



Corruption Claims Involving Politician's Children

2025-056-FB-MR

Summary

The Oversight Board has upheld Meta's decision to leave up a Facebook post that makes allegations of corruption against a Filipino politician using images of him and his children, several of whom appear to be minors. In this case, the Board finds that the language used did not contain a direct or veiled threat but is better understood as a vow to expose corruption by a public figure. The Board notes that children's rights and safety must always be safeguarded. However, public officials should not be allowed to use these protections to avoid scrutiny. Mere references to children in corruption allegations cannot, by themselves, silence such claims when children are used as proxies.

About the Case

In April 2025, a Facebook user posted two images on a Facebook group's page. The first image shows Elizaldy Salcedo Co, a Filipino politician, and his family, including his minor children. The second image shows an airplane flying over water. The caption, in Tagalog and English, states that the children have a Gulfstream airplane in their name and questions how it was purchased.

The caption includes the phrases: "At the expense of your family's safety and security. Right, Zaldy?" and "This is the price Zaldy ... your family." The caption ends with the Tagalog words, "Hindi ka namin patahimikin." Meta translated this statement as, "We will hunt [you] down." Meta did not interpret the phrase as a threat to commit violence, but as an attempt to root out corruption. The Board consulted linguistic experts who



confirmed this interpretation, construing the phrase to mean, “We will not leave you alone.”

The post has been shared more than 4,000 times and has more than 1.7 million views. Two different Meta classifiers – designed to find viral content that potentially violates the Violence and Incitement policy and viral content that could involve harm to young people – identified it. These reports were not prioritized for human review, and the post remained on the platform.

Meta reviewed the post after receiving a report about the content from a contact at the Philippines House of Representatives. The company, after analyzing the post and consulting local experts, concluded that it was non-violating and kept it on the platform. Meta referred the case to the Oversight Board.

Key Findings

The Board finds that the language in the post does not contain a direct or veiled violent threat but is better understood as denouncing and vowing to expose corruption by a public figure.

Issues involving potential threats to children’s safety online should be taken seriously and acted on quickly. However, in this case, the Board finds that the allegations of corruption were directed at the politician alone, not his family members.

The content did not violate the policy on bullying and harassment, which prohibits making allegations of illegal behavior against private minors, because the post was directed at their father. The post also did not violate Meta’s internal guidance which prohibits criminal allegations against adults when it could lead to offline harm.



The Board highlights that people should be free to express their political views, including criticism of politicians, without fear of censorship. Under international human rights law, such speech lies at the core of protected political expression. Political leaders and public officials are required to tolerate greater scrutiny and criticism than private individuals, given their influential role in public affairs.

Criticism of public officials should be evaluated within its social and linguistic context to understand the risks it may pose, especially in environments where exposing corruption may be restricted or dangerous. While allegations of corruption can sometimes occur in the context of threatening attacks, Meta should recognize that when no threat of violence is present – as in this case – such requests may not truly aim to protect children but are rather an attempt by powerful figures to shield themselves from accountability. The response must be necessary and proportionate, taking into account context and language. It should recognize the high public interest in transparency, accountability and protection for speech alleging corruption by public officials.

The Board directs Meta’s attention to recommendations from previous cases calling on Meta to publish its internal guidance so users can clearly understand what is allowed or not. Meta should ensure that it relies on local and contextual expertise to make difficult decisions about content with potential threats, as it did in this case.

The Oversight Board’s Decision

The Board upholds Meta’s decision to leave the content up.

The Board also reiterates previous recommendations that Meta improve enforcement based on contextual analysis related to potentially threatening language, issued in the [Iran Protest Slogan](#), [Call for Women’s Protests in Cuba](#) and [Statements About the Japanese Prime Minister](#) cases. This includes updating internal guidance provided to



content reviewers, where relevant, so that the company addresses any lack of clarity, gaps or inconsistencies.

*Case summaries provide an overview of cases and do not have precedential value.

