

Czech Republic Immigration Detention Data Profile



Quick Facts	
Immigration detainees (2017)	648
Detained minors (2017)	250
Persons expelled (2018)	820
International migrants (2019)	512,705
New asylum applications (2019)	2,809

NOTES ON USING THIS PROFILE

- Sources for the data provided in this report are available online at: <https://www.globaldetentionproject.org/countries/europe/czech-republic>
- "Observation Dates" indicate the timeframe statistical data correspond to or other data were last validated. More than one statistical entry for a year indicates contrasting reports.

STATISTICS

Detention, expulsion, and incarceration statistics

		Observation Date			Observation Date
Total number of immigration detainees by year	648	2017	Top nationalities of detainees	Ukraine, Moldova, Vietnam, Nigeria, Afghanistan	2017
	606	2016			
	2,564	2015			
	1,761	2015			
	404	2014			
	229	2014			
	183	2013			
	770	2013			
	250	2013			
	352	2013			
	366	2012			
	202	2012			
	320	2012			
	334	2011			
	370	2011			
	822	2010			
	1,177	2009			
Number of persons granted alternatives to immigration detention	19	2015	Total number of detained minors	250	2017
	44	2014		364	2016
	57	2013		22	2013
	70	2012		11	2012
	65	2011		7	2011
				40	2010
Number of detained accompanied minors	22	2013	Number of apprehensions of non-citizens	4,505	2018
	11	2012		4,360	2017
	7	2011		4,885	2016
	37	2010		8,165	2015
				4,430	2014
				3,695	2013
				3,315	2012
Immigration detainees as a percentage of total international migrant population	0.08	2013	Number of dedicated long-term immigration detention centres	3	2018
	0.21	2010		1	2014

Estimated capacity of dedicated long-term immigration detention centres	488	2017	Number of persons removed/returned (voluntary returns and deportations)	820	2018
	273	2014		805	2017
				530	2016
				1,715	2015
				320	2014
				330	2013
				430	2012
Number of deportations/forced returns only	225	2018	Percentage of persons removed in relation to total number of people placed in removal procedures	131	2017
	265	2017		13	2014
	265	2016			
	Not Available	2015			
	Not Available	2014			
Criminal prison population	21,623	2019	Percentage of foreign prisoners	8.3	2019
	22,830	2017		8	2017
	17,491	2014		8.8	2014
Prison population rate (per 100,000 of national population)	203	2019			
	216	2017			
	166	2014			
Demographics and immigration-related statistics					
		Observation Date			Observation Date
Population	10,700,000	2020	International migrants	512,705	2019
	10,543,000	2015		433,300	2017
	10,600,000	2012		405,100	2015
				432,800	2013
				398	2010
International migrants as a percentage of the population	4.1	2017	Estimated number of undocumented migrants	100,000 - 195,000	2005
	3.8	2015			
	4	2013			
Refugees	2,054	2019	Ratio of refugees per 1000 inhabitants	0.35	2016
	2,186	2018		0.3	2014
	3,580	2016		0.27	2012
	3,644	2015			
	3,184	2014			
Total number of new asylum applications	2,809	2019	Refugee recognition rate	12.1	2014
	1,385	2016			
	914	2014			
	753	2012			

Stateless persons	1,502	2016	
	1,502	2015	

DOMESTIC LAW

LEGAL TRADITION

Legal tradition	Name	Observation Date
	Civil law	2018

LAWS AND REGULATIONS

Constitutional guarantees?	Yes/No	Constitution and Articles	Year Adopted	Last Year Amended
	Yes	Charter of Fundamental Rights and Basic Freedoms, article 8	1992	

LAWS AND REGULATIONS

Core pieces of national legislation	Name	Year Adopted	Last Year Amended
	Act No. 325/1999 Coll. of 11 November 1999 on Asylum	1999	2017
	Act No. 326/1999 Coll. of 30 November 1999 on the Residence of Foreign Nationals (Foreign Nationals Act)	1999	2018

