ECOM

BETWEEN LAW AND REALITY

REPORT ON HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS AGAINST LGBT PEOPLE IN EASTERN EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA IN 2025

Tallinn
2026

Between Law and Reality: Report on Human Rights Violations against LGBT People in Eastern Europe and Central Asia in 2025 / Kovtun O. — Tallinn: Eurasian Coalition on Health, Rights, Gender and Sexual Diversity (ECOM), 2026. — 42 p.

Author: Oksana Kovtun

Design and layout: Anastasiia Danylevska

Translator: Oksana Serha

This publication was developed and published as part of the regional project “Sustainability of Services for Key Populations in Eastern Europe and Central Asia (EECA) — #iSoS: Empowerment and Innovation,” implemented by a consortium of organizations led by the ICF “Alliance for Public Health” with financial support from the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. The views expressed in this document are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of the ICF “Alliance for Public Health” or the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.

DISTRIBUTED FREE OF CHARGE

CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

REAct	System for monitoring and responding to human rights violations at the community level
ART	Antiretroviral therapy
EECA	Eastern Europe and Central Asia
HIV	Human immunodeficiency virus
GBMSM	Gay, bisexual and other men who have sex with men
PrEP	Pre-exposure prophylaxis
ECOM	Eurasian Coalition on Health, Rights, Gender and Sexual Diversity
STIs	Sexually transmitted infections
LGBT	Lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans people
MSM	Men who have sex with men
NGO	Non-governmental organization
PEP	Post-exposure prophylaxis
SOGI	Sexual orientation and gender identity
AIDS	Acquired immunodeficiency syndrome
CC	Criminal Code

1

INTRODUCTION

The regional report on human rights violations against lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans people (LGBT people) in Eastern Europe and Central Asia (EECA) in 2025 is based on an analysis of documented cases of human rights violations in seven countries of the region: Armenia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and Ukraine.

ECOM — Eurasian Coalition on Health, Rights, Gender and Sexual Diversity — has been systematically monitoring human rights violations against LGBT people since 2017. The consolidated analysis of cases makes it possible to identify not only individual incidents of violations, but also persistent patterns of pressure, forms of institutional and private discrimination, as well as law enforcement practices that fall outside official statistics and government reports.

In 2025, human rights violations against LGBT people in the EECA region remained systemic and interconnected. Documented cases show that violence, interference in private life, extortion, discrimination in employment, education, healthcare, and access to services, as well as arbitrary detention, rarely occur in isolation and often form chains of violations that increase the vulnerability of those affected.

Sources of threats are distributed between both state institutions and private individuals and organizations with whom LGBT people interact in their daily lives. Violations are recorded on the part of law enforcement authorities, migration services, and medical institutions, as well as on the part of sexual partners, family members, employers, colleagues, neighbors, and service industry workers. This range of violators indicates the persistent vulnerability of LGBT people and the limitations of protection mechanisms at both the governmental and societal levels.

The purpose of this report is to present a systemic analysis of documented human rights violations against LGBT people in the EECA region and to identify key mechanisms contributing to their perpetuation. ***The analysis aims to:***

- identify the nature and main forms of human rights violations against LGBT people;
- analyze the impact of legislation, law enforcement practices, and social factors on the vulnerability of LGBT people;
- determine the groups most exposed to various types of violations, taking into account sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI), HIV status, and other factors;
- provide recommendations aimed at eliminating the identified barriers and using the results of the analysis in advocacy and human rights activities.

The report is based on data from the REAct system and includes both quantitative and qualitative analysis of cases used to identify typical violation scenarios and to develop recommendations for emergency response, strategic advocacy, and human rights action at national and regional levels.

The authors of the report express their gratitude to:

- ECOM consultants monitoring human rights violations against LGBT people for their work in identifying and documenting cases,
- the International Charitable Foundation “Alliance for Public Health” and partner organizations within the REAct system for monitoring, responding, and providing data for analysis,
- representatives of the LGBT community for their trust and willingness to seek assistance and document violations of their rights.

2

METHODOLOGY

DATA SOURCES AND PERIOD OF ANALYSIS. This report is based on a secondary analysis of data on human rights violations against LGBT people documented in the REAct system between January 1 and December 31, 2025. The analysis was conducted in January 2026 and covers seven countries of the EECA region: Armenia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and Ukraine.

The analysis relied on case descriptions provided by national REAct coordinators and partner organizations: Armenia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan (ECOM), Ukraine (International Charitable Foundation "Alliance for Public Health"), as well as partner organizations in Moldova. All cases underwent preliminary review by coordinators to ensure compliance with ethical standards, protection of confidentiality, and accuracy of information.

CASE INCLUSION CRITERIA. Only cases in which SOGI and/or HIV status constituted grounds for a human rights violation and where a specific affected individual was identified were included in the analysis. Cases not meeting these criteria were not included.

DATA ANALYSIS. To convert qualitative data (textual case descriptions) into quantitative data, the method of directed content analysis [1] was applied. The classification of human rights violations related to SOGI was based on the Yogyakarta Principles [2], which guide the application of international human rights standards in the context of SOGI and have previously been used to analyze violations of the rights of LGBT people in the EECA region [3, 4].

Based on a preliminary review of the texts, a coding framework was developed that included key categories and indicators of violations. Each case description was analyzed to identify the type of violation, type of violator, grounds for the violation, and characteristics of the affected individuals, including SOGI.

Contextual coding [5] was used to account for the social, cultural, and legal context of each case [6], along with a combination of manifest and latent coding, allowing for the identification of both explicitly described and implicit indicators of violations [7, 8].

Identified themes and categories were transformed into quantitative variables for subsequent statistical analysis. For example, if indicators of torture were present, the corresponding variable was assigned the value "1"; if absent, "0." A single case could include multiple interrelated rights violations, types of violations, and/or multiple violators, which made it possible to reflect the complex nature of violations. During coding, such cases were assigned to all relevant rights/violations/violators categories, which made it possible to reflect the complex nature of violations and analyze the same episode from different legal perspectives (e.g., in cases where individuals were evicted due to SOGI without reimbursement of rent payments, this was recorded both as a violation of the right to housing and as material harm).). In the report, such cases may be mentioned in different sections with distinct analytical emphases, allowing each violated right to be presented fully and in relation to accompanying violations. Insults and verbal aggression related to SOGI or HIV were not identified as a separate category, as such forms of abuse are widespread; they were recorded under the category of "hate speech" in cases where the violation was limited to verbal conduct.

The report sections are structured according to the frequency of documented violations in 2025. Rights are presented not in the order enshrined in international instruments, but according to the number of recorded cases, in order to reflect current priorities and the scale of problems identified during the reporting period.

Data processing was conducted using Microsoft Excel and IBM SPSS Statistics 28.0.

LIMITATIONS OF THE ANALYSIS. Several limitations must be considered when interpreting the results:

1. Data come from different countries and different monitoring teams, which results in variations in the quality, completeness, and level of detail of case descriptions. The number of documented violations does not reflect their actual prevalence and largely depends on the resources, experience, and institutional capacity of monitoring teams in each country.
2. The presented data are not representative of the scale of LGBT rights violations in the EECA region. Affected individuals may not have been aware of the possibility to report violations, may have feared consequences, or may have deliberately chosen not to seek assistance [9, 10]. The volume of documented cases is also influenced by differences in financial and organizational capacities of monitoring projects, uneven territorial coverage, the identity of documenters and their access to different LGBT community groups, as well as the lack of targeted data collection on violations against lesbian and bisexual women, despite the inclusion of available cases in the analysis.
3. In some countries of the region, data collection is conducted in contexts where same-sex relations are criminalized (Uzbekistan), where there are no registered LGBT organizations, and where systemic pressure is exerted by state and law enforcement authorities (in particular Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan), significantly limiting opportunities for safe documentation and access to assistance. As a result, a lower number of documented cases in such countries does not indicate a lower prevalence of violations, but reflects structural barriers to documentation.
4. Differences in the infrastructure of human rights support also affect the statistics — for example, in countries with a more developed network of organizations and resources (including Ukraine), the number of documented cases is higher, reflecting greater accessibility of assistance mechanisms and trust in them, and not necessarily a higher frequency of violations.

The combination of these factors makes it impossible to accurately analyze the year-to-year dynamics of rights violations, and therefore such an analysis is not presented in the report.

Given these limitations, the number of documented cases cannot be used to accurately measure the prevalence of LGBT rights violations in the EECA region or in individual countries. Nevertheless, the data make it possible to identify the nature of violations, types of violators, and key patterns shaping the LGBT human rights situation in the region.

3

RESULTS

In 2025, a total of 647 cases of human rights violations against LGBT people were documented in seven countries of the EECA region (Table 1). The highest number of cases was recorded in Ukraine — 383 (59.2% of the total), significantly exceeding the figures for other countries in the region. This was followed by Uzbekistan (78 cases), Moldova (58), Tajikistan (47), Kazakhstan (33), Kyrgyzstan (30), and Armenia (18). This distribution reflects not only differences in risk levels, but also differences in documentation contexts — the scale and sustainability of monitoring, the availability of support for affected individuals, and, in the case of Ukraine, the additional impact of the full-scale war, which increases vulnerability in everyday life, employment, and access to services.

SOGI OF AFFECTED INDIVIDUALS AND GROUNDS FOR VIOLATIONS. The majority of documented cases in 2025 involved violations of the rights of gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men (GBMSM) — 520 cases (80.4%). Trans women were affected in 77 cases (11.9%), with their proportion varying significantly between countries and being highest in Kyrgyzstan (43.3% of all cases in the country), Armenia (22.2%), Tajikistan (19.1%), and Kazakhstan (18.2%). Lesbian and bisexual women accounted for 19 cases (2.9%), and transgender men for 16 cases (2.5%). In 15 cases (2.3%), violations were documented against LGBT people as a group, primarily in situations of public pressure or discrimination not tied to the specific identity of an affected person.

In the overwhelming majority of incidents, SOGI constituted the grounds for the violation — 574 cases (88.7%). At the same time, situations in which HIV status plays a significant role are consistently documented: 35 cases (5.4%) were categorized as “SOGI and HIV” and another 23 cases (3.6%) as “HIV only.” This pattern is most pronounced in Uzbekistan, where every fifth case is linked exclusively to HIV status (21.1%), and a further 16.7% involve a combination of SOGI and HIV. In these contexts, medical information and HIV status are used as additional tools of pressure — through threats of disclosure, restrictions on access to assistance, and extortion.

CHARACTERISTICS OF VIOLATIONS. A significant proportion of documented cases are complex in nature and affect multiple rights or spheres of life. In 221 cases (34.2%), multiple rights violations were recorded; in 229 cases (46.2%), several types of violations occurred within a single incident; and in 81 cases (12.5%), multiple violators were involved. This structure reflects typical scenarios in which interference with privacy (e.g., outing or threats of outing) is accompanied by extortion, physical violence, police misconduct, or additional pressure from the immediate social circle.

The highest proportion of complex cases was observed in Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan, where multiple types of violations were documented in 76–90% of cases, indicating limited opportunities to promptly stop abuse and obtain effective protection. By contrast, in Moldova, most situations were isolated in nature, reflected in a low proportion of cases involving multiple violated rights (5.2%) and multiple types of violations (12.1%).

A separate category includes so-called “fake dates” — 20 cases (3.1% across the region). Despite a decrease in their share compared to 2024 (11.5%), such practices continue to be most frequently documented in Kyrgyzstan (16.7% of cases in the country) and Tajikistan (12.8%). As a rule, these cases involve contact through online platforms followed by blackmail, extortion, and violence, highlighting the significance of digital risks for LGBT people.

TYPE OF VIOLATORS. In 2025, violations of LGBT people's rights were documented both on the part of state structures and private individuals and organizations. The most frequent violators were unknown persons — 116 cases (17.9%), law enforcement officers — 93 cases (14.4%), and medical professionals not directly associated with HIV services — 88 cases (13.6%). Other violators accounting for a significant share were colleagues and fellow students (9.7%), service industry workers (9.4%), employers (9.3%), sexual partners (8.8%), relatives (6.3%), and neighbors (6.2%).

Unlike in earlier monitoring periods, in 2025 the role of law enforcement as the main violator decreased at the regional level. This does not indicate that the repressive environment is weakening; rather, it reflects a redistribution of risks to less formalized spheres, where protection mechanisms are weaker and seeking help is associated with additional barriers. In such cases, affected individuals often have to deal with violations on their own, especially when pressure comes from partners, relatives, or employers and is accompanied by threats of disclosing SOGI or HIV status.

Country-specific patterns remain pronounced. In Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan, law enforcement authorities still remain among the key violators. In Kazakhstan, the police frequently interfere in private life, which includes outing and extortion. In Uzbekistan, against the backdrop of ongoing criminalization of consensual sexual relations between men [11], pressure is increasingly exerted through the medical sector and control practices, including denial of services and violations of confidentiality. In Ukraine, in the context of the war, the majority of violations occur in the areas of employment, services, and interpersonal relations, accompanied by increased physical violence and bullying, while direct police involvement remains relatively low.

