

Press Release

Carter-Ruck

Date: 25 November 2025

The Bureau
90 Fetter Lane
London EC4A 1EN

T +44 (0)20 7353 5005
DX 333 Chancery Lane
www.carter-ruck.com

Home Secretary and Home Office apologise in High Court and pay £225,000 in libel damages to prominent Muslim community leader, Chowdhury Mueen-Uddin over false war crimes allegations

In the High Court in London today before Mrs Justice Hill, the Home Secretary and the Home Office have apologised unreservedly to Chowdhury Mueen-Uddin, a prominent British Muslim community leader, and paid him £225,000 in libel damages (plus his legal costs) over false allegations that he was one of those responsible for war crimes committed during the 1971 Bangladeshi war of Independence, and that he had committed crimes against humanity during that war.¹

This is believed to be among the highest, or more likely *the* highest, libel payment ever made by a British government department to one of its citizens, reflecting the seriousness of the allegations that were published. Indeed, as Lord Reed, President of the Supreme Court had observed in that Court's unanimous judgment in Mr Mueen-Uddin's favour in 2024: "*it is difficult to imagine a graver allegation than guilt of war crimes and crimes against humanity*", and that "*the allegation is especially grave when it is made by the government of this country against one of its own citizens*".

As Carter-Ruck partner Adam Tudor explained to the Court, Mr Mueen-Uddin's libel complaint related to the publication, in 2019, by the Commission for Countering Extremism (a non-statutory committee of the Home Office), of a Report entitled "*Challenging Hateful Extremism*" ("the Report"). The Report included allegations of complicity by Mr Mueen-Uddin in war crimes and crimes against humanity during the Bangladesh war of independence in 1971, by reference to his conviction (and death sentence) *in absentia* in Bangladesh in 2013.

Mr Mueen-Uddin - who has lived in the United Kingdom since 1973 and been a UK citizen since 1984 – has always vigorously denied the Bangladeshi authorities' allegations against him as being entirely false and politically-motivated. His "conviction" in Bangladesh - more than 40 years after the war ended - was universally condemned by international observers, legislators and global human rights organisations for its fundamental failure to comply with even the most basic principles of procedural fairness. There was no prospect of Mr Mueen-Uddin ever

Authorised and regulated
by the Solicitors Regulation
Authority

SRA No. 44769



¹ The full statement in open Court is attached to this Press Release.

receiving a fair trial and (as the UK Supreme Court recognised in these proceedings) he could not reasonably have been expected to attend a trial there.

As Mr Tudor told the Court today, Mr Mueen-Uddin was extremely distressed by the Report. For it to be asserted that he was guilty of crimes of the most egregious nature known to humanity was grave enough; but for it to be stated by his own government, of the country where he had entrusted his safety and pledged his future decades earlier, was of a different order altogether. As Mr Tudor also explained, when he had initially brought this complaint, Mr Mueen-Uddin had hoped that the Home Secretary would conclude – correctly – that the publication was unjustified and indefensible, and seek to rectify the position without delay. Regrettably, the Home Office elected to seek to strike the claim out as an abuse of process (triggering a series of hearings, including ultimately at the Supreme Court), subjecting Mr Mueen-Uddin to more stress and unjustified reputational damage, and a six-year delay in the vindication to which he was entitled. At no time throughout those six years did the Home Office ever seek to put forward any defence that the allegations were true, as they clearly had no basis to do so.

Mr Mueen-Uddin's six year legal battle culminated in a unanimous decision in his favour by the UK Supreme Court in June 2024.²

Following the Supreme Court's decision, the Home Secretary/Home Office made an unqualified Offer of Amends to Mr Mueen-Uddin, leading to the publication of an apology by the Home Office on its website³ and the reading today by the parties' representatives of an agreed joint statement in open Court.

