

January 15, 2026

To Mr. George-Hilley
Centropy PR (on behalf of Cellebrite)

Thank you for your response on January 12, 2026.

Following your email, we have several additional questions outlined below. We commit to publishing your responses in full if we receive them by Monday, January 19th, 2026 at 5pm ET.

Human Rights Due Diligence & Human Rights Law Compliance

According to our findings, Cellebrite's technology has been used in Jordan since at least 2020. During that period, human rights abuses, concerns about government surveillance abuse, including the [abuse of Pegasus spyware](#) to target civil society, have all been documented.

Moreover, Jordan's Cybercrime laws have been [explicitly condemned](#) by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, as well as [human rights groups](#), for criminalizing political expression.

Given that we documented that Cellebrite's tools were used in cases where the Cybercrime laws were applied to political and other forms of lawful speech, what is Cellebrite's process to determine whether the laws in a particular country comply with international human rights law, and Cellebrite's own ethical criteria for customers?

We note that Cellebrite states that the company will only pursue customers "*whom we believe will act lawfully and not in a manner incompatible with privacy rights or human rights.*" Cellebrite additionally states that "*...sales decisions are also guided by internal parameters and vetting procedures, which consider a potential customer's human rights record...*".

What specific human rights due diligence did Cellebrite perform before, during, and after the sale of Cellebrite technology to Jordanian governmental agencies? What conclusion did Cellebrite arrive at and why? Will you make this assessment public, or describe the criteria used in making it?

How Does Cellebrite's Ethics Committee Work?

In response to our letter, your public relations firm cites Cellebrite's "Independent Ethics & Integrity Committee" as evidence of your commitment to human rights. Will the committee

promptly and thoroughly conduct a review of the Jordanian cases and the company's relationship with Jordan?

More generally, how does this Committee comply with the United Nations (UN) *Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights*? What are the powers and procedures of this committee? Have they made determinations or recommendations in previous cases that have resulted in sanctioning clients and, if so, how many and how were clients sanctioned? Does the Committee evaluate the human rights risks associated with potential customers prior to sales and, if so, against what criteria? Does Cellebrite (or its Committee) investigate clients after reports of human rights abuse with Cellebrite technology and, if so, how and against what criteria?

Providing Accountability Requires Speaking On Specific Cases

Your public relations firm provided a statement that Cellebrite refuses to "comment on specifics as a matter of policy." Given that such a policy would prevent even basic accountability for documented cases of human rights abuse with Cellebrite technology, would you waive it in this case to provide the public with a substantive response?

In particular, the UN *Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights* require that businesses should report formally on how they address the risk of severe human rights impacts, which includes providing "information that is sufficient to evaluate the adequacy of an enterprise's response to the particular human rights impact involved."

How Will Cellebrite Provide Redress?

Multiple individuals in Jordan have had their devices confiscated and imaged, leading to fines and imprisonment. What is Cellebrite's plan to remediate any adverse human rights impacts you have caused or contributed to, as required by the UN *Guiding Principles on Human Rights*?

Does Cellebrite Have a Policy Forbidding Use Alongside Physical Coercion?

Our investigation documents a case of Jordanian authorities physically restraining an individual to use face ID to unlock their device without their consent. Does Cellebrite contractually forbid the use of your tools in conjunction with physical coercion? Does Cellebrite contractually forbid clients to use its technology in other contexts or situations that would amount to human rights abuses?

What steps do you take when physical coercion is documented in conjunction with the use of a Cellebrite product? Would a client who engages in such a use of Cellebrite's tools be prevented from using Cellebrite technology in the future?

Is Customer-Watermarking or Other Technical Measures On The Table?

Cellebrite's technology is widely used around the world, and the company's products now have a multiply-documented risk of abuse. Last year, for example, Amnesty International's Security Lab published a report documenting abuse by the authorities in Serbia. However, investigations of potential human rights abuses, including Cellebrite's own internal investigations, may be hampered by the lack of specific forensic traces uniquely identifying a *particular* Cellebrite customer.

What technical measures does Cellebrite apply to ensure that its technology is not involved in human rights abuses? What technical measures does Cellebrite use to facilitate investigation by Cellebrite in cases of reported human rights abuses?

Will Cellebrite commit to including a unique, customer-specific watermark in device logs that have been imaged? Such a watermark would allow for third parties (and Cellebrite) to investigate and, in the case of abuses, seek appropriate redress and address concerns to the appropriate entity. It would also assist Cellebrite in determining whether a particular customer had violated contractual obligations.

We appreciate your attention to this matter,

Regards



Ronald J. Deibert, O.C., O.Ont
Director, The Citizen Lab
Professor of Political Science
Munk School of Global Affairs & Public Policy
Signal rondeibert.11
Bluesky @rondeibert.bsky.social
<https://deibert.citizenlab.ca/>
<https://citizenlab.ca>