BRIEF OVERVIEW OF VIOLATED RIGHTS AND VIOLATIONS. In 2025, among the most frequently documented violations, violations of the right to personal integrity were prevalent — 185 cases (28.6%), including physical, sexual, and domestic violence (Table 2). Violations of the right to privacy accounted for 164 cases (25.3%) and were primarily related to the disclosure or threat of disclosure of SOGI (17.5%) and extortion (9.3%). A significant share also involved violations of the right to health (15.6%), including denial of medical care, humiliating treatment, and disclosure of medical information, as well as work-related violations (14.7%), including dismissals, refusal to hire, and workplace bullying.

Less frequent but consistently recorded were abuses of authority and cruel treatment by law enforcement (10.7%), arbitrary deprivation of liberty (8.8%), discrimination in the provision of services (8.5%), and issues related to legal gender recognition and documentation (11.4%).

Country-specific differences are primarily reflected in the combination of these categories. In Armenia, a significant proportion of cases involve violations of personal integrity, privacy, and health; in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, outing, extortion, and police pressure; in Moldova, violations of the right to health and freedom of expression; in Tajikistan, interference with private life, extortion, and deprivation of liberty; in Uzbekistan, violations of the right to health and leaks of medical data; in Ukraine, work and service-related violations, as well as physical violence.

An analysis of violations by groups of affected individuals reveals various vulnerability mechanisms (Table 3). For gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men (GBMSM), the most common were violations of privacy (27.7%), work-related violations (16.0%), and discrimination in accessing services (9.0%). For trans women, health-related violations were most pronounced (22.1%), along with incidents of cruel treatment and arbitrary deprivation of liberty, indicating heightened risks in interactions with institutions. Among lesbian and bisexual women, domestic violence was highly prevalent (21.1%), highlighting the significance of the family context. For trans men, despite the smaller number of documented cases, barriers to legal recognition and refusal to issue documents were particularly relevant, directly limiting access to services and the enjoyment of basic rights.

Table 1. Characteristics of cases of rights violations against LGBT people, 2025

Characteristic	Armenia	Kazakhstan	Kyrgyzstan	Moldova	Tajikistan	Uzbekistan	Ukraine	Total
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Total cases (N)	**18**	**33**	**30**	**58**	**47**	**78**	**383**	**647**
SOGI of affected individuals								
Gays, bisexuals, and other MSM	11 (61,1)	19 (57,6)	16 (53,3)	51 (87,9)	32 (68,1)	57 (73,1)	334 (87,2)	520 (80,4)
Transgender women	4 (22,2)	6 (18,2)	13 (43,3)	—	9 (19,1)	9 (11,5)	36 (9,4)	77 (11,9)
Lesbian and bisexual women	2 (11,1)	1 (3,0)	—	1 (1,7)	4 (8,5)	11 (14,1)	—	19 (2,9)
Transgender men	1 (5,6)	2 (6,1)	—	1 (1,7)	1 (2,1)	—	11 (2,9)	16 (2,5)
LGBT people in general	—	5 (15,2)	1 (3,3)	5 (8,6)	1 (2,1)	1 (1,3)	2 (0,5)	15 (2,3)
Grounds for violation								
SOGI only	16 (88,9)	28 (84,8)	27 (90,0)	48 (82,8)	38 (80,9)	41 (52,6)	376 (98,2)	574 (88,7)
SOGI and HIV	—	1 (3,0)	1 (3,3)	9 (15,5)	7 (14,9)	13 (16,7)	4 (1,0)	35 (5,4)
HIV only	—	1 (3,0)	—	1 (1,7)	1 (2,1)	18 (21,1)	2 (0,5)	23 (3,6)
SOGI and sex work	2 (11,1)	3 (9,1)	2 (6,7)	—	1 (2,1)	6 (7,7)	1 (0,3)	15 (2,3)
Cases with multiple violated rights	**8 (44,4)**	**19 (57,6)**	**22 (73,3)**	**3 (5,2)**	**36 (76,6)**	**49 (59,0)**	**87 (22,7)**	**221 (34,2)**
Cases with multiple types of violations	**8 (44,4)**	**22 (66,7)**	**27 (90,0)**	**7 (12,1)**	**36 (76,6)**	**64 (82,1)**	**135 (35,2)**	**299 (46,2)**
Cases with multiple types of violators	**6 (33,3)**	**4 (12,1)**	**13 (43,3)**	**—**	**9 (19,1)**	**14 (17,9)**	**35 (9,1)**	**81 (12,5)**
Type of violators								
Unknown persons	4 (22,2)	5 (15,2)	8 (26,7)	21 (36,2)	1 (2,1)	7 (9,0)	70 (18,3)	116 (17,9)
Law enforcement officers	3 (16,7)	12 (36,4)	15 (50,0)	2 (3,4)	31 (66,0)	19 (24,4)	11 (2,9)	93 (14,4)
Healthcare professionals not related to HIV	3 (16,7)	2 (6,1)	5 (16,7)	19 (32,8)	1 (2,1)	25 (32,1)	33 (8,6)	88 (13,6)
Colleagues / fellow students	1 (5,6)	1 (3,0)	1 (3,3)	1 (1,7)	—	4 (5,1)	55 (14,4)	63 (9,7)

Characteristic	Armenia	Kazakhstan	Kyrgyzstan	Moldova	Tajikistan	Uzbekistan	Ukraine	Total
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Total cases (N)	**18**	**33**	**30**	**58**	**47**	**78**	**383**	**647**
Type of violators								
Service industry workers / staff at shops and cafés	—	—	1 (3,3)	2 (3,4)	1 (2,1)	3 (3,8)	54 (14,1)	61 (9,4)
Employers	2 (11,1)	2 (6,1)	2 (6,7)	1 (1,7)	2 (4,3)	7 (9,0)	44 (11,5)	60 (9,3)
Sexual partners / spouses	1 (5,6)	6 (18,2)	4 (13,3)	3 (5,2)	5 (10,6)	1 (1,3)	37 (9,7)	57 (8,8)
Relatives	3 (16,7)	2 (6,1)	1 (3,3)	1 (1,7)	4 (8,5)	7 (9,0)	23 (6,0)	41 (6,3)
Neighbors	—	1 (3,0)	—	1 (1,7)	2 (4,3)	3 (3,8)	33 (8,6)	40 (6,2)
Military personnel / border guards	3 (16,7)	—	1 (3,3)	—	3 (6,4)	1 (1,3)	18 (4,7)	20 (4,0)
Representatives of local authorities and state agencies	1 (5,6)	3 (9,1)	1 (3,3)	6 (10,3)	1 (2,1)	1 (1,3)	5 (1,3)	18 (2,8)
Landlords	1 (5,6)	1 (3,0)	1 (3,3)	1 (1,7)	2 (4,3)	—	10 (2,6)	16 (2,5)
Friends and acquaintances	1 (5,6)	—	1 (3,3)	—	2 (4,3)	—	12 (3,1)	16 (2,5)
Healthcare professionals related to HIV	—	1 (3,0)	—	—	—	8 (10,3)	4 (1,0)	13 (2,0)
Staff at educational institutions	—	—	—	—	—	2 (2,6)	9 (2,3)	11 (1,7)
Clients of sex workers	1 (5,6)	—	1 (3,3)	—	—	3 (3,8)	—	5 (0,8)
Journalists and bloggers	—	1 (3,0)	1 (3,3)	—	1 (2,1)	1 (1,3)	—	4 (0,6)
NGO staff	—	—	—	—	1 (2,1)	1 (1,3)	1 (0,3)	3 (0,5)
Lawyers and legal professionals	—	—	—	—	1 (2,1)	—	1 (0,3)	2 (0,3)
Cases of “fake dates”	**1 (5,6)**	**1 (3,0)**	**5 (16,7)**	**—**	**6 (12,8)**	**3 (3,8)**	**4 (1,0)**	**20 (3,1)**

Table 2. Types of rights violations against LGBT people by country in the region, 2025

Characteristic	Armenia	Kazakhstan	Kyrgyzstan	Moldova	Tajikistan	Uzbekistan	Ukraine	Total
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Total cases (N)	**18**	**33**	**30**	**58**	**47**	**78**	**383**	**647**
Right to personal integrity	**7 (38,9)**	**6 (18,2)**	**11 (36,7)**	**6 (10,3)**	**8 (17,0)**	**23 (29,5)**	**123 (32,1)**	**184 (28,4)**
Physical violence	5 (27,8)	3 (9,1)	10 (33,3)	5 (8,6)	2 (4,3)	11 (14,1)	75 (19,6)	111 (17,2)
Domestic violence	2 (11,1)	2 (6,1)	1 (3,3)	1 (1,7)	4 (8,5)	4 (6,4)	25 (6,5)	40 (6,2)
Sexual violence or harassment	—	1 (3,0)	—	—	2 (4,3)	8 (10,3)	23 (6,0)	34 (5,3)
Right to privacy	**6 (33,3)**	**17 (51,5)**	**15 (50,0)**	**6 (10,3)**	**30 (63,8)**	**27 (34,6)**	**63 (16,4)**	**164 (25,3)**
Disclosure or threat of disclosure of SOGI	5 (27,8)	10 (30,3)	11 (36,7)	4 (6,9)	14 (29,8)	15 (19,2)	54 (14,1)	113 (17,5)
Extortion of money	—	8 (24,2)	9 (30,0)	1 (1,7)	18 (38,3)	8 (10,3)	16 (4,2)	60 (9,3)
Unauthorized search of home or property	—	3 (9,1)	—	—	8 (17,0)	4 (5,1)	1 (0,3)	16 (2,5)
Unauthorized access to personal correspondence	—	1 (3,0)	1 (3,3)	—	1 (2,1)	2 (2,6)	8 (2,1)	13 (2,0)
Disclosure or threat of disclosure of HIV status	—	2 (6,1)	1 (3,3)	2 (3,4)	—	4 (5,1)	2 (0,5)	11 (1,7)
Coercion to disclose information about partners	1 (5,6)	—	—	—	3 (6,4)	2 (2,6)	—	6 (0,9)
Criminalization of HIV transmission	—	—	—	—	3 (6,4)	—	—	3 (0,5)
Right to the highest attainable standard of health	**4 (22,2)**	**3 (9,1)**	**5 (16,7)**	**18 (31,0)**	**1 (2,1)**	**32 (41,0)**	**38 (9,9)**	**101 (15,6)**
Refusal to provide medical services	2 (11,1)	2 (6,1)	5 (16,7)	15 (25,9)	1 (2,1)	20 (25,6)	25 (6,5)	70 (10,8)
Humiliating treatment in a medical institution	2 (11,1)	2 (6,1)	5 (16,7)	6 (10,3)	—	15 (19,2)	25 (6,5)	55 (8,5)
Disclosure of medical data about HIV	—	—	—	—	—	15 (19,2)	—	15 (2,3)
Disclosure of medical data about SOGI	—	—	—	—	—	7 (9,0)	5 (1,3)	12 (1,9)

Characteristic	Armenia	Kazakhstan	Kyrgyzstan	Moldova	Tajikistan	Uzbekistan	Ukraine	Total
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Total cases (N)	**18**	**33**	**30**	**58**	**47**	**78**	**383**	**647**
Right to work	**2 (11,1)**	**2 (6,1)**	**2 (6,7)**	**2 (3,4)**	**1 (2,1)**	**8 (10,3)**	**78 (20,4)**	**95 (14,7)**
Bullying at the workplace	—	1 (3,0)	1 (3,3)	2 (3,4)	1 (2,1)	2 (2,6)	54 (14,1)	61 (9,4)
Dismissal or refusal to hire	2 (11,1)	1 (3,0)	1 (3,3)	—	—	6 (7,7)	37 (9,7)	47 (7,3)
Refusal to pay wages or grant a promotion	1 (5,6)	—	—	—	—	2 (2,6)	14 (3,7)	17 (2,6)
Right to be recognized as a person with legal rights	**2 (11,1)**	**5 (15,2)**	**4 (13,3)**	**6 (10,3)**	**3 (6,4)**	**5 (6,4)**	**49 (12,8)**	**74 (11,4)**
Property damage or material harm	2 (11,1)	2 (6,1)	3 (10,0)	4 (6,9)	3 (6,4)	5 (6,4)	40 (10,4)	59 (9,1)
Refusal to issue documents due to SOGI	—	3 (9,1)	1 (3,3)	2 (3,4)	—	—	9 (2,3)	15 (2,3)
Right not to be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment	**3 (16,7)**	**9 (27,3)**	**10 (33,3)**	**1 (1,7)**	**15 (31,9)**	**17 (21,8)**	**14 (3,7)**	**69 (10,7)**
Other abuses of power by law enforcement	3 (16,7)	9 (27,3)	8 (26,7)	1 (1,7)	15 (31,9)	17 (21,8)	14 (3,7)	67 (10,4)
Use of force by law enforcement	1 (5,6)	—	5 (16,7)	—	1 (2,1)	6 (7,7)	1 (0,3)	14 (2,2)
Right not to be subjected to arbitrary deprivation of liberty	**2 (11,1)**	**8 (24,2)**	**7 (23,3)**	**—**	**23 (48,9)**	**15 (19,2)**	**2 (0,5)**	**57 (8,8)**
Illegal arrest or detention	2 (11,1)	8 (24,2)	7 (23,3)	—	22 (46,8)	13 (16,7)	2 (0,5)	54 (8,3)
Coerced confessions	—	1 (3,0)	—	—	3 (6,4)	3 (3,8)	—	7 (1,1)
Right to equality and non-discrimination: refusal to provide services in private establishments or humiliating treatment by their staff	**—**	**—**	**1 (3,3)**	**2 (3,4)**	**3 (6,4)**	**1 (1,3)**	**48 (12,5)**	**55 (8,5)**

