHCHR stakeholder page: that only organizations which contributed in 2025 will be invited to submit updates, that no new call for contributions will be opened, and that additional organizations will not be admitted. The Institute did not contribute in 2025 and therefore has an interest in this question, which we disclose at the outset. We raise it, however, on grounds that are not particular to us.

The review was scheduled for 7 November 2025 and did not proceed. It now stands scheduled for 10 November 2026. The summary of stakeholders' information before the Working Group will therefore reflect a civil-society record closed in early 2025 — approximately eighteen months before consideration. Every other State to be reviewed at the fifty-third session had a stakeholder window open in 2026, closing on 10 April 2026. The United States appears to be the only State at that session whose civil society is confined to a record assembled for a different session in a different year.

Human Rights Council resolution 5/1 requires that the review be based on objective and reliable information and be conducted with universality and equal treatment of all States. We respectfully suggest that a record closed eighteen months before consideration serves that requirement less well than one closed seven months before it, as for every other State at the session. We note further that the deferral arose from circumstances relating to the State under review rather than from any act of civil society, with the result that a State's non-participation operates to narrow the information available to the body reviewing it.

We respectfully request consideration of the following, in order of preference:

1. Reopening the stakeholder information window for the review of the United States for a defined period, on the same basis applied to other States reviewed at the fifty-third session;
2. In the alternative, accepting supplementary stakeholder information from organizations that did not contribute in 2025, to be reflected in an addendum to the summary; or
3. In the further alternative, confirming in writing the basis on which the present restriction operates, and whether authority to vary it rests with the Office, with the President, or with the Council.

We would be grateful for a response to the third request in any event, so that any further representations may be directed to the correct body.

We make no criticism of the Office or of the Council, and are grateful for consideration of this request.

Yours faithfully,

Cyrus Hazari

Director

Institute for the Advancement of Justice & Human Rights

info@iaj.institute · <https://www.iaj.institute>

August 25, 2026

IAJ Document Version Control Log

Document ID: IAJ-COM-20260825-002-PUB
Release Date: 2026-08-25

Version History

Version	Date	Author(s)	Summary of Changes
V1.1	2026-08-25	IAJ	Email and date change, decisions symbols post review by IAJ advisor Professor François Crépeau
V1.0	2026-08-11	IAJ	Draft

Classification: IAJ Communication
Access Level: Public