GROUNDS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE IMMIGRATION-RELATED DETENTION

Immigration-status-related grounds	Name	Observation Date
	Detention to prevent unauthorised entry at the border	2018
	Detention for failing to respect non-custodial measures	2018
	Detention for failing to respect a voluntary removal order	2018
	Detention to effect removal	2018
	Detention for unauthorised entry or stay	2018
	Detention to establish/verify identity and nationality	2018
	Detention pending transfer to another Schengen country	2018
	Detention during the asylum process	2018
	Detention to ensure transfer under the Dublin Regulation	2018

GROUNDS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE IMMIGRATION-RELATED DETENTION

Non-immigration-status-related grounds providing for administrative detention in immigration legislation.	Name	Observation Date
	Detention on public order, threats or security grounds	2018

CRIMINALIZATION OF IMMIGRATION-RELATED OFFENCES

Does the country provide specific criminal penalties for immigration-related violations?	Fines	Incarceration	Observation Date
	Yes	No	2016

LENGTH OF DETENTION				
Maximum length for administrative immigration detention in law.	Number of Days		Observation Date	
	545		2018	
LENGTH OF DETENTION				
Average length of detention	Number of Days		Observation Date	
	80		2014	
	51		2013	
	77		2012	
	83		2011	
	79		2010	
	60		2009	
LENGTH OF DETENTION				
Maximum length of detention for asylum-seekers	Number of Days		Observation Date	
	120		2018	
PROCEDURAL STANDARDS				
Provision of basic procedural standards	Name	In Law	In Practice	Observation Date
	Right to appeal the lawfulness of detention	Yes		2018
	Complaints mechanism regarding detention conditions	Yes		2018
	Information to detainees	Yes		2018
	Right to legal counsel	Yes		2018
NON-CUSTODIAL MEASURES (ALTERNATIVES TO DETENTION)				
Types of non-custodial measures	Name	In Law	In Practice	Observation Date
	Designated non-secure housing	No	Yes	2020
	Release on bail	Yes	No	2014
	Supervised release and/or reporting	Yes	Yes	2014
	Designated non-secure housing	No	No	2014
	Registration (deposit of documents)	No	No	2014
	Electronic monitoring	No	No	2014
VULNERABLE PERSONS				
Is the detention of vulnerable persons provided in law? Are they detained in practice?	Name	In Law	In Practice	Observation Date
	Accompanied minors	Prohibited	Yes	2016
	Unaccompanied minors	Prohibited	Not available	2016
	Asylum seekers	Provided	Not available	2016