Characteristic	Armenia	Kazakhstan	Kyrgyzstan	Moldova	Tajikistan	Uzbekistan	Ukraine	Total
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Total cases (N)	**18**	**33**	**30**	**58**	**47**	**78**	**383**	**647**
Right to freedom of thought and expression	**–**	**4 (12,1)**	**–**	**11 (19,0)**	**1 (2,1)**	**1 (1,3)**	**20 (5,2)**	**37 (5,7)**
Hate speech and public calls by private individuals	–	4 (12,1)	–	9 (15,5)	1 (2,1)	1 (1,3)	20 (5,2)	35 (5,4)
Hate speech in the media and by public figures	–	–	–	2 (3,4)	–	–	–	2 (0,3)
Right to adequate housing: eviction or coercion to leave a place of residence	**1 (5,6)**	**2 (6,1)**	**1 (3,3)**	**3 (5,2)**	**2 (4,3)**	**2 (2,6)**	**21 (5,5)**	**32 (4,9)**
Right to an effective remedy and reparation: refusal to provide legal assistance	**1 (5,6)**	**1 (3,0)**	**8 (26,7)**	**–**	**1 (2,1)**	**2 (2,6)**	**9 (2,3)**	**22 (3,4)**
Right to education	**–**	**–**	**–**	**–**	**–**	**3 (3,8)**	**14 (3,7)**	**17 (2,6)**
Bullying in educational institutions	–	–	–	–	–	2 (2,6)	13 (3,4)	15 (2,3)
Expulsion or threat of expulsion from an educational institution	–	–	–	–	–	2 (2,6)	2 (0,5)	4 (0,6)
Right to life	**–**	**3 (9,1)**	**2 (6,7)**	**–**	**1 (2,1)**	**4 (5,1)**	**3 (0,8)**	**13 (2,0)**
Threats of murder	–	1 (3,0)	2 (6,7)	–	–	2 (2,6)	2 (0,5)	7 (1,1)
Murder or attempted murder	–	2 (6,1)	–	–	1 (2,1)	2 (2,6)	1 (0,3)	6 (0,9)
Protection from medical abuse	**–**	**–**	**–**	**2 (3,4)**	**3 (6,4)**	**7 (9,0)**	**1 (0,3)**	**13 (2,0)**
Forced HIV testing	–	–	–	1 (1,7)	2 (4,3)	5 (6,4)	-	8 (1,2)
Forced treatment	–	–	–	1 (1,7)	1 (2,1)	1 (1,3)	1 (0,3)	4 (0,6)
Forced anal examinations	–	–	–	–	–	3 (3,8)	–	3 (0,5)

Characteristic	Armenia	Kazakhstan	Kyrgyzstan	Moldova	Tajikistan	Uzbekistan	Ukraine	Total
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Total cases (N)	**18**	**33**	**30**	**58**	**47**	**78**	**383**	**647**
Right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association	**—**	**2 (6,1)**	**—**	**2 (3,4)**	**1 (2,1)**	**—**	**3 (0,8)**	**8 (1,2)**
Obstacles to holding peaceful assemblies	—	2 (6,1)	—	2 (3,4)	—	—	3 (0,8)	7 (1,1)
Obstacles to the work of NGOs, human rights defenders, and activists	—	—	—	—	1 (2,1)	—	—	1 (0,2)
Right to marry and found a family	**—**	**—**	**—**	**1 (1,7)**	**1 (2,1)**	**2 (2,6)**	**—**	**4 (0,6)**
Deprivation of parental rights	—	—	—	1 (1,7)	1 (2,1)	1 (1,3)	—	3 (0,5)
Forced marriage	—	—	—	—	—	1 (1,3)	—	1 (0,2)
Right to freedom of movement	**—**	**2 (6,1)**	**—**	**—**	**1 (2,1)**	**—**	**1 (0,3)**	**4 (0,6)**
Forced expulsion from a city or country	—	2 (6,1)	—	—	1 (2,1)	—	—	3 (0,5)
Denial or obstruction of border crossing	—	—	—	—	—	—	1 (0,3)	1 (0,3)
Right to seek asylum: denial of asylum	**1 (5,6)**	**—**	**—**	**1 (1,7)**	**—**	**—**	**—**	**2 (0,3)**

Table 3. Types of rights violations against LGBT people by SOGI of affected individuals, 2025

Characteristic	GBMSM	Trans women	Lesbians and bisexuals	Trans men	LGBT people in general	Total
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Total cases (N)	**520**	**77**	**19**	**15**	**16**	**647**
Right to personal integrity	**153 (29,4)**	**20 (26,0)**	**6 (31,6)**	**4 (25,0)**	**1 (6,7)**	**184 (28,4)**
Physical violence	95 (18,3)	13 (16,9)	—	2 (12,5)	1 (6,7)	111 (17,2)
Domestic violence	31 (6,0)	3 (3,9)	4 (21,1)	2 (12,5)	—	40 (6,2)
Sexual violence or harassment	28 (5,4)	5 (5,2)	2 (10,5)	—	—	34 (5,3)
Right to privacy	**144 (27,7)**	**13 (16,9)**	**4 (21,1)**	**—**	**3 (20,0)**	**164 (25,3)**
Disclosure or threat of disclosure of SOGI	99 (19,0)	10 (13,0)	3 (15,8)	—	1 (6,7)	113 (17,5)
Extortion of money	52 (10,2)	4 (5,2)	1 (5,3)	—	2 (13,3)	60 (9,3)
Unauthorized search of home or property	14 (2,7)	1 (1,3)	—	—	1 (6,7)	16 (2,5)
Unauthorized access to personal correspondence	13 (2,5)	—	—	—	—	13 (2,0)
Disclosure or threat of disclosure of HIV status	11 (2,1)	—	—	—	—	11 (1,7)
Coercion to disclose information about partners	4 (0,8)	2 (2,6)	—	—	—	6 (0,9)
Criminalization of HIV transmission	3 (0,6)	—	—	—	—	3 (0,5)
Right to the highest attainable standard of health	**77 (14,8)**	**17 (22,1)**	**5 (26,3)**	**2 (12,5)**	**—**	**101 (15,6)**
Refusal to provide medical services	51 (9,8)	15 (19,5)	2 (10,5)	2 (12,5)	—	70 (10,8)
Humiliating treatment in a medical institution	42 (8,1)	10 (13,0)	2 (10,5)	10 (13,0)	—	55 (8,5)
Disclosure of medical data about HIV	12 (2,3)	—	3 (15,8)	—	—	15 (2,3)
Disclosure of medical data about SOGI	10 (1,9)	1 (1,3)	—	1 (6,3)	—	12 (1,9)

Characteristic	GBMSM	Trans women	Lesbians and bisexuals	Trans men	LGBT people in general	Total
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Total cases (N)	**520**	**77**	**19**	**15**	**16**	**647**
Right to work	**83 (16,0)**	**7 (9,1)**	**3 (15,8)**	**2 (12,5)**	**–**	**184 (28,4)**
Bullying at the workplace	55 (10,6)	4 (5,2)	1 (5,3)	1 (6,3)	–	61 (9,4)
Dismissal or refusal to hire	40 (7,7)	3 (3,9)	2 (10,5)	2 (12,5)	–	47 (7,3)
Refusal to pay wages	15 (2,9)	1 (1,3)	–	1 (6,3)	–	17 (2,6)
Right to be recognized as a person with legal rights	**55 (10,6)**	**14 (18,2)**	**1 (5,3)**	**4 (25,0)**	**–**	**74 (11,4)**
Property damage or material harm	52 (10,0)	6 (7,8)	1 (5,3)	–	–	59 (9,1)
Refusal to issue documents due to SOGI	3 (0,6)	8 (10,4)	–	4 (25,0)	–	15 (2,3)
Right not to be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment	**43 (8,3)**	**18 (23,4)**	**3 (15,8)**	**1 (6,3)**	**4 (26,7)**	**69 (10,7)**
Other abuses of power by law enforcement	41 (7,9)	18 (23,4)	3 (15,8)	1 (6,3)	4 (26,7)	67 (10,4)
Use of force by law enforcement	10 (1,9)	3 (3,9)	1 (5,3)	–	–	14 (2,2)
Right not to be subjected to arbitrary deprivation of liberty	**39 (7,5)**	**11 (14,3)**	**2 (10,5)**	**–**	**5 (33,3)**	**57 (8,8)**
Illegal arrest or detention	36 (6,9)	11 (14,3)	2 (10,5)	–	5 (33,3)	54 (8,3)
Coerced confessions	6 (1,2)	–	–	–	1 (6,7)	7 (1,1)
Right to equality and non-discrimination: refusal to provide services in private establishments or humiliating treatment by their staff	**47 (9,0)**	**6 (7,8)**	**–**	**1 (6,3)**	**1 (6,7)**	**55 (8,5)**
Right to freedom of thought and expression	**28 (5,4)**	**3 (3,9)**	**2 (10,5)**	**2 (12,5)**	**2 (13,3)**	**37 (5,7)**
Hate speech and public calls by private individuals	28 (5,4)	3 (3,9)	2 (10,5)	2 (12,5)	–	35 (5,4)
Hate speech in the media and by public figures	–	–	–	–	2 (13,3)	2 (0,3)

Characteristic	GBMSM	Trans women	Lesbians and bisexuals	Trans men	LGBT people in general	Total
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Total cases (N)	**520**	**77**	**19**	**15**	**16**	**647**
Right to adequate housing: eviction or coercion to leave a place of residence	**27 (5,2)**	**4 (5,2)**	**—**	**1 (6,3)**	**—**	**32 (4,9)**
Right to an effective remedy and reparation: refusal to provide legal assistance	**15 (2,9)**	**6 (7,8)**	**1 (5,3)**	**—**	**—**	**22 (3,4)**
Right to education	**15 (2,9)**	**1 (1,3)**	**—**	**1 (6,3)**	**—**	**17 (2,6)**
Bullying in educational institutions	13 (2,5)	1 (1,3)	—	1 (6,3)	—	15 (2,3)
Expulsion or threat of expulsion from an educational institution	4 (0,8)	—	—	—	—	4 (0,6)
Right to life	**10 (1,9)**	**1 (1,3)**	**2 (10,5)**	**—**	**—**	**13 (2,0)**
Threats of murder	6 (1,2)	—	1 (5,3)	—	—	7 (1,1)
Murder or attempted murder	4 (0,8)	1 (1,2)	1 (5,3)	—	—	6 (0,9)
Protection from medical abuse	**9 (1,7)**	**1 (1,3)**	**2 (10,5)**	**—**	**1 (6,7)**	**13 (2,0)**
Forced HIV testing	6 (1,2)	1 (1,3)	—	—	1 (6,7)	8 (1,2)
Forced treatment	2 (0,4)	—	2 (10,5)	—	—	4 (0,6)
Forced anal examinations	3 (0,6)	—	—	—	—	3 (0,5)
Right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association	**2 (0,4)**	**1 (1,3)**	**—**	**—**	**5 (33,3)**	**8 (1,2)**
Obstacles to holding peaceful assemblies	2 (0,4)	1 (1,3)	—	—	4 (26,7)	7 (1,1)
Obstacles to the work of NGOs, human rights defenders, and activists	—	—	—	—	1 (6,7)	1 (0,2)
Right to marry and found a family	**2 (0,4)**	**—**	**1 (5,3)**	**1 (6,3)**	**—**	**4 (0,6)**
Deprivation of parental rights	2 (0,4)	—	—	1 (6,3)	—	3 (0,5)
Forced marriage	—	—	1 (5,3)	—	—	1 (0,2)

Characteristic	GBMSM	Trans women	Lesbians and bisexuals	Trans men	LGBT people in general	Total
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Total cases (N)	**520**	**77**	**19**	**15**	**16**	**647**
Right to freedom of movement	**1 (0,2)**	**2 (2,6)**	**—**	**—**	**1 (6,7)**	**4 (0,6)**
Forced expulsion from a city or country	1 (0,2)	1 (1,3)	—	—	1 (6,7)	3 (0,5)
Denial or obstruction of border crossing	—	1 (1,3)	—	—	—	1 (0,2)
Right to seek asylum: denial of asylum	**1 (0,2)**	**—**	**1 (5,3)**	**—**	**—**	**2 (0,3)**

RIGHT TO PERSONAL INTEGRITY

In 2025, violations of the right to personal integrity were documented in 184 cases across all countries included in the analysis. The main forms were physical, domestic, and sexual violence.

Physical violence was recorded in 111 cases and predominantly affected GBMSM and trans people on the basis of SOGI or in combination with sex work. In most incidents, it was complex in nature and occurred as part of a chain of interrelated violations, including threats, outing, extortion, arbitrary detention, and blackmail.

Attacks took place both in public spaces (streets, public transport, cafés) and in private contexts — in apartments, rented housing, and during dating. In Ukraine and Kazakhstan, beatings were reported in public spaces following gender expression (e.g., display of symbols). In some Ukrainian cases, physical violence was perpetrated by a partner's acquaintances or relatives, indicating that the circle of aggressors extends beyond random encounters.

A separate group of cases involves so-called "fake dates" and meetings arranged through online platforms (8 cases). In Armenia, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Ukraine, GBMSM and trans people were deliberately lured into meetings, after which they were beaten, robbed, and humiliated. Violence was often accompanied by video recording and threats to distribute the materials, demonstrating the use of physical violence as a tool of control and oppression.