Speaking after today's hearing, Mr Mueen-Uddin said:

"I am delighted by this outcome. I had hoped that, faced with my clear position that these allegations against me were completely untrue, and with the fact that the Tribunal which had resulted in my "conviction" in 2013 was wholly discredited and universally condemned, the then Home Secretary and Home Office would quickly recognise its error and apologise.

It has been at times a dispiriting and distressing journey for me on the road to securing justice in this matter. However, I am very pleased that my trust in the English legal and Court system, and indeed in the government which presides over all of us in this country which I am proud to call my home, has been vindicated".

Mr Chowdhury Mueen-Uddin is represented by a Carter-Ruck team led by [Adam Tudor](#) and Natasha Doley, along with a counsel team comprising [Jacob Dean](#) and [Lily Walker-Parr](#) of 5RB.

For further information, please contact Adam Tudor – adam.tudor@carter-ruck.com

² [Supreme Court rules unanimously against Home Secretary in landmark libel claim brought by prominent Muslim community leader - Carter-Ruck](#)

³ [Chowdhury Mueen-Uddin – apology - GOV.UK](#)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

Claim No. QB-2020-002120

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

MEDIA AND COMMUNICATIONS LIST

BETWEEN:-

CHOWDHURY MUEEN-UDDIN

Claimant

-and-

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT

Defendant

STATEMENT IN OPEN COURT

Solicitor for the Claimant

1. My Lady, in this matter I appear on behalf of the Claimant, Chowdhury Mueen-Uddin. The Defendant, the Home Secretary, is represented by Amy-Marie Wilson of the Government Legal Department.
2. Mr Mueen-Uddin was born in East Bengal in 1948, which, until the conclusion of the War of Independence in 1971, was part of Pakistan, and which is now the state of Bangladesh. He has lived in the United Kingdom since 1973 and has been a British citizen since 1984.
3. As well as making the United Kingdom his home for more than fifty years and raising his family here, Mr Mueen-Uddin has made a considerable contribution to British civil society. Mr Mueen-Uddin is a senior and prominent member of the Muslim community and has held a number of prominent public and charitable positions, including serving as Secretary-General of the Council of Mosques UK & Ireland and as Director of the MCB project *Muslim Spiritual Care Provision in the NHS*. He was elected Chairman of Multi-Faith group for healthcare Chaplaincy – a coalition of nine world faith groups, and is a founder member and chair of Muslim Aid.
4. In 2013 (that is, more than 40 years after the end of the War of Independence) Mr Mueen-Uddin, along with a number of other individuals, was convicted - in his absence - of war crimes and sentenced to death by a specially convened tribunal in Bangladesh known as the "International Crimes Tribunal" or ICT over atrocities committed during the 1971 War.

5. Both before, during and since its proceedings, the ICT was the subject of widespread worldwide condemnation by leading human rights groups and political figures. Critics consider that the Bangladeshi legislation establishing the ICT expressly disappplied fundamental procedural and evidential safeguards designed to ensure a fair trial, enabling the Tribunal not only to try individuals in their absence but also to rely on hearsay and even newspaper articles as evidence of guilt. Mr Mueen-Uddin had no proper opportunity to defend himself and could not have attended the trial without facing likely execution. Similarly, there was no real possibility of him bringing an appeal against his conviction.
6. Mr Mueen-Uddin has always strongly and publicly denied (including through his British counsel) every single one of the allegations against him as being false and politically-motivated.
7. In October 2019, six years after the ICT conviction, the UK's Commission for Countering Extremism published a major report entitled "*Challenging Hateful Extremism*". The Commission was established by the Defendant in early 2018 as part of the then government's counter-extremism policy; it is a non-statutory expert committee of the Home Office, for which the Home Office and the Defendant are responsible.
8. The Report called for an 'urgent and effective response' to violent extremism and terrorism. It aimed to define through consensus what extremism is and how the Government and civil society should react to it.
9. As well as being distributed in hard copy, the Report was published prominently on the Commission's website and shared by the Home Office's official Twitter account, as well as the Commission's own Twitter account. It received considerable attention across the media.
10. A section of the Report headed "Ideological and Sectarian Violence" and "What Extremism Looks Like in England and Wales" included a reference to Mr Mueen-Uddin which, as the High Court subsequently ruled at a hearing to ascertain the meaning of the words complained of, would have been understood by readers to assert that Mr Mueen-Uddin was one of those responsible for war crimes committed during the 1971 War of Independence, and that he had committed crimes against humanity during that war.
11. The Report made no reference to the concerns regarding the ICT's procedures, nor to the fact that Mr Mueen-Uddin had consistently maintained his innocence. The authors did not contact Mr Mueen-Uddin for comment prior to publication.
12. Mr Mueen-Uddin learned of the contents of the Report from members of his family, friends and colleagues who had read and brought it to his attention.
13. Mr Mueen-Uddin was extremely distressed upon reading the Report. For it to be asserted that he was guilty of crimes of the most egregious kind known to humanity was grave enough; but, for him, for it to be stated by his own government, of the country to which he had entrusted his safety and pledged his future decades earlier, was of a different order altogether.
14. Following publication of the Report, in December 2019 my firm sent a letter of complaint to the Home Office, pointing out that the Report contained extremely serious allegations concerning Mr Mueen-Uddin, that he considered these statements to be false, and demanding suitable redress.