MANDATORY DETENTION

Mandatory detention	Filter	Name	Observation Date
	No	No	2018

COVID-19 UPDATES

	Update Status	Observation Date
<p>Latest Update</p>	<p>Responding to the Global Detention Project’s Covid-19 survey, the Public Defender of Rights (Ombudsman) of the Czech Republic reported that no moratorium on new immigration detention orders had been established and that no such measure was under consideration. However, the Czech Ombudsman said that despite this, it seems that authorities have minimised the numbers of immigration detention decisions ordered during recent months, especially during the first weeks of the state emergency which had been declared on 12 March 2020 and ended on 17 May 2020. Between 12 March and 19 May, 8 persons were placed in immigration detention, of whom 5 were detained for the purpose of Dublin transfers. On 20-21 May, 25 non-citizens were detained and in the period of 22 May to 7 June, 12 more persons were detained. The Ombudsman office was unable to obtain information on detention orders issued after 7 June. Since 1 April, the Bělá-Jezová Detention Centre has been operating as a mixed facility, serving as a temporary mandatory quarantine facility for newly arriving asylum seekers and newly detained migrants, who are confined separately from the standard detainee population while in quarantine (see 4 June Czech Republic update on this platform). The “preventive quarantine” section’s staff consists solely of doctors and police officers. All new asylum seekers and newly detained migrants are automatically sent to this centre and they are obliged to abide with all quarantine measures. Following 14 days of quarantine, and if they do not test positive for Covid-19, they are sent to the respective facilities—regular reception centres for asylum seekers or migration detention for people in removal procedures. Under Czech Republic law, for a person to be legally detained, they must fall under one of the grounds provided by the Foreign Nationals Act 1999 (FNA), including, inter alia, section 124(1), whereby “police may detain a non-citizen who is over 15 years of age: 1) if they have been notified about the commencement of administrative expulsion proceedings; 2) if a final decision on administrative expulsion has been made; or 3) if a re-entry ban has been imposed by another EU member state. The same section subsequently lists the specific grounds justifying detention in the above circumstances. As indicated by the Ombudsman, following this determination, authorities conduct an assessment of whether non-custodial measures would be sufficient. These non-custodial measures (“alternatives to detention” or ATD) are: 1) the obligation to provide the address of one’s place of residence, to reside at that address and report any change of address to the police on the following working day; 2) the obligation to provide a security deposit; 3) the obligation to report in person at a police station within a time limit stipulated by the police on a regular basis; and/or 4) the obligation to stay at a designated place by the police and be present to undergo a residential control. Of the 25 non-citizens detained on 20-21 May, 23 were issued a detention order according to the above-mentioned reasoning, as they were deemed to not fulfil the conditions for an ATD measure to be imposed. All 23 non-citizens would have to undergo a quarantine because: 1) some of the non-citizens provided an address where they could stay, which was far from the place where the arrest took place. It would be dangerous to let the person travel there, as it may constitute a threat to public health; 2) the security deposit was not sufficient due to the lack of prospect of the foreigner leaving the territory, given that borders were closed and in general, countries imposed travel restrictions; 3) in light of the quarantine measures taken, it was not possible for a non-citizen to report in person to a police station; and 4) police could in theory appoint a specific place for a returnee to stay, but this specific place was dedicated to vulnerable persons and so the non-citizens in question did not fulfil this criterion. Police authorities thus concluded that ATD measures were not sufficient and issued a immigration detention orders. The Ombudsman office informed that they were not aware of any detainees released from immigration detention and that rather, they had been informed of several detention extension orders. In addition, the Public Defender of Rights said that they were unaware of any measures taken to prevent the spread of Covid-19 when migrants or asylum seekers are released from detention centres. Before 1 April, detainees were reportedly tested in the facilities where they were held. After that date and following the opening of the temporary quarantine facility at Bělá-Jezová, each person that is sent there is to undergo a Covid-19 test and an x-ray scan. Detainees are then tested again for Covid-19, 13 or 14 days following their arrival. If the second test is also negative, they are to be transferred almost immediately to another facility, depending on his or her legal status. The Ombudsman office said that as far as they were aware, staff and detainees in detention and reception centres were provided with personal protective equipment. In addition, in these centres, several restrictions were imposed on visits, legal services, group-based activities in the centres, dining rules in collective canteens and others. The temporary facility however has a different regime. A systematic visit under the NPM mandate was carried out in this facility, yet the report has not been made public so far and so the Office of the Public Defender of Rights has refrained from commenting on this issue for the time being. Moreover, the Ombudsman office stated that removals had been halted in practice. However, they have not received any formal notice of this from the government. With protective measures being lifted progressively, some removals to Slovakia have been carried out in recent weeks. The government of the Czech Republic took several measures regarding immigration. From 14 March, the government banned the entry of foreign nationals to the country but provided certain exceptions. There was, however, no limitation on lodging applications for asylum. In addition, the government announced a ban on the entry of all foreign nationals arriving from states which were considered as highly risky at the time. This did nonetheless not apply to foreign nationals with a temporary residence permit for more than 90 days, permanent residence permit, and foreign nationals, whose entry was in the interest of the Czech Republic. Embassies of the Czech Republic suspended the processing of applications for visas as well as temporary and permanent residence permits, with the exception of those whose entry was in the interest of the country. Following the end of the state of emergency on 17 May, the Ministry of Health has been regulating cross-border movement by its protective measures. Currently, EU Member States, Norway, the United Kingdom, Iceland, Lichtenstein, and Switzerland are divided into three groups - high, medium and low-risk states. Individuals coming from these states, would have had different measures applied upon them. The Ombudsman office said that Government Resolution No. 198 stipulated that foreign nationals who were lawfully temporarily or permanently present in the territory of the Czech Republic at the time of the declaration of the state of emergency were entitled to remain in the territory for the duration of the state of emergency. Also, foreign nationals whose visa or residence permit expired during this period are obliged to leave the territory within 60 days from the day when the state of emergency ended (i.e. 16 July 2020). No expulsion proceedings would be initiated against these foreign nationals and they would not be penalised for their stay in the territory during this period.</p>	<p>2020</p>
	<p>According to information provided to the GDP by Hana Frankova (Organisation for Aid to Refugees), Czech authorities have continued to arrest non-nationals during the pandemic. After their arrest, non-nationals have been moved to Bělá Jezová Detention Centre, which has been temporarily converted into a quarantine reception centre. All new asylum seekers have also been required to quarantine at this facility - but they have been held separately to migrant detainees. Quarantine lasts for 14 days, and everyone held in the facility is tested for the virus. Prior to Bělá Jezová’s conversion into a quarantine facility, new detainees who were held at the Vyšní Lhoty and Balková detention centres were tested for the virus at the beginning and end of their quarantine period. In all three detention facilities, detainees have been provided with face masks and disinfectant. While deportations were not officially halted by authorities, the closure of borders and suspension of international travel prevented both Dublin transfers and administrative expulsions. (However, according to one non-governmental source who contacted the GDP on the condition of anonymity, since mid-May authorities have sought to resume Dublin transfers to EU states to which direct flights are operating.) Those awaiting deportation have not been released. Instead, their detention has been prolonged—and these extensions have been conducted without the usual procedural steps taking place. The Organization for Aid to Refugees is, however, aware of at least one case in which a detainee’s detention was not prolonged and the individual was instead released. Having ramped up its detention capacity in recent years, authorities have also been systematically detaining asylum seekers—despite repeated criticisms from human rights bodies, including the Committee against Torture (in 2018) and the Human Rights Committee (in 2013). During the crisis, however, authorities reportedly moved detained asylum seekers to open reception facilities (or “accommodation centres”).</p>	<p>2020</p>