Full Case Decision

1. Case Description and Background

In April 2025, a Facebook user posted two images on a Facebook group's page. One photo depicts the Filipino politician Elizaldy Salcedo Co and his family. This includes his children, several of whom appear to be minors. This photo is [reported](#) to have been previously publicly shared by the politician on his social media. The other photo shows an airplane flying over water. The caption, in Tagalog and English, states that the then-congressman's children have a Gulfstream aircraft in their name and questions how it was purchased. It includes the phrases, "At the expense of your family's safety and security. Right, Zaldy?" and "This is the price, Zaldy. Your family." It ends with the Tagalog words, "Hindi ka namin patahimikin." While Meta translated this statement as, "We will hunt [you] down," it did not interpret it as a threat to commit violence against the target, but rather, as an intent to root out corruption. Linguistic experts consulted by the Board confirmed this reading, but interpreted this phrase as, "We will not leave you alone."

The post has been shared over 4,000 times and has over 1.7 million views. On the day it was posted, two different Meta classifiers identified the post and sent it for human review. One of the classifiers is designed to detect viral content that potentially violates Facebook's Violence and Incitement policy, while the other identifies potentially viral content that could involve harm to young people. Neither report was prioritized by the company's automated systems for human review, and the post remained on the platform.



Following a report from a contact at the House of Representatives of the Philippines, Meta's Public Policy team later escalated the content. The company stated it did not receive any communications from the depicted Congressman. Meta analyzed the post, consulting experts with local contextual knowledge, who did not interpret the caption in the post as a threat to commit violence. Following this review, the company concluded that the post did not violate the Community Standards and kept it on the platform. Meta then referred the case to the Board.

Without taking a position on the specific facts here, the Board notes that the Philippine context poses various challenges for those raising allegations of corruption. In this regard, the Board considered the following elements in reaching its decision:

Corruption is a global problem that undermines the rule of law and public discussion and scrutiny of corruption are essential to accountability. The [Global Investigative Journalism Network](#) (GIJN), and the [Organized Crime and Corruption Reporting Project](#) (OCCRP) have reported on various techniques for using relatives as proxies to disguise the true ownership of assets and conceal illicit wealth. Politicians around the world, including heads of state, high-ranking officials and oligarchs, are reported to use this tactic to avoid public scrutiny and accountability, including sanctions. Such investigations have uncovered hundreds of minors listed as owners of companies in jurisdictions with limited transparency, revealing how easily family ties can be exploited to avoid scrutiny (see public comment by Transparency International, PC-31435). In 2025, the [United Nations \(UN\) Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights'](#) concluding [remarks](#) on the seventh periodic report of the Philippines reiterated "its concern that corruption remains pervasive in all branches of government and in the wider public sector."

In September 2025, over 30 Philippine businesses and civil society organizations released a [statement](#) expressing concern over perceived corruption in the



government's infrastructure projects. [Reporting](#) shows public anger surged with viral social media campaigns, mass protests and frustration over “nepo babies” - children of powerful politicians and government contractors who display a lavish lifestyle online, reinforcing the belief that public funds are being misused for personal gain. In this context, current Philippine President Ferdinand Marcos Jr. established an [independent commission](#) to investigate potential irregularities in infrastructure initiatives and ordered [lifestyle checks](#) on government officials to ensure transparency on wealth and assets.

Civic discourse in the Philippines is restricted, particularly for people criticizing the government, including those reporting on corruption. False allegations of corruption are also sometimes used as tools for attacking political opponents. Persecution, carried out both by governmental actors and private interests, including the killing of journalists and human rights defenders, is not uncommon. International non-governmental organizations [Freedom House](#) and [Human Rights Watch](#) reported that journalists and activists critical of the government often face criminal cases and extrajudicial violence. Notable examples include [Percy Lapid](#) (Percival Carag Mabasa) and [Melinda “Mei” Magsino](#), two prominent Filipino journalists known for their reporting on corruption, who were reportedly killed due to that work. These organizations also noted that [red-tagging](#) - a practice by state authorities of labeling and persecuting activists, journalists and human rights defenders who criticize the government, branding them as communists, subversives or terrorists regardless of their actual beliefs or affiliations – persists. In a recent [report](#), the UN Special Rapporteur on freedom of expression warned that red-tagging “significantly increases the level of threats and is a form of incitement to violence,” undermining civic space and delegitimizing human rights work.

With respect to the images in this post, in March 2025, Co [denied ownership](#) of an aircraft that had been used to transport the former Philippines President Rodrigo Duterte to face [charges](#) at The Hague. This issue was widely debated online, including



because of [speculation](#) that the same airplane was [previously used](#) by President Marcos Jr., leading online users and some political figures to question who owned it and who paid for the flight. Co [resigned](#) in September 2025 from the House of Representatives after being [summoned](#) to appear before the commission conducting the investigation.

