

ASSESSMENT BY THE COMMONWEALTH OMBUDSMAN FOR TABLING IN PARLIAMENT

Under s 486O of the Migration Act 1958

This is the fourth s 486O assessment on Mr X and Ms Y who have remained in immigration detention for more than four and a half years. The previous assessment 1001513-O1 was tabled in Parliament on 6 December 2017. This assessment provides an update and should be read in conjunction with the previous assessments.

Family members	Mr X (and wife)	Ms Y (wife)
Citizenship	Country A	Country A
Year of birth	1969	1963

Ombudsman ID	1001513-O2
Date of department's report	4 December 2017
Total days in detention	1,640 (at date of department's report)

Recent detention history

Since the Ombudsman's previous assessment, Mr X and Ms Y have continued to be placed in the community.¹

Recent visa applications/case progression

November 2017	Safe Haven Enterprise visa (SHEV) application refused.
November 2017	Mr X and Ms Y's case was referred to the Immigration Assessment Authority (IAA) for review.

Health and welfare

Mr X

International Health and Medical Services (IHMS) advised that Mr X continued to be monitored for a medical condition.

Ms Y

IHMS advised that Ms Y continued to be monitored and prescribed with medication for the management of medical conditions. At the time of IHMS's latest report she had been referred for multiple specialist appointments.

Recent detention incidents

October 2017	An Incident Report recorded that Mr X and Ms Y's property was vandalised.
--------------	---

¹ Mr X and Ms Y were granted a placement in the community under s 197AB of the *Migration Act 1958* and remain in immigration detention.

Other matters

Mr X and Ms Y are placed in the community with their son, Mr Z, who is the subject of Ombudsman assessment 1001332-O2.

Case status

Mr X and Ms Y were detained in June 2013 after arriving in Australia by sea and have remained in immigration detention, both in a detention facility and the community, for more than four and a half years.

In November 2017 Mr X and Ms Y's SHEV application was refused and their case was referred to the IAA for review.