In 6 cases, physical violence occurred in the context of sex work, predominantly affecting trans sex workers. In Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Armenia, clients beat sex workers, stole money and property, and then blackmailed them threatening to report them to the police. The criminalization of sex work, combined with the stigmatization of LGBT people, creates conditions of de facto impunity.

Particularly concerning are 15 cases of physical violence against trans people documented in all countries except Kazakhstan. Beatings, forced undressing, and sexualized humiliation indicate transphobic motivation and an intent to deprive individuals of agency and control over their own bodies.

In many cases, physical violence followed a typical pattern: outing — threats — beating — extortion — arbitrary detention or forced departure. Fear of exposure, criminalization, and distrust of law enforcement led most affected individuals either not to seek protection or to abandon attempts to seek justice at an early stage of the process.

Domestic violence was documented in 40 cases across all countries analyzed and, despite the formal existence of protective legislation [12–18], it was prolonged and systemic in nature. The most common form was violence by parents and relatives after coming out or outing. In Tajikistan, Kazakhstan, and Uzbekistan, disclosure of SOGI led to beatings, threats, isolation, deprivation of communication, and expulsion from home. In some cases, fathers and older brothers used severe physical violence "as a means of correction," while mothers acted as a source of psychological pressure or supported the aggression. Minors and young adults faced incitement to suicide and threats of "treatment" or "re-education." Domestic violence was also recorded in intimate partner relationships, manifesting itself as psychological, physical, and economic pressure. In Ukraine, cases of systematic humiliation, restricted contacts, threats of outing to family or at work, use of physical force, and property destruction were documented, in violation of the Law "On Preventing and Combating Domestic Violence" adopted in 2017 and applicable to individuals who are living together but not married [17].

In many situations, domestic violence became a trigger for secondary violations — forced displacement, loss of housing, interruption of education or work (e.g., in Armenia, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan). Suicidal thoughts and self-harm were directly linked to prolonged family pressure, and in some cases vulnerability was exacerbated by the intersection of SOGI and HIV status (Uzbekistan).

Sexual violence and harassment were documented in 34 cases in Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and Ukraine. In many incidents, fear of outing served as the primary mechanism of control, while additional levers included institutional authority, dependence on an employer or medical professional, and the affected individuals' vulnerable social position.

Some cases involved violence perpetrated by government officials and professional structures. In Uzbekistan, incidents of cruel treatment and sexualized humiliation of trans women in police custody were documented, including coercion of a third party into sexual acts and threats of gang rape. Cases were also recorded in which MSM patients were raped by urologists and subsequently blackmailed with threats of disclosing their SOGI. Under Article 118 of the CC, rape committed by a medical worker entrusted with supervisory duties over the victim is punishable by 10 to 15 years' imprisonment [11]. However, if a victim seeks legal assistance — which may entail the risk of being outed by the perpetrator during the investigation — there is a risk of the victim being charged under Article 120. In Kazakhstan, a case of sexual violence by the manager of an LGBT venue was recorded while the victim was asleep; Article 121 of the CC provides for imprisonment from 5 to 8 years for sexual acts involving violence or threats thereof, or committed by exploiting the victim's helpless state [19].

Harassment and attempted sexual coercion also occurred in everyday situations — in taxis, service centers, and shops. In Uzbekistan, sexual violence by a taxi driver was documented; in Ukraine — cases of unlawful detention and attempted rape in public spaces. In many instances, victims agreed to legal support only on the condition that the risk of secondary victimization be minimized. Sexual violence also occurred within the family environment. In Uzbekistan, a case of repeated rape by a stepfather against an MSM individual was documented, where control was maintained through threats of outing and disclosure of HIV status. A separate category involves cases of sexual coercion through blackmail with intimate materials, predominantly in Ukraine.

Overall, violations of the right to personal integrity against LGBT people in the region are systemic and interrelated. Physical, domestic, and sexual violence, as well as the intentional risk of HIV transmission, form a persistent pattern of control based on stigma, power inequality, and fear of identity disclosure. Limited access to protection, distrust of law enforcement, and the risk of secondary victimization contribute to impunity and shift the burden of protection onto affected individuals themselves and human rights mechanisms.

RIGHT TO PERSONAL PRIVACY

In 2025, 164 cases of violations of the right to personal privacy were documented, accounting for about one-third of all recorded violations. In all countries analyzed, the violations involved disclosure or threat of disclosure of SOGI, extortion, unauthorized access to personal data and correspondence, searches, coercion to disclose information about partners, as well as disclosure or threat of disclosure of HIV status and criminalization of HIV transmission. In Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan, nearly half of all documented cases were directly related to privacy violations, while in Uzbekistan and Armenia their share was approximately one-third.

Disclosure or threat of disclosure of SOGI (outing) was recorded in 113 cases and generally formed part of complex violations. The most common scenario was using outing as a means of blackmail in interpersonal and intimate relationships — by former partners, casual acquaintances, and contacts on apps and social media. In Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan, former partners of GBMSM threatened to share intimate materials with relatives or publish them online. Similar cases were documented in Kazakhstan, Ukraine, and Moldova, where threats of outing were combined with extortion, psychological abuse, and coercion to continue unwanted relationships.

Fake dates remained a persistent mechanism. In Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan, violators deliberately lured MSM and trans women into meetings, secretly filmed them or accessed their intimate materials, and then demanded money under threat of publication. In Ukraine and Moldova, situations were more common where, after voluntary contact, the initiator returned with threats to share videos/photos and demands for payment.

Outing was also used by law enforcement authorities — through coercion into "confessions" and threats to disclose SOGI to family or social circles. In Ukraine, cases of outing in the workplace and educational environment were documented, leading to bullying, dismissals, or expulsions, and consequently, loss of income and social status.

The digital environment became a distinct arena for privacy violations. In Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Armenia, Ukraine, and Moldova, personal data, passport photos, intimate materials, and direct indications of SOGI were published on social media. Account takeovers, fake profile setups, and messages to family and colleagues were common. In many cases, affected individuals refused to seek formal protection, as outing was perceived as a risk greater than the violation itself, and contacting the police or court often meant expanding the circle of informed parties.

Extortion was documented in 60 cases, in all countries except Armenia, and most often occurred in the context of threats to disclose SOGI. Financial demands were accompanied by threats of outing, distribution of intimate materials, fabricated charges (including under articles on HIV transmission, pornography, sodomy, or prostitution), and the use of violence. A significant number of cases involved extortion by law enforcement — including unlawful detentions, confiscation of phones and documents, threats of criminal proceedings, and offers to "settle the matter" in exchange of money. Given their distrust of institutions, affected individuals often opted for harm-reduction strategies — paying money, blocking contacts, negotiating through human rights defenders, or relocating.

Unauthorized searches of homes and property were documented in 16 cases in Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and Ukraine, primarily affecting GBMSM, and in one case a trans woman. The most common practices included arbitrary personal searches in public places, at checkpoints, or in police stations, often accompanied by derogatory comments and homophobic rhetoric. In Uzbekistan and Tajikistan, entries into apartments under the pretext of "inspections" or "operational activities" were documented, with confiscation of personal belongings and data storage devices. A distinct recurring pattern involved the confiscation and search of digital devices, with detainees being forced to unlock their phones and provide access to messages and dating apps, including during raids and sting operations — in Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan.

Unauthorized access to personal correspondence was recorded in 13 cases across all countries, except Armenia and Moldova, and often served as a trigger for further violence — ranging from outing and humiliation to physical, sexual, and economic pressure. Violators included both government officials and relatives, partners, colleagues, and acquaintances. In Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, and Kyrgyzstan, such interference frequently resulted in immediate outing to families or communities, while in Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and Ukraine it led to physical violence and threats from relatives.

In Ukraine, there were cases of fellow students and neighbors deliberately accessing personal accounts, followed by dissemination of data and public humiliation. At the same time, each of these countries has legislation protecting the privacy of correspondence and communications, as well as prohibiting the unlawful collection and dissemination of private information (e.g., Art. 144 of the CC of Tajikistan [20]).

Disclosure or threat of disclosure of HIV status was documented in 11 cases across all countries except Armenia and Tajikistan and involved GBMSM. In all incidents, the very risk of disclosure in a context of stigma constituted a form of harm in itself, regardless of whether the information was actually made public. In Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan, blackmail related to HIV status by law enforcement officials was recorded, while in Ukraine cases involved forced disclosure of HIV status to representatives of the Territorial Recruitment Centers in order to stop detention or confirm exemption from military service. HIV status was also used as a tool of pressure in labor relations (Uzbekistan) and as a form of defamation in the digital environment (Kazakhstan, Moldova).

Coercion to disclose information about partners was documented in 6 cases in Armenia, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan and was used not for the purposes of protection or criminal investigation, but as a tool of pressure, recruitment, and control. In Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, MSM and trans women, including those involved in sex work, were unlawfully detained and forced to provide information about partners or clients under threats of outing, criminal prosecution, or accusations of "spreading HIV." In Armenia, in the context of military service, MSM were required to "prove" their homosexuality by providing information about partners and photographs.

Criminalization of HIV transmission was documented in three cases in Tajikistan involving GBMSM and demonstrates the use of criminal law (Art. 125 of the CC) [20] as a tool of repressive control. Criminal proceedings were initiated in the absence of proven HIV transmission — solely on the basis of HIV status and sexual contacts, including police access to personal correspondence and social media; in one case, the encounter with the partner was likely staged.

Thus, violations of the right to personal privacy are recurrent in nature and function as a universal tool of control, pressure, and punishment against LGBT people. Privacy — in digital, family, work, and institutional environments — is systematically undermined through outing, extortion, and criminalization, which increases the vulnerability of affected individuals and effectively deprives them of safe protection mechanisms.

RIGHT TO THE HIGHEST ATTAINABLE STANDARD OF HEALTH

In 2025, 101 cases of violations of the right to the highest attainable standard of health were documented, with around one-third occurring in Ukraine and Uzbekistan. The violations primarily involved denial of medical care, humiliating treatment in medical facilities, and disclosure of medical information about HIV status and/or SOGI.

Refusal to provide medical care was recorded in 70 cases across all countries in the region, most frequently in Ukraine (24 cases) and Uzbekistan (20). These refusals concerned both emergency and specialized care as well as basic HIV-related services, including testing, prevention, and treatment. In the vast majority of cases, the key trigger was SOGI and/or HIV status, and the refusals were accompanied by stigmatizing and humiliating attitudes.

A typical mechanism involved a sudden change in the attitude of medical staff after disclosure of SOGI or HIV status: patients who had already been admitted for treatment encountered refusals to continue therapy, unjustified discharge, referral to other facilities, or recommendations to receive outpatient treatment without clinical grounds. Such situations were documented when individuals sought surgical, ophthalmological, dental, and neurological care in Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, and Kyrgyzstan, where HIV status or trans identity was explicitly used as a justification for refusal.

In several cases, refusals concerned emergency and inpatient care, including situations with a direct threat to life and health. In Uzbekistan and Moldova, hospitalization denials were recorded in cases of acute appendicitis, severe burns, opportunistic infections, and complicated chronic conditions. Medical decisions were replaced by moral judgments about the patient, and refusals were framed as "lack of indications" or the "possibility of home treatment," indicating the discriminatory nature of such practices.

A separate group of cases concerns restrictions on access to antiretroviral therapy (ART), pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP), and post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP). In Uzbekistan, refusals to prescribe or dispense ART were documented, along with pressure to discontinue therapy, refusal to change treatment regimens despite severe side effects, and threats not to prescribe treatment as a form of punishment — practices that directly contradict Article 21 of the Law "On Combating the Spread of the Disease Caused by the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV Infection)" [21]. In Kazakhstan, a refusal to provide PEP after high-risk exposure was recorded, while in Ukraine access to PrEP was restricted under the pretext of "medication shortages" or "removal from the register," which contravenes clinical protocols and national HIV prevention programs.

Refugees and asylum seekers face additional barriers. In Moldova, cases were documented where PrEP or STI diagnostics and treatment were effectively unavailable due to administrative status and ignorance of medical personnel, including doctors' claims that they "don't know about PrEP" or cannot prescribe it to refugees from Ukraine (8 cases). Such refusals led to interruptions in prevention and treatment and increased the risk of health deterioration.

A significant number of cases involved denial of medical care to trans people (17 cases). Doctors refused to conduct examinations, provide referrals, or issue medical certificates, citing "lack of experience," "mismatched documents," or personal beliefs. In several cases, refusals were accompanied by public humiliation, misgendering, and disclosure of confidential information, which intensified trauma and fostered avoidance of healthcare institutions.

Humiliating treatment in medical institutions was documented in 55 cases across all countries except Tajikistan, with almost half of them (25 cases) in Ukraine. These cases did not concern the quality of medical care but rather the systematic portrayal of patients as "wrong," "undesirable," or "guilty" — because of their SOGI, HIV status, or the combination of both. The most common manifestations included verbal humiliation, moral condemnation, accusations of "immorality" and "spreading diseases," explicit death wishes, as well as demonstrative HIV stigmatization — refusal to touch the patient, demonstrative disinfection, and comments about "contagiousness." For LGBT people, including trans persons, misgendering and public attempts to "figure out who you are" were common, turning medical visits into sources of shame and psychological violence.

