

Woman Challenges UK Government Over Citizenship Revocation Without Terror Conviction

August 24, 2025

— Categories: Human Rights



A British-born woman has spoken publicly about losing her UK citizenship despite never being convicted of terrorism, raising questions about the government's use of deprivation powers and their impact on civil liberties.

The woman, who has requested anonymity due to safety concerns, said she was informed that her citizenship had been revoked under legislation allowing the Home Secretary to remove nationality if it is considered “conducive to the public good.” She stated that she has never faced a terrorism charge or conviction, yet she has been left without British nationality.

The case highlights ongoing criticism of the UK’s approach to citizenship deprivation. While such powers were previously applied mainly to individuals convicted of serious crimes or with proven links to extremist groups, they can now be exercised without a criminal trial. Appeals are handled by the Special Immigration Appeals Commission, a process that is often closed to public hearings, limiting public access to the evidence used in such cases.

Government officials maintain that these powers are necessary to protect national security. Ministers say they are applied sparingly and only when there is clear evidence of a potential threat. Campaigners and legal experts argue that the lack of transparency makes it difficult to assess the process fully and warn that the measures disproportionately affect people with dual nationality.

Recent legislative changes have further strengthened these rules. Under a law passed earlier this year, deprivation orders remain in force during appeals, meaning individuals lose rights immediately while their case is under review. Critics say this reduces legal protections, while supporters argue it prevents individuals deemed a security risk from returning to Britain while proceedings continue.

Figures from government records show that hundreds of people have had their citizenship removed since 2010, though only a fraction of these cases involved a criminal conviction. Rights groups point to the closed nature of many proceedings, noting that it is difficult to independently verify the grounds for deprivation.

The woman at the centre of this case said the decision has had a severe impact on her life. “I was born in Britain. This is my home. To have that taken away without any conviction feels like being erased,” she said. She reported that the loss of citizenship has restricted her ability to travel, access services, and reconnect with family in the UK. Human rights lawyers argue that such actions could risk breaching international obligations against rendering people stateless.

The debate over citizenship deprivation is expected to continue, with legal experts calling for clearer guidelines and additional safeguards. As the government prioritises national security, further scrutiny is likely on how these powers are applied and whether they align with principles of justice and due process.