2. User Submissions

The content creator received notification of the Board’s review but did not provide a statement.

3. Meta’s Content Policies and Submissions

I. Meta’s Content Policies

Violence and Incitement

The [Violence and Incitement policy](#) rationale states that Meta removes “language that incites or facilitates violence and credible threats to public or personal safety.” It notes that “people commonly express disdain or disagreement by threatening or calling for violence in non-serious and casual ways” and that Meta tries to consider “language and context in order to distinguish casual or awareness-raising statements from content that constitutes a credible threat to public or personal safety.”

The policy states that everyone is protected from “threats of violence that could lead to death (or other forms of high-severity violence).” It also prohibits threats of violence “that could lead to serious injury (mid-severity violence).” It defines threats of violence as “statements or visuals representing an intention, aspiration or call for violence against a target, and threats can be expressed in various types of statements such as statements of intent, calls for action, advocacy, expressions of hope, aspirational statements and conditional statements.” Meta’s internal guidance to moderators



states that “hunting is a method of violence if there is clear context that the goal of the hunt is to commit violence against the target.”

The policy also prohibits, on escalation and with additional information and/or context, “coded statements where the method of violence is not clearly articulated, but the threat is veiled or implicit, as shown by the combination of both a threat signal and contextual signal.” A threat signal can include a coded statement shared in a retaliatory context, that “acts as a threatening call to action” and that indicates “knowledge of or shares sensitive information that could expose others to violence.” A context signal is defined as when “local context or expertise confirms that the statement in question could lead to imminent violence,” the target or their representative reports the content to Meta, or when the target is a child.

Bullying and Harassment

Meta’s [Bullying and Harassment Community Standard](#) prohibits various forms of abuse directed against individuals. The policy rationale explains that bullying and harassment can take many forms, including “making threats” and “sending threatening messages.” It also “distinguishes between public figures and private individuals” to “allow discussion, which often includes critical commentary of people who are featured in the news or who have a large public audience.”

In its public rules, Meta prohibits “allegations about criminal or illegal behavior” targeting private minors. Meta’s internal guidance to reviewers also provides that on escalation, the company may remove certain criminal allegations against adults when context demonstrates that the allegation poses a risk of offline harm to the named individual.

II. Meta’s Submissions



Meta referred this case to the Board because it contains references to children and language that could be perceived as threatening. Meta noted the tension between the “paramount value of voice” and safety and privacy that this case raises. Meta stated that “in situations where the politician’s family, in particular their children, are part of the corruption allegations, voice remains paramount, but the assessment can become more complicated, especially when the accusations may sound threatening.”

Meta stated that it sometimes receives “pushback from the politicians to remove this type of content, particularly where it references their family members” and that “these concerns are heightened when the family members are minor children.” In this case, Meta noted that “people have an interest in discussing perceived corruption by their elected officials, some of which may involve their family members.” In response to a question from the Board, Meta explained that the statement about pushback from politicians was “anecdotal” and not based on “data we track.” The company’s escalation teams recalled that they have received previous complaints from politicians and public officials about content that alleges corruption and references their family members. These officials “have not threatened [the company] for non-compliance,” only requested the removal of the content.

In response to the Board’s questions, Meta explained that in this case, it escalated the content to subject matter experts for additional review, after it received “a report from a point of contact at the House of Representatives.”

The company determined the content was not a direct or veiled threat under its Violence and Incitement policy. Meta initially translated the caption “Hindi ka namin patahimikin” as “We will hunt you down,” and noted that “hunting” requires “nuanced” interpretation under the company’s internal guidance. It can “suggest an intent to commit violence but also may be innocuous (synonymous with searching for something or someone).” In response to a question from the Board on whether Meta considered other translations in light of other phrases in the post, the company also shared that



another possible translation provided by its regional expert was, “We will not let you know silence/peace.”

With the benefit of local context and subject matter experts, Meta found that the content did not contain a direct threat to commit violence against the politician or his family. Meta interpreted the phrase “At the expense of your family's safety and security” in the post’s caption to mean that “corruption has thrust the family into the public eye in an unfavorable way that compromises their security.” It also interpreted the statement “We will hunt you down” as “an intent to root out the type of corruption referenced in the post.”