Disclosure of medical data about HIV was documented in 15 cases, all in Uzbekistan. Violations occurred both in specialized AIDS centers and in primary and specialized healthcare facilities (e.g., dental clinics). Diagnoses were disclosed to third parties without patients' consent — to relatives, neighbors, landlords, colleagues, and representatives of mahalla committees — under the pretext of "prevention," "care," or "official necessity."

A recurring pattern involved public announcements of diagnoses within medical facilities (e.g., in corridors), the use of stigmatizing language ("you have AIDS," "you are with AIDS") and visual markers in medical documentation. In one case, a medical worker used access to an AIDS center database, which led to the transfer of information to third parties and subsequent violence and threats. In several cases, disclosure of HIV status was used as a tool of pressure and blackmail — healthcare workers threatened to share information with mahalla committees, law enforcement authorities, or employers, and in one case a doctor demanded a large sum of money for the "confidential processing" of treatment.

Disclosure of medical data about SOGI was documented in 12 cases (7 in Uzbekistan and 5 in Ukraine) and included direct disclosure of information as well as practices in which a patient's SOGI became the subject of public discussion or was shared with third parties without consent. In government institutions, cases included "corridor outings," unethical recording of SOGI in documentation, and disregard for requests to restrict access to personal data. In Ukraine, a case was documented in which a doctor publicly described a "medical history" in the media with details that could identify the patient. In Uzbekistan, the consequences of disclosure of SOGI are exacerbated by the risk of criminal prosecution: healthcare workers threatened to share information with law enforcement authorities, and in some cases information obtained during medical consultations served as grounds for summoning the patient to the police, where they were subjected to humiliation, threats, and extortion. Overall, denial of care, humiliating treatment, and disclosure of confidential information are not isolated incidents but recurring patterns. In some contexts, the healthcare system itself becomes a source of stigma and violence, which undermines trust in healthcare, leads individuals to avoid treatment and prevention services, and directly threatens the health of those affected.

RIGHT TO WORK

Across the region, 95 cases of labor rights violations were documented, including bullying, dismissals, and refusals to hire, as well as denial of wages or related labor protections. Cases were recorded in all countries of the region and were primarily related to SOGI, while two cases (in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan) concerned HIV status.

Workplace bullying was recorded in 61 cases, predominantly targeting GBMSM on the grounds of sexual orientation. In most incidents, the trigger was not voluntary coming out, but rather outing, suspicions or gender expression (such as symbols or appearance), participation in public events, social media activity, or overheard conversations. After this, the work environment rapidly shifted from neutral to hostile, and a single episode of "visibility" was often sufficient to trigger systemic pressure (Ukraine, Moldova, Uzbekistan).

The most common mechanism was the normalization of verbal abuse under the guise of "jokes," "personal opinions," or "corporate culture." Homophobic comments, derogatory nicknames, and accusations of "abnormality" were recorded, particularly targeting GBMSM and trans people. At the same time, pressure was disguised as managerial decisions — exclusion from projects, the imposition of disproportionate performance targets, or reassignment to isolated or less prestigious tasks. Additional tools of pressure included threats of outing and control, such as promises to "tell the management," "share the information with the team," or disclose it beyond the workplace. In Kazakhstan and Tajikistan, such threats were accompanied by intimidation, insinuations of physical violence or defamation, significantly reducing willingness to seek protection.

In some cases, pressure escalated into actual safety risks, including physical violence, particularly in service and low-wage sectors. Cases included beatings after work shifts, threats of violence, and employers' refusal to acknowledge incidents, shifting responsibility onto the affected individuals instead ("you brought it on yourself," "you don't look right"), particularly in Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Ukraine. A typical response from employers was victim-blaming and avoidance of responsibility: instead of intervening, affected individuals were advised to "keep personal matters private," "be more careful," or change jobs. Even in cases of systematic bullying, complaints were often ignored or led to increased pressure (Ukraine, Moldova).

Dismissals and refusals to hir were documented in 47 cases across all countries in the region except Moldova and Tajikistan and were most commonly linked to sexual orientation. Two cases of MSM being dismissed on grounds of HIV status were recorded in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan — the diagnosis was used as a pretext for pressure and coercion to quit, without any medical or legal justification.

The most common scenario was dismissal or refusal to hire under the pretext of "reputational risks," client complaints, or references to a "family-oriented environment" or "internal rules." In the service, delivery, retail, and hospitality sectors, employees lost their jobs or shifts after homophobic complaints, while the management refused to acknowledge discriminatory motives. Informal employment remained an additional vulnerability: in Armenia and Ukraine, probationary periods, lack of formal contracts, and hybrid employment arrangements were used to terminate employment immediately, without procedures or safeguards. Another persistent mechanism was coercion to quit "voluntarily" through pressure, removal from shifts, and signals of "incompatibility with corporate culture." In cases documented in Ukraine and Kazakhstan, the employees' professional competence was not disputed, yet SOGI itself became the determining factor.

Refusals to hire often occurred at the final stages of recruitment and were disguised as formal reasons — after interviews or internships, candidates were rejected due to their appearance, questions about their personal lives, or documents — in the case of trans individuals, while the vacancy remained open.

Spheres that appeal to "morality" and work with children remain particularly vulnerable. In Ukraine and Uzbekistan, teachers, childcare workers, and education professionals were pushed out of their jobs after outing or public visibility — through parental pressure, accusations of "immorality," and formal disciplinary grounds, while SOGI was effectively equated with professional unsuitability.

Denial of wages, mandatory compensations, or promotion was recorded in 17 cases in Armenia, Uzbekistan, and Ukraine, and was used as a tool of punishment, control, and expulsion from the workplace. Withheld wages, sick pay, vacation pay, and severance compensation were documented, justified by the absence of a contract or "internal decisions." In some cases (Armenia, Ukraine), payment was recovered after complaints to the labor inspectorate or negotiations through human rights defenders; in others (Uzbekistan), non-payment was accompanied by threats and outing.

Hidden forms of financial discrimination included blocked career advancement, reduced income through cuts in bonuses, reassignment to lower-paid roles, and targeted tightening of requirements under the guise of "optimization." In one Ukrainian case, a reduction in salary and increased workload were used as pressure following a refusal to enter into a romantic relationship with a manager.

Overall, violations of the right to work form a recurring pattern: visibility or suspicion of SOGI triggers bullying, which transforms into economic pressure and often ends in forced dismissal. In conditions of weak internal protection mechanisms and widespread victim-blaming, affected individuals frequently choose to quit rather than formally assert their rights, reinforcing impunity and the systemic nature of discrimination.

RIGHT TO BE RECOGNIZED AS A PERSON WITH LEGAL RIGHTS

In 2025, 74 cases of violations of the right to be recognized as a person with legal rights were documented across all countries analyzed. The majority involved property damage or material harm (59 cases), with the largest number recorded in Ukraine (40). Refusals to issue documents based on SOGI were also common in Ukraine (9 cases), while in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Moldova such violations were isolated.

Property damage or material harm occurred both as a standalone form of violation and as a continuation of physical, sexual, or psychological violence. The damage was often inflicted deliberately, accompanied by homophobic or transphobic rhetoric and threats of outing, and aimed at creating an unsafe environment and forcing affected individuals to leave. In Ukraine and Moldova, cases included homophobic graffiti painted on doors and walls, broken windows, damaged locks, and the repeated soiling of entrance doors. In small towns and rural areas, such actions quickly became public and led to forced relocation.

A significant portion of material damage was inflicted directly during attacks. In Ukraine, Kyrgyzstan, Armenia, and Uzbekistan, cases were recorded in which phones, laptops, money, and personal belongings were seized or destroyed during homophobic attacks, fake dates, or sexualized violence. Deprivation of communication devices and documents was used to limit access to assistance and tighten control.

In several cases, material harm was linked to loss of housing or financial losses. In Ukraine and Tajikistan, unlawful evictions, refusals to return rent payments, and withholding of deposits after the disclosure of tenants' SOGI were documented. In Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Armenia, clients refused to pay for the services of trans and cisgender sex workers, used violence, stole money and property, and then blackmailed them with threats to contact the police or distribute intimate materials. These cases demonstrate the direct link between material harm and criminalization, stigma, and the inability to safely seek protection.

A separate group of cases involved law enforcement officers confiscating phones, passports, and money without procedural documentation, demanding bribes or effectively legitimizing damage caused by third parties. In Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, such actions were accompanied by threats of criminal prosecution under provisions related to "sodomy," "prostitution," or HIV, turning material harm into an element of systemic pressure and extortion.

Violations related to refusal to issue documents due to SOGI primarily affected trans people (12 of 15 cases). Typical practices included the imposition of additional requirements not provided for by law, procedural delays, redirection, and humiliating treatment. In Kazakhstan, refusals to amend documents for trans people were recorded even where a full package of medical certificates was submitted. Such decisions were justified by claims of an "incomplete transition" and accompanied by demands for additional surgical interventions, as surgical procedures to form so-called male or female genitalia, including sterilization, continue to be a mandatory requirement for obtaining permission to change the passport gender [22], despite calls from the UN Committee Against Torture to abolish this requirement [23]. Some applicants are involved in or preparing for legal proceedings, facing procedural delays including those caused by concurrent divorce proceedings.

In Kyrgyzstan, a case was recorded in which a trans girl encountered an obstacle when obtaining a passport because a Public Service Center employee refused to address the situation and demanded the presence of her parents; the barrier was resolved after NGO intervention and communication with the institution's management. In Ukraine and Moldova, obstacles in document processing affected both trans people and GBMSM.

In Ukraine, humiliating treatment was recorded at Administrative Service Centers and civil registry offices, with refusals to accept documents on the grounds of "absence of internal instructions," doubts about the authenticity of certificates, or refusal to provide services on an extraterritorial basis. In Moldova, MSM experienced denials and delays in issuing certificates and notary services after disclosure of sexual orientation, which effectively blocked access to legal procedures. Overall, the documented cases point to a persistent vulnerability of LGBT people, particularly trans people, in terms of legal recognition and access to government services. In many situations, the exercise of basic rights depends on the subjective attitudes of staff, legal illiteracy, and discriminatory practices, making such violations systemic.

RIGHT NOT TO BE SUBJECTED TO TORTURE OR TO CRUEL, INHUMAN, OR DEGRADING TREATMENT OR PUNISHMENT

In 2025, 69 cases of violations of the right not to be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment were documented. The majority of these violations involved abuse of authority by law enforcement officers, while 14 cases included the direct use of physical force. Such practices were observed in all countries analyzed, with the use of force most frequently documented in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. At the same time, each of the countries where such cases were documented has legislation prohibiting abuse of power or official authority [11, 19, 20, 24, 25].

Analysis of the cases shows that physical and psychological violence by law enforcement is persistent and targeted. Violence was used not only during arrests but also as a tool of intimidation, extraction of confessions, extortion, and coercion to cooperate. The most severe forms of such violations were documented in Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and Kyrgyzstan, though elements of degrading treatment are present in all countries of the region.

In many cases, violence began at the moment of actual detention — without presenting documents, explaining reasons, or carrying out procedural formalities. People were beaten with fists, feet, and improvised objects, subjected to choking, and held in stress positions. In Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, cases were documented of prolonged unlawful detention in police stations or temporary detention facilities, accompanied by systematic beatings, deprivation of sleep, food, and access to medical care. In some cases, MSM and trans women were held in such conditions for up to two weeks.

Cases of sexualized violence constitute a particularly severe category. In Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, cases were documented of rape, threats of gang rape, forced anal "examinations," and other humiliating acts committed by law enforcement officers or with their acquiescence. In several cases, the violence was accompanied by video recording and subsequent blackmail, which intensified the trauma and effectively deprived the affected individuals of the possibility to seek protection. Such practices were primarily used against GBMSM and trans women and were punitive in nature.

Physical and psychological violence was frequently used as a tool of extortion. People were threatened with criminal charges, outing, and the publication of compromising materials. In Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Kazakhstan, cases were recorded in which extortion demands reached several thousand US dollars, and refusal to pay resulted in increased pressure, further acts of violence, or fabricated accusations. The recruitment of LGBT people under threats of violence and criminal prosecution was also documented, including coercion to provide community contacts, participate in fake dates, or engage in covert cooperation.

Even in the absence of physical violence, treatment by law enforcement officers was often humiliating. People were systematically insulted, subjected to homophobic and transphobic language, and mocked for their appearance or SOGI. In Armenia, Kyrgyzstan, and Kazakhstan, cases were documented in which police refused to accept complaints from LGBT people, accompanied by ridicule and demonstrative contempt, which effectively denied them access to justice.

In all countries of the region, affected individuals rarely filed complaints about torture and ill-treatment, primarily due to fear of further reprisals, mistrust of law enforcement, and prior negative experiences. Even in cases where complaints were submitted (e.g., in Armenia), investigations were prolonged and violators were not held accountable, fostering a persistent sense of impunity and contributing to the further perpetuation of such practices.

RIGHT NOT TO BE SUBJECTED TO ARBITRARY DEPRIVATION OF LIBERTY

In 2025, 57 cases of violations of the right not to be subjected to arbitrary deprivation of liberty were documented, including unlawful detentions, arrests, and coerced confessions. Such cases were recorded in all countries analyzed except Moldova, with the highest numbers in Tajikistan (23) and Uzbekistan (15).