INTERNATIONAL LAW

Relevant international treaties and date of ratification		
International treaties	Name	Ratification Year
	ICPED, International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance	2017
	OP CRC Communications Procedure	2015
	CTOCTP, Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children	2014
	CTOCSP, Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime	2013
	CRPD, Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities	2009
	OPCAT, Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment	2006
	CRSSP, Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons	2004
	ICERD, International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination	1993
	ICCPR, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights	1993
	ICESCR, International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights	1993
	CEDAW, Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women	1993
	CAT, Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment	1993
	CRC, Convention on the Rights of the Child	1993
	CRSR, Geneva Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees	1993
PCRSR, Protocol to the Geneva Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees	1993	
VCCR, Vienna Convention on Consular Relations	1993	
Ratio of relevant international treaties ratified	16/19	
Relevant international treaties and date of ratification		
Individual complaints procedure	Name	Acceptance Year
	CRC, [Third] Optional Protocol to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child establishing a communications procedure, 2011	2015
	CEDAW, Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, 1999	2001
	ICERD, declaration under article 14 of the Convention	2000
	CAT, declaration under article 22 of the Convention	1996
	ICCPR, First Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966	1993
Relevant international treaties and date of ratification		
Ratio of complaints procedures accepted	Number	Observation Date
	5/7	
	5/7	

