

February 14, 2026

Sent by email to:

thomas.hogan@cellebrite.com (CEO)
ronnen_armon@yahoo.com (Chief Products & Technologies Officer)
sigash@gmail.com (Chief Information Officer)

We write with respect to a Citizen Lab investigation, details of which are summarized below. We repeat several questions that remain unanswered from our previous correspondences.

We commit to publishing your responses in full if we receive them by Monday, February 16th before 5 PM Eastern Time.

Cellebrite Use by Kenyan Authorities

We have found that Cellebrite's forensic technology was employed on the device of a Kenyan activist by the authorities after an arbitrary arrest to access the contents of the device without the individual's consent.

Human rights violations occur routinely in Kenya against activists and the political opposition, and are extensively documented. Our research raises serious questions about the effectiveness of Cellebrite's human rights due diligence process.

Unanswered Questions Regarding Human Rights Due Diligence

What is Cellebrite's process to determine whether the laws in a particular country comply with international human rights law, and Cellebrite's criteria?

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 Kenyan 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 one of our previous letters, 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 Kenyan cases and the company's relationship with Kenyan authorities?

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

The UN *Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights* (UN *Guiding Principles*) 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."

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 compliance with the *UN Guiding Principles*?

How Will Cellebrite Provide Redress?

What is Cellebrite's plan to remediate any adverse human rights impacts you have caused or contributed to in Kenya, as required by the *UN Guiding Principles*?

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. The Citizen Lab has previously investigated abuse of Cellebrite's technology in Jordan.

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'R. Deibert', written in a cursive style.

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