Unlawful deprivation of liberty by law enforcement officers was documented in 54 cases. Detentions were carried out without legal grounds, procedural documentation, or explanation of rights, and were selective and discriminatory in nature. Formal pretexts included “identity verification,” “operational activities,” “document checks,” “raids,” “migration inspections,” and “complaints from neighbors,” while the actual grounds were the real or perceived affiliation with the LGBT community, HIV status, or the use of online dating platforms, often in the context of fake dates.

Those detained were taken to police stations and held for several hours to several days, with phones confiscated, freedom of movement restricted, and without access to a lawyer. In Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan, a significant number of arrests took place in private spaces — apartments, hotels, clubs, or meeting locations arranged through online dating. In Kazakhstan, mass raids in LGBT-friendly spaces became a common practice, during which people were held for hours without explanation, prohibited from using their phones, required to provide personal data, and subjected to administrative liability on formal grounds unrelated to the stated purpose of the inspections.

Arbitrary detentions were also documented when people sought help. In several cases, trans women who called the police after being attacked were themselves taken to police stations, while the attackers were not held accountable. At the stations, their complaints were refused, and they were subjected to degrading remarks and threats — contributing to a persistent pattern of secondary victimization. Trans women were also detained under the pretext of “appearance not matching documents” — on streets, in transport, and in public spaces, including in Uzbekistan. In some cases, such detentions lasted the entire night and were accompanied by interrogations, humiliation, and threats of further prosecution.

In a number of cases, arbitrary deprivation of liberty was used as a tool of pressure to obtain confessions and signatures on documents. Coercion to give testimony occurred in conditions of isolation, psychological pressure, and threats, and in some cases involved physical violence.

In seven cases (three each in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan), police officers directly stated that a confession such as “I am gay” or “I am bisexual” would allow the individual to avoid criminal prosecution (“we need it for statistics”). Refusals were accompanied by threats to initiate proceedings under Article 120 “Sodomy” of the CC of Uzbekistan, Article 241 “Illegal production and circulation of pornographic materials or objects” of the CC of Tajikistan, Article 125 of the CC of Tajikistan, and Article 113 of the CC of Uzbekistan concerning HIV infection and transmission. After such confessions were obtained, the treatment typically worsened and included insults, humiliation, and threats of outing.

Another persistent practice involved forcing detainees to sign falsified documents — explanations, confessions, statements declaring no complaints, or administrative offense protocols that did not correspond to the actual circumstances. In Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, cases were documented in which, after hours of detention, humiliation, and beatings, detainees were forced to sign such documents under threats of prolonged detention, increased violence, or disclosure of information to third parties.

The documented cases indicate the systemic nature of violations of the right not to be subjected to arbitrary deprivation of liberty. Detention is used not as a lawful measure but as a tool of intimidation, control, and suppression, primarily targeting GBMSM and trans women, followed by coercion to provide false testimony and to refrain from defending their rights.

RIGHT TO EQUALITY AND NON-DISCRIMINATION

Violations of the right to equality and non-discrimination in 2025 were systemic in nature and often intersected with violations of other rights. This section examines cases of discrimination in the sphere of private services — refusals of service and humiliating treatment by employees of commercial establishments. Other forms of discrimination (particularly in employment) are analyzed in the relevant sections of the report.

In 2025, 55 cases of violations of the right to equality and non-discrimination against LGBT people in the sphere of private services were documented across all countries in the region except Armenia and Kazakhstan, with the overwhelming majority recorded in Ukraine (48 cases). Violations mainly manifested in two forms — refusal to provide services (either explicit or disguised) and humiliating treatment. Refusals included being forced out of taxis, denial of accommodation, termination of service in cafés and entertainment establishments, refusal to produce goods or provide services, cancellation of rides, and denial of transport. Humiliating treatment included mockery, insults, public humiliation, moralizing statements about “family values,” intrusive questions, and pressure.

Refusals of service were most frequently recorded in public food, hospitality, leisure, rental, retail, and transportation sectors. Formally, such refusals were explained by “internal rules,” a “family-oriented format,” or complaints from other customers; however, during interactions, the SOGI of those affected was directly or indirectly cited as the true cause. In Ukraine, cases were documented in which same-sex couples were denied service after complaints from visitors about “indecent behavior,” including kissing and hugging, as well as refusals of accommodation in hotels and hostels, frequently accompanied by homophobic rhetoric and refusals to issue refunds. All of these cases constitute direct discrimination and contravene the country’s existing Law “On the Principles of Preventing and Combating Discrimination in Ukraine” [26].

In the sphere of personal services and retail, refusals to fulfill orders were recorded after it became known that the client was an LGBT person or that the order involved a same-sex couple. This included the production of gifts, photo printing, engraving, beauty and tattoo services, as well as termination of service under the pretext of "personal beliefs." In Moldova, a case was documented in which entry to an establishment after the Equality March was denied, demonstrating open discrimination on the grounds of SOGI and public visibility, contrary to the Law "On Ensuring Equality" [27], according to which discrimination committed against a group of persons constitutes a serious form of discrimination, and discrimination in access to publicly available services, including cultural and entertainment services, is prohibited.

A significant number of cases did not end in formal refusal but were accompanied by humiliation. Typical examples included public insults by staff members — cashiers, security guards, administrators, and drivers — often in the presence of other customers. In Ukraine, incidents of humiliation were recorded in shops and supermarkets due to appearance, manner of speech, symbols, or presumed orientation, including direct insults and moralizing remarks referring to the war and "normality."

The transport sector is particularly vulnerable due to the possibility of immediate service termination. In Ukraine, taxi drivers refused to continue trips or forced passengers to leave the vehicle after homophobic comments or display of symbols, which is especially dangerous at night and during the curfew. In Uzbekistan, a case was documented in which a taxi driver insulted and physically attacked a passenger; given the absence of an explicit prohibition of discrimination in the Constitution and the lack of separate anti-discrimination legislation, combined with the criminalization of homosexuality, such circumstances effectively block the ability of the affected individuals to seek protection. In Kyrgyzstan, a trans woman was denied boarding a domestic flight after check-in due to the alleged "mismatch in documents," while in Tajikistan humiliating "interrogations" and intrusions into the private lives of trans women took place at airports. Such cases result from the absence in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan of the possibility to change documents in accordance with gender identity [28], with a change of gender marker available only through court proceedings [29, 30].

In many cases, rapid response mechanisms were used — negotiations with management, written complaints, reports to customer support services, documentation of evidence, and preparation of formal statements. In some incidents, it led to apologies, refunds, or compensation. At the same time, a significant number of cases demonstrates the limitations of such tools: not all affected individuals are prepared to file formal complaints, and "amicable resolution" rarely involves acknowledgment of the discriminatory motive and does not lead to sustainable change.

RIGHT TO FREEDOM OF THOUGHT AND EXPRESSION

In 2025, 37 cases of violations of the right to freedom of thought and expression were documented. The majority of them (35) involved hate speech, public insults, and calls for aggression by private individuals, and were recorded in all countries analyzed except Armenia and Kyrgyzstan. Documented cases show that any form of visibility — social media posts, participation in public events, the use of LGBT symbols, or appearance — is often perceived as "crossing acceptable boundaries" and becomes a trigger for aggression.

The most common form of violation was public insults, threats, and harassment in the digital space. In Kazakhstan and Tajikistan, social media posts — photos with a partner, participation in joint activities, or public statements — resulted in waves of homophobic comments, threats in private messages, and calls for violence. In some cases, the pressure was systematic and accompanied by attempts to establish the personal information of affected individuals.

In offline spaces, hate speech was used as a tool to push LGBT people out of public places and social roles. In Ukraine and Kazakhstan, cases of public insults in cafés, shops, on the street, and in residential buildings were documented, where people were humiliated, forced to leave, or subjected to pressure from those around them. In some cases, aggression was accompanied by threats of physical violence, while the police response was formal or entirely absent, reinforcing a sense of impunity.

Restrictions on freedom of expression were also recorded during public events and peaceful assemblies. In Moldova, participants in the feminist march on March 8 and the LGBT rights march on June 15, 2025, faced insults and aggressive shouts from passersby, with no adequate intervention from law enforcement, which effectively undermined the possibility to safely express beliefs in public space.

Statements by public figures, politicians, and media personalities that normalize hatred and legitimize aggression pose a particular threat. In Moldova, inciting statements targeting LGBT people were documented in 2025, including calls for violence and claims that their presence in society was “unacceptable.” During the “Propaganda of Love” campaign, a local government representative publicly threatened participants, saying they should “kill themselves” and “should not live in Moldova.” In a video address by opposition politician Renato Usatîi, whose violations were also documented in previous years [4], rhetorical remarks about “killing or eliminating LGBT people” were made, illustrating the shift from the expression of opinion to the public justification of violence.

Taken together, these cases indicate a persistent mechanism for restricting freedom of expression, whereby hate speech and threats are used to intimidate and push LGBT people out of public space. The insufficient response of state institutions perpetuates this effect, compelling affected individuals toward self-censorship and withdrawal from public visibility and public life, which directly undermines the realization of this right in the region

RIGHT TO ADEQUATE HOUSING

In 2025, 32 cases of violations of the right to adequate housing were documented in all countries analyzed. In all these cases, the outcome was similar: affected individuals either immediately lost their housing or faced circumstances in which continued residence became unsafe due to threats, pressure, and the risk of violence.

In many cases, eviction was triggered by outing or the leakage of confidential information. In Armenia, a dormitory director, upon overhearing a phone conversation with a partner, forcibly removed the affected person and refused to provide housing to “a gay,” not allowing him to collect his belongings. In Uzbekistan, a landlord demanded that a tenant vacate the apartment following the disclosure of the affected person’s HIV status by a medical worker, accompanying the eviction with threats of public exposure. In another case from Uzbekistan, disclosure of the diagnosis to relatives and neighbors led to forced separate living arrangements.

A significant number of violations is linked to family rejection and the dependent status of minors or young adults. In Kazakhstan, an underage trans girl was expelled from her home after coming out and had to seek temporary shelter. In Ukraine, there were documented cases in which parents or close relatives, upon discovering same-sex relationships, resorted to violence, confiscated documents, and withdrew support, leaving affected individuals without housing or basic resources.

Another persistent mechanism involved pressure from neighbors leading to de facto eviction. In Ukraine, a video of a kissing couple posted in residents' chat groups triggered threats and demands to move out. In another case, systematic insults, graffiti on the door, property damage, and police inaction prompted a landlord to ask the tenant to move out "to avoid problems with neighbors." Similar scenarios were recorded in Moldova, where threats, rumors, and property damage led to forced relocation.

Evictions frequently occurred in conditions of legal vulnerability — in the absence of formal rental agreements. In Ukraine, landlords used this as leverage, demanding to move out immediately and refusing to return deposits, disguising the discriminatory motive with formal complaints about "lifestyle." In cases where documenters intervened, the key tools were negotiation, the collection of evidence, and reminders of the risks associated with violating rental regulations.

In some cases, forced eviction was accompanied by direct threats and the use of government authorities as a means of intimidation. In Ukraine, threats to "tip off the Territorial Recruitment Center," "fabricate the case," or "create problems" were recorded, including a case where the pressure came from a police officer — a relative of the neighbors. In Tajikistan, a conflict with homophobic neighbors led to the intervention of a local police officer and the subsequent demand from the landlord to vacate the property, intensifying fear of public exposure.

As a result, most affected individuals were forced to urgently seek temporary shelter (with friends, in hostels, shelters, or LGBT refuges) and psychological support. A significant factor of vulnerability was not only the eviction itself but also its abrupt nature — at night, without access to belongings, during the curfew, or under the threat of further violence — when the home ceased to be a safe space.

RIGHT TO AN EFFECTIVE REMEDY AND REPARATION

In 2025, 22 cases of violations of the right to an effective remedy and reparation were documented in all countries analyzed except Moldova. Key manifestations included denial of legal assistance, failure or delays in registering complaints, discriminatory treatment, and restricted access to lawyers. In many situations, affected individuals left police stations without their complaints being officially registered or refrained from taking further action due to fear of reprisals or exposure.

The most common practice was refusal to accept a complaint or its de facto obstruction. Affected individuals were told to "wait," "come back later," "calm down," "not waste time," or were directly discouraged from filing a complaint, which denied them access to investigation and reparation mechanisms. Even when complaints were formally accepted, registration was often delayed or artificially impeded. Seeking protection was frequently accompanied by discriminatory and humiliating treatment. Police officers engaged in mockery and insults, asked irrelevant questions, and resorted to victim-blaming, implying that those affected were at fault themselves.

In some cases, complaints were accepted only from alleged violators, while those affected were left to handle the matter on their own or were denied protection. Attempts to obtain legal protection sometimes led to retaliatory pressure from law enforcement — threats of criminal prosecution, coercive measures (including testing), administrative detention, or demands to leave the city. Refusals to provide legal assistance were especially frequent in cases of assault and extortion, including fake dates, outing, harassment, and in cases concerning trans women, where interactions with the police often led to secondary victimization. For example, in Uzbekistan, after filing a complaint about violence, the affected person was threatened with proceedings under Articles 120 and 113 of the CC ("sodomy" and "HIV transmission") with the prospect of imprisonment if the complaint was not withdrawn.

Taken together, these practices resulted in a lack of effective investigation and reparation. A significant number of affected individuals abandoned attempts to seek protection due to fear of exposure, repeated violence, or further pressure, including forced relocation or departure, which highlights the inaccessibility of legal protection for LGBT people in the region.

