The author of the communication is a woman acting on her own and on behalf of her two minor children. The author claims that their eviction would violate their rights under article 11 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The author has been renting a flat during the last 14 years. Initially, the flat was owned by the Municipal Company of Public Land and Housing (*Empresa Municipal de la Vivienda y Suelo de Madrid* or *EMVS*). On 2014, the latter transferred the property of many different units to the private investment fund FIDERE-Blackstone. On 7 August 2014, the author’s husband signed a new lease of the flat for an initial monthly rent of 517.79 euros, with annual increases. Currently, that rent has been increased more than 30% of the initial rent, reaching up to 680 euros.

In the beginning of 2017, the family was not able to pay the rent, as they were facing difficult socio-economic conditions. At the same time, the author and her husband had previously joined other former tenants of EMVS to file a criminal lawsuit against FIDERE-Blackstone, for the illegal acquisition of public property. In this scenario, the author claims that the new owners of the flat filed a lawsuit to invalidate the contract, reclaiming the unpaid rents, and requesting their eviction, in part, motivated by retaliation. The family acknowledged the unpaid debts, but requested to stay any eviction until they could be able to find an alternative housing. In June 2018, the relevant Court declared the invalidation of the lease, and ordered their eviction from the flat.

The family unit is currently at “risk of residential exclusion”, and requested to suspend the judicial eviction order. The author also claims that her family is currently living below the threshold of relative poverty, which in Madrid amounts to a net income of 17.238 euros per year. Because of the eviction proceedings, the author has been suffering from a state of generalized anxiety.

Considering the situation of her family, the author submits that she has not been able to find an alternative in the private housing market, as their income is not stable. Finally, the author claims that they have no alternative housing, considering their social or family networks.

The author claims that in the event of an eviction from their home, the State party would violate her and her family’s rights under article 11 of the Covenant, as it has not provided any adequate alternative housing. The authors claim to have no financial status to search for housing in the private market or that they do not count with any social or family networks that could provide them with an alternative housing.