URGENT REQUEST TO INVESTIGATE, ARREST, OR DENY ENTRY TO SUSPECTED WAR CRIMINAL, GUY HOCHMAN

18 January 2026

To:

Minister of Public Safety, The Honourable Gary Anandasangaree
Public Safety Canada
269 Laurier Avenue West
Ottawa ON K1A 0P8
Email: gary.anand@parl.gc.ca

Minister of Justice, The Honourable Sean Fraser
Department of Justice Canada
84 Wellington Street
Ottawa, ON K1A 0H8
Email: sean.fraser@parl.gc.ca

Canadian Border and Security Agency
Steven Cescon, CBSA Superintendent, Pearson International Airport
Email: steven.cescon@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca

Michael Prosia, CBSA Chief, Southern Ontario Region
Email: michael.prosia@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca,

Chelsea Chamberlain, Border Services Officer, Pearson International Airport
Email: chelsea.chamberlain@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca

Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Central Region Intake Unit
155 McArthur Ave
Ottawa ON K1A 0R4
Email: CR_Central_Intake_Unit-Groupe_Reception_Centralisee_RC@rcmp-grc.gc.ca

Department of Justice

Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes Section
284 Wellington Street
Ottawa, ON K1A 0H8
E-mail: wc-cdg@justice.gc.ca

From:

The Hind Rajab Foundation
Boulevard Louis Mettewie 46
1080 Brussels, Belgium
Email: info@hindrajabfoundation.be

Canadian Lawyers for International Human Rights
66 Wellington Street West (PO Box 1074)
M5K1A2 Toronto, ON
Email: info@claihr.ca

International Centre of Justice for Palestinians - Canada
1235 Bay Street, Suite 700
M5R 3K4 Toronto, ON
Email: canada@icjpalestine.com

Legal Centre for Palestine
4711 Yonge Street., 10th floor
M2N6K8 Toronto ON
Email: general@lcpal.ca

ATTACHMENT: DOSSIER ON GUY HOCHMAN

OVERVIEW

1. Please be advised that Israeli and Greek citizen **Guy Hochman** is scheduled to enter Canada on 18 January (today) or 19 January 2026 (tomorrow) in order to speak at an event in Toronto. There are reasonable grounds to believe that **Mr. Hochman** has committed war crimes and incitement to genocide, contrary to the Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes ACT (CAHWCA) and international legal instruments.

2. This submission follows earlier communications sent to the Canada Border Services Agency by the Hind Rajab Foundation and Canadian Lawyers for International Human Rights, as well as by the International Centre of Justice for Palestinians, on 16 January 2026. Those communications requested that Mr. **Guy Hochman**, who is reasonably believed to be

inadmissible to Canada under the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, be denied entry to Canada on public policy grounds.

3. The attached Dossier provides further details regarding **Mr. Hochman**'s alleged involvement in international crimes and includes video, photographic, and other evidentiary material substantiating those allegations, including evidence of **Mr. Hochman**'s participation in the attack and destruction of the Raed al-Attar Mosque in Rafah, while it was empty, on 25 September 2024. The Dossier also demonstrates clear evidence of Mr. Hochman's incitement to commit genocide against the Palestinian population of Gaza. Finally, albeit not necessarily attaching criminal liability, the Dossier details Mr. Hochman's incitement of other international crimes.

4. The Dossier provides extensive information on Mr. Hochman's background, positions, social media presence, and conduct in relation to his criminal liability. This information and the below overview of Canadian and international laws likely to have been violated should form the basis of your decision to deny **Mr. Hochman** entry into Canada. In the alternative, should entry not be refused, we respectfully submit that these materials warrant the initiation of an investigation and **Mr. Hochman**'s arrest for offences under the CAHWCA.

APPLICABLE LAW

5. According to the Government of Canada's *13th Report on Canada's Program on Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes* (2011–2015):

> On December 18, 1998, Canada signed the *Rome Statute* of the International Criminal Court, ushering in even stronger laws criminalizing war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide. In addition, the *Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes Act* received Royal Assent on June 29, 2000, and the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act* received Royal Assent on November 1, 2001. These legislative developments reinforced Canada's existing "no safe haven" policy and established Canada as a global leader in holding persons who have committed war crimes, crimes against humanity or genocide accountable.[1] [emphasis added]

6. International crimes were codified into Canadian law in 2002 through the Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes Act (CAHWCA).[2] The CAHWCA provides for universal jurisdiction: Canada can prosecute alleged perpetrators present in Canada, regardless of

[1] 13th Report on Canada's Program on Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes (2011–2015) at pg. 5.