RIGHT TO EDUCATION

In 2025, 17 cases of violations of LGBT people's right to education were documented — 14 in Ukraine and 3 in Uzbekistan. These violations primarily took the form of systematic bullying and the creation of a hostile environment in educational institutions, as well as expulsions or threats of expulsion.

The most common violation was systematic bullying by classmates, fellow students, and, in some cases, teachers (15 cases). Harassment usually began after outing or suspicion of "non-conformity." In Uzbekistan, a school incident (a kiss between two students) was reported by a teacher to the administration and the parents, which legitimized stigma and led to public condemnation, threats of physical harm, and a forced change of school. In Ukraine, similar mechanisms were triggered when a teacher intervened in private correspondence and made it public, sparking bullying within the group and pressure from families, despite the order issued by the Ministry of Education and Science in 2019 [31].

Bullying was often combined with humiliation, physical aggression, and social isolation, directly affecting attendance and academic performance. Ukrainian cases included systematic insults, exclusion from learning processes, withholding of educational information, and physical violence — from shoving to an incident of humiliation in the toilet (imitation of forced oral sex and immersion of the head in a toilet). In the school environment, such situations were accompanied by prolonged psychological pressure and suicidal thoughts among adolescents.

In some cases, teachers and administration acted not as protectors but as participants in discrimination. In Ukraine, incidents were documented of public humiliation of students due to SOGI, lowered grades, and pressure through academic leverage. In a case involving a trans student, systematic misgendering and derogatory comments by teachers exacerbated bullying within the group and worsened the student's psychological and emotional state. Discrimination based on HIV status also limited access to education. In Uzbekistan, a medical university student was subjected to pressure from the administration following a medical examination, effectively being forced to leave under the pretext of being "unfit" for study. The conflict was only resolved after intervention at the management level, although stigmatization persisted.

A key common mechanism involved educational institutions failing to ensure a safe environment and replacing accountability with narratives such as “you brought it on yourself” or “sort it out among yourselves.” Administrations often ignored complaints or justified those responsible for violations, which reinforced bullying and made leaving school or university the most likely outcome.

Overall, violations of the right to education are closely linked to intrusion into private life, discrimination, and psychological violence, and in some cases — threats to life. The lack of effective anti-discrimination mechanisms and a formal approach to complaints make access to education for LGBT people conditional and unsafe.

RIGHT TO LIFE

In 2025, 13 cases of violations of LGBT people’s right to life were documented, including direct death threats, as well as murders and attempted murders. Such cases were recorded in all countries analyzed, with the exception of Armenia and Moldova. Violations of the right to life primarily occurred in private and interpersonal contexts — in families, in partner and intimate relationships, and in everyday situations. In these settings, the risk of lethal violence is directly linked to outing, stigmatization of SOGI, and the lack of effective protection, making those affected particularly vulnerable.

In several cases, families became a source of direct threats to life and used violence as a form of “punishment” for failure to conform to expected gender or sexual norms. In Tajikistan, a trans girl was brutally beaten by her older brothers and ended up in intensive care. In Kazakhstan, after the outing of a minor, his mother and sister beat him and threatened him with a knife. In Ukraine, threats of murder and physical violence by relatives were recorded following the discovery of same-sex relationships, and these cases demonstrate that the family environment often becomes a space of maximum risk.

Intimate and partner relationships also served as contexts for threats to life and attempted murders. In Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, knife threats from partners were recorded, accompanied by extortion and blackmail with threats of outing. In Uzbekistan, a former partner inflicted severe stab wounds on the victim who upon hospitalization faced threats of criminal prosecution under the article on “sodomy” (Art. 120 of the CC), forcing him to leave the country. In another case from Uzbekistan, a bisexual woman died from beatings inflicted by her husband after the discovery of a same-sex relationship.

Threats to life also came from acquaintances and strangers outside of family or partner relationships. In Uzbekistan, a minor faced threats of physical violence from classmates after outing, while in Ukraine, attacks in public spaces were recorded involving beatings and knife threats after those affected were perceived as LGBT persons.

A particularly dangerous form of violence was fake dates, which carried a high risk of fatal outcomes. In Uzbekistan, a case was recorded in which an encounter was used to carry out a targeted attack — the affected person was beaten, doused with flammable liquid, and set on fire, and then blackmailed with threats of outing to prevent them from seeking protection. In some cases, threats to life came from government representatives — in Uzbekistan, law enforcement officers threatened a lesbian woman and her daughter after detention and multiple days of violence at a police station, using threats as a tool to intimidate and prevent complaints.

Analysis of the cases shows that violations of the right to life are rarely isolated and are typically preceded by outing, extortion, physical violence, arbitrary detention, and pressure from family, social environment, or the government. Given the criminalization of MSM (in Uzbekistan), fear of criminal prosecution, distrust of law enforcement, and entrenched social stigma, the risk of lethal violence for LGBT people becomes part of a recurring chain of violations rather than an exception.

PROTECTION FROM MEDICAL ABUSE

In 2025, 13 cases of medical abuse were documented, the majority of them in Uzbekistan (7 cases), with isolated cases in Moldova, Tajikistan, and Ukraine. The violations included forced HIV testing, anal examinations, and so-called "treatment" used not for health purposes but as a tool of intimidation, punishment, or pressure on grounds of SOGI.

Forced HIV testing was conducted without informed consent and was accompanied by threats of criminal prosecution. In Uzbekistan and Tajikistan, refusal to undergo testing was linked to potential prosecution under laws on "sodomy" (Art. 120 of the CC of Uzbekistan) or "HIV transmission" (Art. 112 of the CC of Uzbekistan, Art. 125 of the CC of Tajikistan), turning the medical procedure into an element of investigative pressure and blackmail, including threats of outing. Cases of mandatory testing after returning from abroad were recorded, including in the context of Uzbekistan's law of August 1, 2025 that requires HIV testing for individuals who were abroad for more than 90 days [32]. In Moldova, an MSM was tested for HIV without notification or consent during a medical examination for university admission, where such testing is not mandatory.

Forced anal examinations were used in Uzbekistan as a punitive and humiliating practice aimed at "proving" same-sex contacts. These procedures were carried out without medical indication or consent, initiated by investigative authorities, and accompanied by threats of criminal prosecution. In some cases, they were combined with forced blood tests for HIV and STIs and demands to "confess" one's sexual orientation.

Forced "treatment" and attempts to "correct" SOGI occurred most commonly in family or religious contexts, involving medical or quasi-medical practitioners. Documented cases include the placement of LGBT individuals in psychiatric institutions at the initiative of family members, the prescription of psychotropic medications without clinical indication (Uzbekistan), and "therapeutic" practices involving priests or healers (Moldova, Tajikistan, Ukraine). These interventions were accompanied by isolation, physical and psychological violence and resulted in severe consequences for mental health, including suicidal thoughts.

Overall, violations of LGBT people's medical rights are not isolated and arise at the intersection of criminalization, stigma, family violence, and state abuse. Under these conditions, the medical system fails to fulfill a protective function and becomes part of a recurring chain of pressure and coercion.

RIGHT TO FREEDOM OF PEACEFUL ASSEMBLY AND ASSOCIATION

In 2025, 8 cases of violations of the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association were documented. The majority were connected to the obstruction of peaceful events in Kazakhstan, Moldova, and Ukraine, and one case concerned pressure on NGOs and human rights activists in Tajikistan. The main consequences were the disruption of events, intimidation of participants, increased self-censorship, and heightened risks for organizers.

Obstacles to peaceful assembly were most commonly carried out through administrative and law enforcement intervention under formal pretexts of "inspections," "identity checks," or "public order violations." In Kazakhstan, the disruption of the public campaign "I Am Not Propaganda" was documented: law enforcement representatives, without legal grounds, restricted the movement of participants, prohibited the use of phones, collected personal data, and recorded videos; some participants were taken to a police station and charged with administrative offenses. At the same time, pressure was also reported against a partner venue in another city, pointing to coordinated attempts to shut down the campaign entirely. Detentions and subsequent administrative prosecutions were also recorded for participants in solo pickets against the draft law prohibiting so-called "LGBT propaganda" [33], adopted on November 12, 2025.

In Ukraine, obstacles were more often caused by radical groups attempting to disrupt closed and semi-closed events. Attempts to enter community centers were recorded, along with the use of hate speech and intimidation. In a number of cases, the police response was delayed or purely formal, and events could only proceed through emergency relocation and enhanced security measures implemented by the organizers.

In Moldova, a case was documented in which participants' access to the Equality March area was temporarily blocked, despite compliance with the notification procedure under the Law "On Assemblies" [34]. Although the event ultimately took place, the restriction of access was perceived as interference with the right to peaceful assembly and occurred against the backdrop of public statements by politicians portraying LGBT events as a "threat." For example, Chișinău Mayor Ion Ceban repeatedly made public statements against the LGBT community, including proposals to ban LGBT community events in the city [35].

Taken together, pressure on peaceful assemblies and NGOs forms a single restrictive mechanism: events are disrupted or driven into highly closed formats, participants avoid publicity, venues withdraw from cooperation, and activists are forced to redirect resources from program activities toward risk management, protection, and security.

RIGHT TO MARRY AND FOUND A FAMILY

In 2025, 4 cases of violations of the right to marry and found a family were documented. In three of them (Moldova, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan), the violations involved the deprivation or restriction of the right to maintain a relationship with a child, while another case in Uzbekistan concerned forced marriage against the will of the affected person. All situations unfolded in the context of family violence, stigma, and pressure of traditional and religious norms, in the absence of effective state protection.

In Uzbekistan, coercion into marriage was used as a form of "punishment" for same-sex relationships and was accompanied by threats, isolation, and pressure that drove the affected person into a suicidal state. After the relationship was discovered, the family effectively deprived the young woman of her freedom and began selecting a husband for her; marriage itself became a forced survival strategy and a means of protection from further violence and expulsion.

In another case from Uzbekistan, marriage was used as a tool of "normalization" and concealment, and discrimination was reproduced at the institutional level. A man living with HIV was married at the initiative of his family and later faced a refusal from a medical professional to recognize his right to biological fatherhood. The doctor denied the possibility of having a healthy child, ignoring current medical protocols. Access to medical care was restored only following the intervention of an NGO and the institution's management. Restrictions on the right to maintain a relationship with a child were also used as a sanction for sexual orientation — in Moldova, a court restricted a father's contact with his child solely on the basis of his homosexuality, referring to abstract notions of "improper upbringing" without assessing actual risks or parenting skills.

Overall, these cases demonstrate that the right to marry and found a family for LGBT people in the region remains precarious. Families often transform from spaces of support into sources of pressure and violence, while state institutions — courts, medical facilities, and child protection authorities — either fail to provide protection or legitimize discrimination themselves, forcing affected individuals to choose between formal family ties and their own autonomy and safety.

RIGHT TO FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT

In 2025, 4 cases of violations of the right to freedom of movement were documented. In three cases, in Kazakhstan and Tajikistan, affected individuals were forced to leave their city or country, and in Ukraine a trans woman was denied the right to cross the state border.

Forced departures were often a direct consequence of violence and systemic pressure from law enforcement authorities. In Tajikistan, a man, after a fake date, illegal detention, torture, and months of blackmail faced confiscation of his internal and international passports as a deliberate mechanism to restrict his freedom of movement. Even after being evacuated with the assistance of activists, he was repeatedly detained at borders due to his details having been entered into informal "stop lists" presumably related to SOGI. In Kazakhstan, a trans woman who contacted the police because of threats was directly advised by officers to leave the city, which was accompanied by humiliation and threats of criminal prosecution.

The denial of the right to cross the border was also discriminatory in nature. In Ukraine, a trans woman was refused permission to leave the country despite possessing valid documents and a medical certificate confirming gender transition. The procedure involved a humiliating search, unauthorized photo and video recording, questions about her private life, and the temporary confiscation of her documents. The refusal was not reviewed even upon confirmation of the documents' authenticity and was further compounded by the publication of material on the official page of the border service. In a transnational context, violations also affected LGBT migrants. In Kazakhstan, following a police raid, foreign nationals — gay men and a trans woman — faced the threat of deportation, and their release was accompanied by extortion. For a trans woman from Tajikistan, intervention by migration authorities created a risk of forced return to a country where she faced persecution and violence.

Taken together, these cases demonstrate that freedom of movement for LGBT people in the region is often conditional. Confiscation of documents, informal stop lists, threats of deportation, denial of border crossing, and pressure to leave are used as tools of control and punishment, particularly at the intersection of SOGI, transgenderness, and migration status.

RIGHT TO SEEK ASYLUM

In 2025, violations of the right to seek asylum affecting LGBT people were documented in Armenia and Moldova. They manifested in refusals to accept applications, discriminatory treatment by migration authorities, and distorted assessment of grounds for international protection related to SOGI — either completely blocking access to the asylum procedure or significantly increasing the risk of return to a country of persecution.

In Armenia, a refusal to accept an application at the initial stage was recorded. A lesbian woman was denied registration of her asylum request after staff at the migration center learned of her sexual orientation. The refusal was not accompanied by any written explanation, and the woman was advised to leave the country within several months. Only following the intervention of a human rights organization and an appeal to the management was the application accepted and an identity document issued.