Relevant international treaties and date of ratification

	Name	Recommendation Excerpt	Recommendation Year
<p style="text-align: center;">Relevant recommendations issued by treaty bodies</p>	Committee against Torture	<p>§21: (a) End the practice of detaining persons in need of international protection, particularly children, and ensure the provision of alternative accommodation for families with children; (b) Continue its efforts to improve material conditions in reception centres and detention facilities, including with regard to provision of basic necessities, health-care services and educational and recreational opportunities for children; (c) Provide free legal assistance at all reception and detention centres, and facilitate access to those places by NGOs providing legal assistance; (d) Develop and implement a standard procedure for the identification and protection of persons in vulnerable situations, including victims of torture and ill-treatment; (e) Review the policy of obliging detained foreigners awaiting deportation to pay for their detention, with a view to abolishing it.</p>	2018
	Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women	<p>§ 39: The Committee urges the State party to immediately cease the detention of asylum-seeking, refugee or irregular migrant women and their children and to implement less coercive alternative measures.</p>	2016
	Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination	<p>§ 26: The Committee recommends that the State party duly consider alternatives to detention of asylum seekers and use detention as a last resort and for the shortest appropriate period, avoid detention of asylum seekers under 18 years of age, ensure that the conditions of all immigration detention and reception centres are in conformity with international standards, and end the practice of issuing expulsion orders prior to registering asylum applications.</p>	2015
	Human Rights Committee	<p>§17: The State party should: (a) Reduce the maximum legal period of detention for foreign minors awaiting deportation and, in any event, ensure that detention of children is permitted only as a measure of last resort and for the shortest appropriate period; (b) Take measures to ensure that the detention of foreigners is always reasonable, necessary and proportionate in light of the individual circumstances, that detention is resorted to for the shortest appropriate period and only if the existing alternatives to administrative detention have been duly considered and deemed not appropriate; (c) Ensure that the holding of asylum-seekers in reception centres is applied only as a measure of last resort for the shortest appropriate period, after due consideration of less invasive means; (d) Ensure that the physical conditions in all immigration detention and reception centres are in conformity with international standards.</p>	2013
	Committee against Torture	<p>§ 17: The Committee recommends that the State party implement alternatives to detention of asylum seekers, including unconditional release, in particular of families with children and asylum seeking adults who are responsible for children; that asylum seekers enjoy freedom of movement in closed reception centres, with adequate reception conditions; that the State party review the duration of restrictions on freedom of movement of asylum seekers in closed reception centres and that it review the regime and material conditions in centres for foreign nationals awaiting deportation in order to ensure that they are in conformity with the principle of non-refoulement set out in article 3 of the Convention and in the 1951 Convention on the Status of Refugees</p>	2012
	Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination	<p>§ 20: The Committee calls on the State party to include in the next periodic report information [...] on the situation of foreigners in detention centres.</p>	2011
	Committee on the Rights of the Child	<p>§ 64: The Committee reiterates its previous recommendation (CRC/C/15/Add.201) to the State party to avoid any form of detention of asylum-seekers under 18 years of age. The Committee further recommends that the State party consider all possible alternatives, including unconditional release, prior to detention and emphasizes that this should not be limited to unaccompanied or separated minors, but extended to all cases involving children.</p>	2011

Regional treaties, regulations, and directives

Regional legal instruments	Name	Year of Ratification (Treaty) / Transposed (Directive) / Adoption (Regulation)
	CPCSE, Convention on the Protection of Children against Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse	2016
	CATHB, Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings	2017
	ECHR, Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (commonly known as the European Convention on Human Rights)	1992
	ECHR1, Protocol 1 to the European Convention on Human Rights (amended by protocol 11)	1992
	ECHR7, Protocol 7 to the European Convention on Human Rights (amended by protocol 11)	1992
	ECPT, European Convention for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment of Punishment	1995