[2] *Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes Act* [Canada], SC 2000, c. 24, 23 October 2000 ("CAHWCA").

where the crimes occurred or the nationality of the perpetrator or victim. The CAHWCA integrates into Canadian law the definitions of international crimes as defined in the Rome Statute and the broader body of customary international law, including the Geneva Conventions and Additional Protocols.

7. In an effort to give preventative effect to Canadian law on war crimes, sections 33 and 35 of Canada's *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act* ("the *IRPA*") empowers CBSA to exclude those suspected of involvement in war crimes:

> 33 The facts that constitute inadmissibility under sections 34 to 37 include facts arising from omissions and, unless otherwise provided, include facts for which there are reasonable grounds to believe that they have occurred, are occurring or may occur.
>
> [...]
>
> 35(1) A permanent resident or a foreign national is inadmissible on grounds of violating human or international rights for
>
> > (a) committing an act outside Canada that constitutes an offence referred to in sections 4 to 7 of the *Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes Act*; [or]
> >
> > (b) being a prescribed senior official in the service of a government that, in the opinion of the Minister, engages or has engaged in terrorism, systematic or gross human rights violations, or genocide, a war crime or a crime against humanity within the meaning of subsections 6(3) to (5) of the *Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes Act*.

8. Based on the evidence detailed in the attached Dossier, there are reasonable grounds to believe that **Mr. Hochman** committed war crimes and incitement to genocide as provided under Section 6(1)(a) and (c) of the CAHWCA, respectively.

ALLEGED CRIMINAL CONDUCT AND LIABILITY

9. Based on the information detailed in the Dossier and the overview below, there are reasonable grounds to believe that **Mr. Hochman** has committed the following offences:

- Intentionally directing attacks against buildings dedicated to religion, that is, objects which are not military objectives **(Article 8(2)(b)(ix), Rome Statute and Section 6(1)(c), CAHWCA)**.

- Extensive destruction of property, not justified by military necessity and carried out unlawfully and wantonly **(Article 8(2)(a)(iv), Rome Statute and Section 6(1)(c), CAHWCA)**.
- Attacking or bombarding, by whatever means, towns, villages, dwellings or buildings which are undefended and which are not military objectives (**Article 8 (2) (b) (v), Rome Statute and and Section 6(1)(c), CAHWCA)**.
- Directly and publicly inciting others to commit acts of genocide **(Article 6 and 25(3)(e), Rome Statute and Section 6(1)(a), CAHWCA)**.

Destruction of Raed al-Attar Mosque in Rafah

10. As detailed in the Dossier, On 25 September 2024, a video was leaked showing **Mr. Hochman** with Israeli forces inside Raed Al-Attar Mosque in Rafah (Coordinates: 31.320277, 34.232745). The destruction of the Mosque was recorded using drone footage and reportedly shared in far-right messaging groups. The video footage circulating online shows Israeli soldiers, including **Mr. Hochman**, setting up and detonating explosives inside the Mosque, resulting in its complete destruction.

11. Under International Humanitarian Law (IHL), civilian objects, including mosques, are protected against attack and may only be attacked if they qualify as a military objective.[3] Customary IHL,[4] as codified in Article 52(2) of Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions, defines military objectives as:

> *Limited to those objects which by their nature, location, purpose, or use make an effective contribution to military action, and whose total or partial destruction, capture or neutralisation, in the circumstances ruling at the time, offers a definite military advantage.*

12. This definition establishes a dual threshold for determining whether an object can be lawfully targeted:

    1. The object must make an effective contribution to military action, requiring a proximate nexus between the object and specific military operations.
    2. Its destruction must offer a definite—not potential, or indeterminate—military advantage at the time of the attack.[5]

[3] Article 52 (1) of Additional Protocol I.
[4] Rule 8, ICRC Customary international humanitarian law. See also International Criminal Court (ICC) (2010) *Prosecutor v. Abu Garda*, Decision on the Confirmation of Charges, Pre-Trial Chamber I, 8 February, para. 88.
[5] See for example, International Criminal Court (ICC) (2014) *Prosecutor v. Germain Katanga*, Judgment, Trial Chamber II, 7 March. Case No. ICC-01/04-01/07, para. 893.

13. Importantly, civilian objects lose their protection only for such time as they are military objectives.[6] Once an object ceases to be used for military purposes, such as after fighters have vacated it, it reverts to its civilian status, and any further attack on it is unlawful. Military necessity does not justify ongoing destruction of civilian objects after they are no longer being used for military purposes.

14. Additionally, the protection of civilian objects is not negated solely by the proximity of military activities or military installations (*e.g.*, tunnels). The decisive factor is how an object is used, not its location relative to military targets.[7] This means each object must be individually assessed on a case-by-case basis to determine if it qualifies as a military objective, and collective or abstract assessments are not permissible.[8] The legality of attack cannot be assessed collectively or in abstract terms.

