

7.2. Safety

COMMON ANALYSIS
Last update: October 2026

The analysis below is based on the following EUAA COI products: COI Update 2026; Country Focus 2026, 4.2., 6.1.2., 6.1.3., 6.1.4., 6.1.5., 6.1.6., 6.1.7.; Country Guidance should not be referred to as a source of COI.

☐ 7.2.1. Absence of persecution or serious harm

When examining the element 'absence of persecution or serious harm', the decision-maker should refer to chapters 3 to 6 of this document.

When assessing the requirement of safety with regard to the applicability of IPA in individual cases of applicants from Pakistan, the following elements should be taken into account:

- **General security situation in relation to indiscriminate violence**

  Based on the analysis under Indiscriminate violence, the conclusions with regard to the three cities of Islamabad, Lahore and Karachi are as follows: **in Islamabad** (Islamabad Capital Territory), **Lahore** (Punjab) and **Karachi** (Sindh), there is no real risk for a civilian to be personally affected within the meaning of Article 15(c) QR.

- **Actor of persecution or serious harm and their reach**

  In cases where the person fears persecution or serious harm by state actors (e.g. Persons (perceived to be) opposing the Government, Persons convicted on blasphemy charges, or Persons with diverse SOGIESC), there is a presumption

that IPA would not be available.

Non-state actors, including Islamist and Baloch separatist militants, do not have a strong presence throughout Pakistan. Therefore, in case of persecution by such actors, the safety requirement could be satisfied in parts of the country outside of their reach.

In some cases, where the applicant faces persecution or serious harm related to the prevalent social norms in Pakistan and the actor of persecution or serious harm is the Pakistani society at large (e.g. Ahmadis, Women and girls, Persons with diverse SOGIESC), the safety requirement would in general not be met, and IPA would not be available.

If the actor of persecution or serious harm is the (extended) family of the applicant, the safety requirement may be met, depending on the reach of these actors. For certain particularly vulnerable categories, such as single women and children, considering the lack of State protection and their potential vulnerability to other forms of violence or exploitation, the safety requirement would in general not be met, and IPA would not be available, irrespective of the reach of the (extended) family.

Additionally, the applicant's profile could make them a priority target, increasing the likelihood that the actor of persecution or serious harm would attempt to trace them in the potential IPA location (e.g. individuals targeted by insurgent militants). In the context of Pakistan, there is limited information that non-state actors would consider an individual as a priority target and be willing to pursue them in the potential IPA location.

For the area of operation and influence of actors, see Areas of control and influence and Indiscriminate violence.

☐ 7.2.2. Availability of protection against persecution or serious harm

Alternatively, it may be determined that the requirement of safety is satisfied if the applicant would have access to protection against persecution or serious harm, as

defined in Article 7 QR, in the area where IPA is considered. In the case of persecution by the State, a presumption of non-availability of State protection applies. See also Actors of protection.

☐ 7.2.3. Conclusion on safety

Imported image pandoc_image_14.svg

The requirement of safety may be satisfied in Islamabad, Lahore, and/or Karachi, depending on the profile and the individual circumstances of the applicant. When the actor of persecution or serious harm is the State or the Pakistani society at large, the requirement of safety would not be met. Additionally, for certain particularly vulnerable individuals, the requirement of safety would in general not be met.

© European Union Agency for Asylum 2026 | Email: info@euaa.europa.eu