Regional treaties, regulations, and directives

	Name	Recommendation Excerpt	Recommendation Year	Observation Date
<p>Recommendations issued by regional human rights mechanisms</p>	<p>European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT)</p>	<p>§30: Pursuant to Section 134, paragraph 3, of the Law on the Residence of Foreigners, outdoor exercise may be restricted or cancelled by the police on “serious grounds”. [...] the Committee recommends that the aforementioned legal restrictions be abolished.</p> <p>§ 31: the imposition of the strict regime does not in itself entail a solitary confinement regime. In practice, however, it may well be the case that only one foreign national is placed in the strict regime unit at a time. [...] the CPT trusts that the Czech authorities will take the necessary measures to ensure that foreign nationals who are de facto held in a solitary-confinement-type regime are provided with appropriate human contact on a daily basis.</p> <p>§ 32: the CPT considers that the accommodation of children accompanying their parent(s) together with other adults in a detention centre can have a negative psychological effect on the child’s development and well-being, particularly when the child is young. The placement of minors with their parents in a detention centre should only occur as a last resort, and if, in exceptional circumstances, such placement cannot be avoided, its duration should be as short as possible. Every possible effort should be made to avoid separation of children from their parent(s).</p> <p>§33: the CPT recommends that the necessary measures be taken to ensure that unaccompanied/separated minors are always provided with special care and accommodated in an open (or semi-open) establishment specialised for juveniles (e.g. a social welfare/educational institution for juveniles); if necessary, the relevant legal framework should be amended accordingly. §34: the CPT recommends that the Czech authorities take steps to ensure that a staff member competent to provide first aid, preferably with a recognised nursing qualification, is always present in the Centre, including at night.</p> <p>§36: The Committee recommends that measures be taken to provide professional interpretation when required during medical examinations.</p> <p>§37: the delegation noted that almost no members of staff who were directly in contact with foreign nationals spoke any foreign language. Further, many members of staff - in particular those deployed by the private security company - had apparently received no specific training to work in a multi-ethnic environment. The CPT recommends that the Czech authorities take appropriate measures to remedy these deficiencies.</p> <p>§38: Some private security staff usually carried pepper spray canisters inside the detention areas. According to the management, such devices had never been used in the Centre. The CPT recommends that the Czech authorities take the necessary steps to ensure that the above-mentioned precepts are effectively implemented in practice.</p> <p>§41: It is regrettable that foreign nationals were usually allowed to receive visits only in semi open booths and were thus prevented from having any physical contact with the visitor(s). In the CPT’s view, visiting rooms should enable immigration detainees to meet under open conditions with family and friends visiting them, and the environment should be child-friendly (including a play area for children). If, exceptionally, it is considered necessary to impose restrictions on a particular foreign national, this should be done on the basis of an individual risk assessment. The Committee recommends that the necessary steps be taken in the light of the above remarks.</p>	<p>2014</p>	<p>2014</p>

Bilateral/Multilateral agreements linked to readmissions

Bilateral/multilateral agreements linked to readmission	Name	Year in Force	Observation Date
	Germany	1995	2017
	Austria	2005	2017
	Bulgaria	1998	2017
	Bulgaria	2005	2017
	Croatia	2004	2017
	Hungary	1995	2017
	Italy	1999	2017
	Norway	1993	2017
	Poland	1993	2017
	Romania	1994	2017
	Slovakia	2004	2017
	Slovenia	2004	2017
	Switzerland	2011	2017
	Armenia	2011	2017
	Kosovo	2011	2017
	Moldova	2004	2017
	Moldova	2012	2017
	Montenegro	2012	2017
	Russian Federation	2012	2017
Ukraine	2015	2017	
Canada	1996	2017	
Viet Nam	2008	2017	

Non treaty-based international human rights mechanisms

Visits by special procedures of the Human Rights Council	Name	Year of Visit	Observation Date
	None		2018

Non treaty-based international human rights mechanisms

Relevant recommendations by UN Special Procedures	Name	Recommendation Excerpt	Recommendation Year	Observation Date
	None			2018

Non treaty-based international human rights mechanisms

Relevant recommendations of the UN Universal Periodic Review	Recommendation Issued	Year Issued	Observation Date
	No	2008	2017
	Yes	2012	