15. In the present case, the Raed al-Attar Mosque in Rafah was a clearly identifiable religious structure. Prior to its destruction, open-source imagery and reporting show that the area surrounding the mosque had been used by displaced Palestinian civilians as a site of refuge, with makeshift tent camps established nearby following widespread bombardment elsewhere in the Gaza Strip.

16. There is no evidence that the Raed al-Attar Mosque was being used for military purposes at the time of its destruction. The Israeli military has not publicly stated that it identified military activity or threats inside the mosque prior to its demolition. No active hostilities are visible in the footage documenting the event. There is no indication that the mosque made an effective contribution to Israeli military action, nor that its destruction offered a definite and direct military advantage.

17. The method of destruction is of particular relevance. Leaked video footage shows Israeli soldiers entering the mosque, placing controlled explosives inside the structure, and detonating them in a coordinated manner. Such controlled demolition requires deliberate planning, physical access, and conditions of operational control. These conditions are

---

[6] See for example, International Criminal Court (ICC) (2014) *Prosecutor v. Germain Katanga*, Judgment, Trial Chamber II, 7 March. Case No. ICC-01/04-01/07, para. 893.

[7] See for example, International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) (2003) *Prosecutor v. Naletilić and Martinović*, Trial Judgment, 31 March, Case No. IT-98-34-T, para. 605.; ICTY (2005) *Prosecutor v. Pavle Strugar*, Trial Judgment, 31 January, Case No. IT-01-42-T, para. 310; ICTY (2007) *Prosecutor v. Milan Martić*, Trial Judgment, 12 June, Case No. IT-95-11-T, para. 98.

[8] See for example, International Criminal Court (ICC) (2014) *Prosecutor v. Germain Katanga*, Judgment, Trial Chamber II, 7 March. Case No. ICC-01/04-01/07, paras 893-894.

incompatible with active combat or immediate military necessity and strongly indicate that the mosque was not being used by enemy forces at the time of its destruction.

18. The footage also shows **Mr. Hochman** present with Israeli soldiers during the demolition of the Raed al-Attar Mosque. His presence in uniform, in close proximity to the operation, and during a non-combat demolition establishes direct physical proximity to the act and situates him at the scene during the commission of the destruction.

19. Even if underground military infrastructure existed in the broader area, or if the mosque had previously been used by armed groups, such factors would not, in themselves, render the mosque a lawful military objective at the time of its demolition. IHL does not permit the destruction of protected civilian or religious structures solely due to their location above tunnels, prior alleged use, or generalized security concerns.

20. HRF further found that there was no proximate nexus between the destruction of the Raed al-Attar Mosque and any specific military operation. The demolition appears to have been carried out after Israeli forces had established control over the area. The deliberate placement of explosives inside the mosque, followed by its total destruction, indicates that the act was not incidental to hostilities but constituted a separate, intentional operation.

21. Based on the evidence reviewed, the Raed al-Attar Mosque retained its civilian and religious character at the time of its destruction. Its demolition cannot be justified under IHL. It appears that the following war crimes may have been committed:

    - Intentionally directing attacks against buildings dedicated to religion, education, art, science or charitable purposes, historic monuments, hospitals and places where the sick and wounded are collected, provided they are not military objective (**Article 8(2)(b)(ix), Rome Statute and Section 6(1)(c), CAHWCA)**.
    - Extensive destruction of property, not justified by military necessity and carried out unlawfully and wantonly **(Article 8(2)(a)(iv), Rome Statute and Section 6(1)(c), CAHWCA)**.
    - Attacking or bombarding, by whatever means, towns, villages, dwellings or buildings which are undefended and which are not military objectives (**Article 8 (2) (b) (v), Rome Statute and and Section 6(1)(c), CAHWCA)**.

Direct and Public Incitement to Commit Genocide

22. The International Tribunal for Rwanda **(**ICTR) defined incitement to commit genocide as as conduct that directly provokes others to commit genocidal acts. Such incitement may occur

through speeches, chants, or threats made in public places or at public gatherings, as well as through the dissemination, sale, or public display of written or printed materials, placards, posters, or through any other form of audio-visual communication.[9]

23. The ICTR has further clarified that the requirement of "direct" incitement demands more than vague, abstract, or indirect advocacy. Rather, the speech or conduct must specifically urge another person or group to take immediate criminal action.[10] Whether incitement is "direct" is assessed contextually, taking into account linguistic, cultural, and historical factors, as well as the surrounding circumstances in which the statements were made.

