

## Supreme Court Ruling Strengthens Government Power in Citizenship Deprivation Cases

June 27, 2025

— Categories: Human Rights



The UK Supreme Court has further narrowed the scope for individuals appealing against the removal of British citizenship, in a decision that reinforces the government's authority over national security matters. The ruling, shaped by the long-running case of Shamima Begum, sets clearer

limits on how far courts can go in challenging ministerial decisions in cases involving terrorism and public safety concerns.

Begum, who was stripped of her British citizenship in 2019 after travelling to Syria as a teenager and joining ISIS, had argued that she could not mount a fair appeal from the Syrian detention camp where she remains. The Court of Appeal initially agreed that she should be allowed to return to the UK to participate in her legal challenge. But the Supreme Court disagreed, ruling that national security concerns should take precedence, and that it is not for the courts to second-guess the Home Secretary's judgment in such matters.

The justices made clear that the appeal process in these cases falls under administrative law, meaning the courts can review whether decisions were made lawfully and rationally, but not whether they were right or fair in a broader sense. The Special Immigration Appeals Commission (SIAC), which handles sensitive cases involving national security, can hear new evidence and examine legal arguments. But it must ultimately defer to the Home Secretary's assessment of the risks involved.

The ruling has drawn mixed responses. Supporters argue that it reinforces accountability by leaving national security decisions with elected officials rather than the courts. Others, including human rights advocates, worry that the decision reduces meaningful oversight and may limit access to justice, particularly for individuals stuck abroad and unable to fully participate in legal proceedings.

In practice, the Begum case has become a legal landmark, shaping how citizenship deprivation appeals are likely to be handled going forward. It

confirms that while courts retain a reviewing role, the government has the final say when it comes to questions of national security and the rights of those accused of threatening it.