INSTITUTIONAL INDICATORS

Governing structures																
Federal or centralized governing system		Federal or centralized governing system									Observation Date					
		Centralized system									2016					
Governing structures																
Centralized or decentralized immigration authority		Centralized or decentralized immigration authority									Observation Date					
		Centralized immigration authority									2017					
Institutions responsible for immigration detention																
Custodial authority		Agency			Ministry			Ministry Typology			Observation Date					
		Refugee Facilities Administration			Ministry of the Interior			Interior or Home Affairs			2017					
		Administration of Refugee Facilities			Ministry of the Interior			Interior or Home Affairs			2007					
		Police			Ministry of Interior						2006					
		Administration of Refugee Facilities			Ministry of the Interior			Interior or Home Affairs			2005					
Institutions responsible for immigration detention																
Detention Facility Management		Entity Name									Entity Type		Observation Date			
		Interior Ministry's Refugee Facilities Administration									Governmental		2017			
		Police									Governmental		2014			
		Refugee Facility Administration of the Ministry of the Interior of the Czech Republic									Governmental		2009			
		Ministry of Education									Governmental		2007			
		Administration of Refugee Facilities									Governmental		2005			
Institutions responsible for immigration detention																
Formally designated detention estate?		Formally designated immigration detention estate?				Types of officially designated detention centres						Observation Date				
		Yes				Dedicated immigration detention facilities						2018				
Institutions responsible for immigration detention																
Types of detention facilities used in practice		Immigration detention centre (Administrative)	Immigration field office (Administrative)	Transit centre (Administrative)	Reception centre (Administrative)	Offshore detention centre (Administrative)	Hospital (Administrative)	Border guard (Administrative)	Police station (Criminal)	National penitentiary (Criminal)	Local prison (Criminal)	Juvenile detention centre (Criminal)	Informal camp (Ad hoc)	Immigration detention centre (Ad hoc)	Surge facility (Ad hoc)	Observation Date
Yes										Yes						2014
Detention monitoring institutions																
Authorized monitoring institutions		Institution					Institution Type					Observation Date				
		Organization for Aid to Refugees					Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO)					2018				
		Public Defender of Rights (Ombudsman)					National Human Rights Institution (or Ombudsperson) (NHRI)					2017				
		European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment					International or Regional Bodies (IRBs)					2014				

Detention monitoring institutions																
Does NHRI carry out visits?		Does NHRI carry out visits in practice?								Observation Date						
		Yes								2018						
Detention monitoring institutions																
Does NHRI publicly release reports on immigration detention?		Does NHRI publicly release reports on immigration detention?								Observation Date						
		Yes								2018						
Detention monitoring institutions																
Does national preventive mechanism (NPM) carry out visits?		Does NPM carry out visits in practice?								Observation Date						
		Yes								2016						
Detention monitoring institutions																
Does NPM publicly release reports on immigration detention?		Does NPM publicly release reports on immigration detention?								Observation Date						
		Yes								2016						
Detention monitoring institutions																
Do NGOs carry out visits?		Do NGOs regularly carry our visits?								Observation Date						
		Yes								2018						
Detention monitoring institutions																
Do international and/or regional bodies (IRBs) visit immigration-related detention facilities?		Do international and/or regional bodies (IRB) regularly visit immigration-related detention facilities?								Observation Date						
		Yes								2014						
Detention monitoring institutions																
Do IRBs publicly report their findings from inspections?		Do IRBs publicly report their findings from detention inspections?								Observation Date						
		Yes								2014						
Outsourcing and privatisation																
Types of privatisation/outsourcing		Types of Privatisation/Outsourcing								Observation Date						
		Detention facility security								2018						
Outsourcing and privatisation																
Detention contractors and other non-state entities	Name of entity	Type of entity	Detainee transport	Food services	Health care	Social services	Laundry services	Legal counselling	Management	Owner of detention facility	Recreation	Security	Telephone service	Translation services	Observation Date	
	Unnamed private security company	For profit										Yes			2018	

More information about immigration detention in Czech Republic is available at the website of the Global Detention Project (www.globaldetentionproject.org)