15. Mr Mueen-Uddin hoped that the Home Secretary would conclude that the publication was unjustified and indefensible, and seek to rectify the position without delay, not least to mitigate and stem the reputational damage and distress caused to Mr Mueen-Uddin by the publication, and to provide him with appropriate vindication.
16. The Home Office and Commission removed the offending allegations from the online version of the Report (albeit not until four months after its publication), but they did not apologise or provide other redress, leaving Mr Mueen-Uddin with no alternative other than to commence proceedings for libel.
17. Some 11 months after the proceedings had been issued, the Home Secretary brought an application to strike out Mr Mueen-Uddin's claim on the basis that it was an abuse of process. In this application, the Home Secretary asserted that Mr Mueen-Uddin's claim was an attempt to mount an improper collateral attack on his 2013 conviction by the ICT. The claim was struck out by the High Court on 15 November 2021, a decision which was upheld on appeal by the Court of Appeal in a decision dated 28 July 2022.
18. Mr Mueen-Uddin appealed to the Supreme Court which, in June of 2024, (nearly five years after the publication of the Report) unanimously rejected all of the Home Secretary's submissions, reversing the decisions of the lower Courts to strike the claim out as an abuse of the process and allowing Mr Mueen-Uddin to continue with his claim.
19. The Supreme Court confirmed that Mr Mueen-Uddin's claim was not an abuse of the process of the English Court. It could not possibly constitute an improper collateral challenge to the ICT proceedings given that Mr Mueen-Uddin clearly had not had a full opportunity to defend himself in that tribunal.
20. Following the decision of the Supreme Court, the Home Secretary made an unqualified Offer of Amends to Mr Mueen-Uddin, which he has accepted.
21. Accordingly, the Defendant is here today, through Counsel, to apologise unreservedly to Mr Mueen-Uddin, as they have also now done on the Commission's website. The Defendant has also agreed to pay very substantial compensation to Mr Mueen-Uddin, as well as his legal costs.

Counsel for the Defendant

22. My Lady, the Commission and the Home Office apologise unreservedly to Mr Mueen-Uddin for the reputational damage, and distress which the publication in question has caused him. They also acknowledge the further distress caused to Mr Mueen-Uddin by the lengthy Court proceedings culminating in the unanimous Supreme Court judgment in his favour in June 2024, reinstating his claim.
23. The Home Secretary acknowledges that the parties are now able to resolve these issues by joining in this Statement in Open Court and through the Defendant's Unqualified Offer of Amends.

Solicitor for the Claimant

24. My Lady, given the public apology and other steps agreed to by the Home Office, the Claimant is content to bring his claim for libel to a close.

25 November 2025