24. In this regard, the ICTR ruled that exhortations to the public to "work" or to "sweep away the dirt," when viewed in their specific context, were sufficiently explicit to amount to direct and public incitement to commit genocide.[11]

25. **Mr. Hochman'**s public statements and audiovisual content, produced while embedded with Israeli military forces, demonstrate conduct that may constitute direct and public incitement to commit genocide.

26. He repeatedly called for and normalised mass killing and extermination of Palestinians, calling for the use of nuclear weapons, celebrating the deaths of civilians, and advocating collective punishment through displacement and destruction. He further incited the destruction of civilian infrastructure and religious sites, explicitly stating that "not a single mosque will remain in Gaza" and celebrating widespread devastation as historical and justified. He publicly asserted exclusive Israeli ownership over Gaza, promoting conquest, expulsion, and permanent dispossession, and obstructed humanitarian aid, framing deprivation as a legitimate military objective.

27. He consistently portrayed the Palestinian population of Gaza as an inherently culpable collective, denying the existence of civilians or protected persons, describing them as "sons of death," invoking the biblical commandment to "blot out Amalek," and asserting that there

[9] Prosecutor v. Niyiramasuhuko et al, No. ICTR-98-42-T, Decision on Defence Motions for Acquittal Under Rule 98 bis (16 December 2004) at para. 109; Prosecutor v Akayesu, No. ICTR-96-4-T, Judgement (2 September 1998) at para. 559; Prosecutor v Ngirabatware, No. ICTR-99-54-PT, Decision on Defence Motion to Dismiss Based Upon Defects in Amended Indictment (8 April 2009) at para. 25

[10] Prosecutor v Kajelijeli, No. ICTR-98-44A-T, Judgment and Sentence (1 December 2003) at para. 855; Prosecutor v Bizimungu et al, No. ICTR-99-50-T, Decision on Defence Motions Pursuant to Rule 98 bis (22 November 2005) at para. 57; Prosecutor v. Muvunyi, No. ICTR-00-55A-T, Judgement (11 February 2010) at para. 24; Prosecutor v Niyiramasuhuko et al, No. ICTR-98-42-A, Judgement (14 December 2015) at para. 3338

[11] Prosecutor v Niyiramasuhuko et al, No. ICTR-98-42-T, Judgement and Sentence (24 June 2011) at para. 6027

were “no uninvolved” individuals. By framing the entire population as culpable, he removed moral and legal restraints on violence and normalised mass targeting of the group.

28. **Mr. Hochman** also publicly endorsed and celebrated abusive and criminal conduct by Israeli military units, including sexual violence against detainees, framing such acts as heroic and as service to the state.

29. His communications were widely disseminated through social media and other public channels, amplified by his position as a military officer in uniform, and occurred within the context of ongoing military operations in Gaza that have been characterised by international bodies as breaching international humanitarian law and amounting to genocide.

30. Taken together, his repeated, public, and explicit communications satisfy the legal elements for direct and public incitement to commit genocide, as he specifically urged immediate criminal action, targeted a protected group, and demonstrated the specific intent to destroy the Palestinian population of Gaza. These actions were reinforced by the conduct of soldiers on the ground and aligned with genocidal statements from senior Israeli officers[12], creating a coordinated environment in which genocidal acts were normalized, promoted, and implemented.

31. In this context, **Mr. Hochman**’s statements outlined in the Dossier demonstrate reasonable grounds to believe that he has committed the offence of:

    - Directly and publicly inciting others to commit acts of genocide **(Article 6 and 25(3)(e), Rome Statute and Section 6(1)(a), CAHWCA)**.

CANADA’S OBLIGATIONS

32. Canada maintains solemn treaty obligation pursuant to Article 146 of the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 to ‘seek out and prosecute’ those reasonably suspected of grave breaches who set foot in Canada. Those obligations are directly engaged by the presence of **Mr. Hochman** in Canada. It is not possible to seek out or prosecute persons reasonably suspected of such breaches by failing to question or charge them.

[12] Law for Palestine (2023) *Law for Palestine releases database with 500 instances of Israeli incitement to genocide, continuously updated*. Available at: https://law4palestine.org/law-for-palestine-releases-database-with-500-instances-of-israeli-incitement-to-genocide-continuously-updated/ (Accessed: 17 October 2025); International Court of Justice (ICJ) (2023) *Application Instituting Proceedings*, South Africa v. Israel. Available at: https://www.icj-cij.org/sites/default/files/case-related/192/192-20231228-app-01-00-en.pdf (Accessed: 17 October 2025). See also https://x.com/ytirawi/status/1794826941209702699.