In Moldova, a refusal was documented in the case of an MSM from Uzbekistan, despite detailed evidence of violence, torture, and coercion to cooperate with the police in a context where homosexuality is criminalized. Migration authorities interpreted his statements as indications of “terrorist and extremist activity,” ignored the context of coercion and threat, formally appointed a lawyer without any meaningful interaction, failed to provide an interpreter, and required him to “prove” his sexual orientation, which violates international asylum standards.

Overall, the right to seek asylum for LGBT people in the region is often violated even before a full examination of the claim begins, or is undermined through biased interpretation of facts, discriminatory requirements, and a lack of procedural guarantees, creating a high risk of denial of protection and subsequent return to the country of persecution.

4

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The analysis of human rights violations against LGBT people in the EECA region in 2025 shows that rights remain conditional and dependent on context, visibility, and the subjective decisions of representatives of the state and society. Without systemic change, violations will continue to be reproduced, and the burden of protection will remain on the affected individuals themselves and on human rights organizations. A shift is therefore needed from reactive responses to individual cases toward a sustainable policy for the protection of LGBT rights based on non-discrimination, accountability of state institutions, and long-term support for civil society.

1. Violations of LGBT rights are systemic and recurring in nature and rarely take place in isolation. Most documented cases represent chains of interconnected violations — from interference with privacy and degrading treatment to violence, arbitrary deprivation of liberty, and threats to life. Key triggers of such chains remain outing, stigma related to SOGI, and power imbalances. State authorities, donors, and international partners should treat violations of LGBT rights as a structural problem requiring comprehensive, cross-sectoral responses rather than as isolated incidents.

2. The number and nature of documented cases in 2025 confirm the need to continue and expand systematic monitoring of LGBT rights violations. Documented cases still reflect only a fraction of the actual scale of violations and significantly depend on geography, resources, and monitoring teams' access to different subgroups within the community. Documentation projects should be scaled up, data collection should expand beyond major cities, cooperation with partner organizations and activists with access to vulnerable subgroups (particularly trans people, LGBT migrants, and youth) should be strengthened, and community legal literacy and readiness to report violations should be enhanced.

3. Law enforcement authorities in many countries of the region remain one of the primary sources of human rights violations against LGBT people — including arbitrary detention, torture, degrading treatment, extortion, and coercion to confess. These practices are systemic and accompanied by a sense of impunity. It is necessary to introduce independent monitoring mechanisms for the actions of law enforcement, mandatory registration of all reports of violations, accessible and safe complaint procedures, and external investigations into cases of violence and abuse of authority with due consideration of SOGI.

4. Interference with privacy — outing, threats to disclose SOGI and HIV status, extortion, unauthorized searches, and access to digital data — is used as a universal mechanism of pressure and control, and the digital environment remains one of the key areas of vulnerability. States and NGOs should strengthen privacy protection measures, including accountability for unlawful outing and extortion, as well as develop programs to raise awareness among LGBT people about safe online practices, risks associated with sharing personal data, and self-protection measures in online dating.

5. Repressive legislation continues to play a key role in perpetuating violations of LGBT people's rights by creating conditions for blackmail, extortion, arbitrary prosecution, and denial of protection. National legislation must be brought into compliance with international human rights standards, including the decriminalization of same-sex relations, the repeal of criminal liability for HIV transmission, and the decriminalization of sex work as a measure to reduce vulnerability to violence and exploitation.

6 Domestic and family violence remains one of the most dangerous and least protected areas for LGBT people. Families often become sources of expulsion, violence, homelessness, and threats to life, particularly for youth and trans people. States should expand domestic violence legislation to include SOGI as a protected characteristic and recognize intimate partner relationships as a possible context of violence, as well as develop networks of shelters, crisis centers, and support programs for LGBT people who cannot live safely with their families.

7 In a number of countries, the healthcare system perpetuates stigma and violence through denial of care, humiliating treatment, disclosure of confidential data, and forced medical interventions. These practices are institutional rather than isolated. Systematic training of medical professionals in non-discriminatory standards of care should be implemented, oversight of confidentiality protections should be strengthened, and modules on SOGI and HIV should be integrated into medical education and professional training programs.

8 Economic pressure — through discrimination in employment, education, and housing — remains a key mechanism for excluding LGBT people from social life and increases their vulnerability to violence and exploitation. The introduction and effective enforcement of anti-discrimination laws explicitly referencing SOGI is recommended, along with the creation of accessible complaint procedures and mechanisms to protect affected individuals from retaliation.

9 Freedom of expression, peaceful assembly, and association remains restricted in the region due to hate speech, pressure from radical groups, and insufficient protection by the state, leading to increased self-censorship and reduced public visibility of the LGBT community. States should actively protect peaceful assemblies, publicly condemn hate speech by politicians and public figures, and impose penalties for incitement to violence.

10 Violations of rights related to asylum and freedom of movement demonstrate that for LGBT people, even attempts to leave a dangerous environment are accompanied by new forms of discrimination and violence. Migration and border authorities must apply procedures consistent with international protection standards, eliminating discriminatory requirements, arbitrary refusals, and interference with applicants' privacy on the basis of SOGI.

COUNTRY-SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

In Uzbekistan, human rights violations against LGBT people are the most repressive and dangerous, including the criminalization of homosexuality, torture, arbitrary detention, medical abuse, and a high risk of lethal violence. Article 120 of the CC and practices of blackmail and extortion associated with it remain a key factor of vulnerability. Therefore, it is necessary to repeal criminal liability for consensual same-sex relations, end the practice of forced medical interventions (anal examinations, HIV testing without consent), ensure independent investigations into cases of torture and cruel treatment on the part of law enforcement, and guarantee LGBT's people access to asylum procedures and protection from forced return.

In Tajikistan, arbitrary detention, extortion, and violence by law enforcement — including sexualized violence and threats of criminal prosecution — are widespread. LGBT people are effectively deprived of effective legal protection..

It is necessary to end the practice of arbitrary detention and pressure on LGBT people under the pretext of “operational activities,” prohibit the use of criminal provisions on HIV (Art. 125 of the CC) and “distribution of pornography” (Art. 241 of the CC) as tools of blackmail, extend the application of the Law “On the Prevention of Domestic Violence” to include partnerships outside formal marriage, and ensure access of NGOs and lawyers to detainees without discrimination.

In Kazakhstan, human rights violations against LGBT people are often linked to arbitrary police practices, raids, online harassment, and discrimination against trans people. The lack of anti-discrimination legislation increases vulnerability. It is therefore recommended to adopt a comprehensive anti-discrimination law including SOGI, end attempts at mass raids and the collection of personal data in LGBT-friendly spaces, ensure protection of trans people from discrimination during border crossings and interaction with government authorities, and strengthen responses to online threats and hate speech.

In Kyrgyzstan, there remains a high level of violence, extortion, and degrading treatment, particularly toward trans women, and seeking protection often leads to secondary victimization. It is necessary to ensure safe and non-discriminatory procedures for filing reports with the police, eliminate threats of criminal prosecution when seeking help, and strengthen law enforcement training on SOGI and human rights.

In Ukraine, violations of LGBT people’s rights primarily occur in the areas of employment, education, housing, and private services, as well as through hate speech. Despite a more developed legal framework, protection often remains formal. It is recommended to include SOGI as protected characteristics in anti-discrimination legislation, strengthen penalties for hate speech and discrimination in private services, ensure non-discriminatory treatment of trans people at border crossings, and expand crisis support networks and shelters for LGBT people.

In Moldova, despite the existence of anti-discrimination legislation that includes SOGI as protected characteristics, cases of hate speech, political rhetoric, denial of services, and restrictions on freedom of expression and assembly persist. It is necessary to actively enforce existing anti-discrimination laws in practice, counter hate speech by politicians and public figures, protect participants in peaceful assemblies and public events, and strengthen non-discriminatory practices in migration and asylum procedures.

In Armenia, LGBT people face violations of the right to housing, discrimination regarding asylum, and a lack of systemic protection mechanisms against discrimination. It is necessary to adopt a separate anti-discrimination law that includes SOGI, ensure non-discriminatory access to asylum procedures, and expand both governmental and non-governmental support infrastructure for LGBT people without housing.

SOURCES

- Hsieh H-F, Shannon SE. Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. Qualitative Health Research. 2005;15(9):1277-88. doi: 10.1177/1049732305276687.
- The Yogyakarta Principles. Principles on the Application of International Human Rights Law in Relation to Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity. Yogyakarta, Indonesia; 2006 6-9 November.
- Kovtun O, Tilek kyzy E, Masiumova N. Being yourself is a defect: analysis of documented rights violations related to sexual orientation, gender identity and HIV in 2022 using the REAct system in six eastern European, Caucasus and Central Asian countries. Journal of the International AIDS Society. 2024;27(S3):e26311. doi: 10.1002/jia2.26311.
- Kovtun O. Regional Report on Violations of the Human Rights of LGBT People in the Countries of Eastern Europe and Central Asia 2024. ECOM; 2024. Available from: https://ecom.ngo/library/regionaljniy-otchet-2024/.
- Lichtenstein M, Rucks-Ahidiana Z. Contextual Text Coding: A Mixed-methods Approach for Large-scale Textual Data. Sociological Methods & Research. 2021;52(2):606-41. 10.1177/0049124120986191.
- Younas A, Cuoco A, Vellone E, Fàbregues S, Barrios ELE. Contextual Coding in Qualitative Research Involving Participants with Diverse Sociocultural Backgrounds. The Qualitative Report. 2022;27(11):2509-27. doi: 10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5702.
- Kleinheksel AJ, Rockich-Winston N, Tawfik H, Wyatt TR. Demystifying Content Analysis. Am J Pharm Educ. 2020;84(1):7113. doi: 10.5688/ajpe7113.
- Cash P, Snider C. Investigating design: A comparison of manifest and latent approaches. Design Studies. 2014;35(5):441-72. doi: 10.1016/j.destud.2014.02.005.
- Falck F, Bränström R. The significance of structural stigma towards transgender people in health care encounters across Europe: Health care access, gender identity disclosure, and discrimination in health care as a function of national legislation and public attitudes. BMC Public Health. 2023;23(1):1031. doi: 10.1186/s12889-023-15856-9.
- Hate Crime Data-Collection and Monitoring Mechanisms: A Practical Guide. Warsaw: OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR); 2014. Available from: https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/3/a/124533.pdf.
- Criminal Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan (1994).
- Law of the Republic of Armenia “On the Prevention of Family and Domestic Violence and Protection of Persons Exposed to Family and Domestic Violence” (2024).
- Law of the Republic of Moldova “On the Prevention and Combating of Violence against Women and Domestic Violence” (2024).
- Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan “On the Prevention of Domestic Violence” (2009).
- Law of the Kyrgyz Republic “On the Protection and Defence Against Domestic Violence” (2017).
- Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On Amendments and Additions to Certain Legislative Acts of the Republic of Uzbekistan in Connection with the Further Improvement of the System For the Reliable Protection of the Rights, Freedoms and Legitimate Interests of Women and Children” (2023).

- Law of Ukraine “On Preventing and Combating Domestic Violence” (2023).
- Law of the Republic of Tajikistan “On the Prevention of Domestic Violence” (2013).
- Criminal Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan (2014).
- Criminal Code of the Republic of Tajikistan (1998).
- Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On Combating the Spread of the Disease Caused by the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV Infection)” (2013).
- Country Overview: Kazakhstan: Outright International; 2025. Available from: https://outrightinternational.org/our-work/europe-and-central-asia/kazakhstan.
- Analysis of the national legislation of Kazakhstan related to SOGI and HIV. ECOM; 2024. Available from: https://ecom.ngo/resource/files/2024/09/ecom_national_kazahstan_2024_rus.pdf.
- Criminal Code of the Republic of Armenia (2021).
- Criminal Code of Ukraine (1991).
- Law of Ukraine “On the Principles of Preventing and Combating Discrimination in Ukraine” (2014).
- Law of the Republic of Moldova “On Ensuring Equality” (2012).
- Study Reviewing Access of Trans People to Healthcare Services, Including HIV Prevention and Treatment Services and Hormone Replacement Therapy in the EECA Region. ECOM; 2024. Available from: https://ecom.ngo/resource/files/2024/06/ecom_transmedicine_2024_rus.pdf.
- National Report on Violations of the Rights of LGBT People in Kyrgyzstan. ECOM; 2024. Available from: https://ecom.ngo/library/natsionaljniy-otchet-kirgizstan-2024/.
- Country Overview: Tajikistan: Outright International; 2025. Available from: https://outrightinternational.org/our-work/europe-and-central-asia/tajikistan.
- Certain Issues of Responding to Cases of Bullying and the Application of Educational Measures in Educational Institutions (2019).
- ECOM’s Position: Amendments to the Laws on Mandatory HIV Testing in the Republic of Uzbekistan. ECOM; 2025. Available from: https://ecom.ngo/news/mandatory-hiv-testing-uzbekistan/.
- Kazakhstan: Proposed ’LGBT Propaganda’ law risks institutionalising discrimination, warn UN experts. UN; 2025. Available from: https://www.ohchr.org/ru/press-releases/2025/11/kazakhstan-proposed-lgbt-propaganda-law-risks-institutionalising.
- Law of the Republic of Moldova “On Assemblies” (2008).
- Gay Parade to Be Banned in Chișinău: How Is This Linked to the Elections? Deutsche Welle; 2025. Available from: here.


ECOM