Meta also found the post did not contain a veiled threat for the same reasons its regional teams found that it did not constitute a direct threat – because the post was interpreted as “political critique and expression of intent to hold the politician to account for perceived corruption.” Meta referenced the two required elements of a veiled threat under its policy but did not analyze the post for them, as its “regional team did not interpret it as a threat at all.”

The company also found that the post did not violate its Bullying and Harassment policy that prohibits criminal allegations against private minors. Meta explained that the content did not make any claims suggesting that the children had engaged in criminal behavior. Meta further noted that it considered that the politician was the focus of criticism and not the children.

Meta also found that the content did not violate its internal guidance in its Bullying and Harassment policy, prohibiting certain criminal allegations against adults when “on escalation, context demonstrates the allegation poses a risk of offline harm to the named individual.” Meta noted that even if the text could be interpreted as a criminal allegation, the politician is a member of the legislative branch and qualifies as a public figure. Under this policy, public figures, as opposed to private individuals, are not



protected from these kinds of attacks because allegations of criminality are often part of legitimate speech criticizing politicians. It also noted that the company did not have any indication, based on the feedback from their regional team, that the content contributed to a risk of offline harm to the politician or his family.

The Board asked Meta questions about the classifiers that identified the content as potentially violating and how they prioritize content for review; the approaches Meta considers to protect the rights of family members implicated in allegations of corruption; and how Meta generally responds to requests from politicians in scenarios like this. Meta answered all of the questions.

4. Public Comments

The Board received four public comments that met [the terms for submission](#). Two of the comments were submitted from Latin America and the Caribbean, one from Europe and one from the United States and Canada. To read public comments submitted with consent to publish, click [here](#).

The submissions covered the following themes: how to safeguard political expression on corruption, particularly when it involves rhetorical threats or targets politicians' and public officials' family members, including minors; the balance between protecting children's rights when they are implicated or depicted in such contexts; rhetorical threats as a feature of global political discourse; anti-corruption reporting and investigating; and corruption strategies for concealing assets through family members.

5. Oversight Board Analysis

The Board selected this case because it highlights the challenges in evaluating freedom of expression in the context of allegations of political corruption - a core form of political speech - particularly when such allegations may reference family members of



politicians or public officials, involving concerns for the safety and privacy of minors. This case falls within the Board’s strategic priority of Elections and Civic Space.

The Board analyzed Meta’s decision in this case against Meta’s content policies, values and human rights responsibilities. The Board also assessed the implications of this case for Meta’s broader approach to content governance.

5.1 Compliance With Meta’s Content Policies

Content Rules

Violence and Incitement Community Standard

Issues involving threats to the safety and wellbeing of children online should be taken seriously and addressed quickly. The Board finds, however, that the content in this case does not violate the Violence and Incitement policy nor directly implicate such concerns. The post criticizes a politician for claims of corruption and, in light of the culturally informed translation of the words contained in the post, does not contain a direct or veiled threat.

First, the post does not contain threats “that could lead to death (or other forms of high-severity violence)” or to “serious injury (mid-severity violence)” outlined by the policy. The phrases in the post that might be construed as calls for violence are better understood as denunciations of corruption and vows to ferret it out. Linguistic experts consulted by the Board explained that the phrase “Hindi ka namin patahimikin,” initially translated by Meta as “We will hunt you down,” literally means “We will not let you go in peace” or “We will not let you live a quiet life,” but is better interpreted as “We will not leave you alone.” With this translation, it is not a threat of violence but rather represents a pledge to pursue and expose the politician’s corruption. In this context, other phrases, including “At the expense of your family’s safety and security” and “This is the price, Zaldy. Your family,” should not be interpreted to signify an intent or call to



commit violence. They criticize and call out Co for allegedly involving his family in corruption, drawing them into public scrutiny.

Second, the post also does not contain a veiled threat, which requires a “threat signal” and a “context signal.” The threat signal can be context-based, by referencing retaliation or historical violence, inviting others to carry out violence or sharing sensitive information. The content was not shared in a retaliatory context, rather amid major political events and debates over pervasive political corruption. These included public debates over the ownership of the airplane that transported former president Duterte to The Hague following his arrest, and speculations about then-Congressman Co owning the aircraft. There is also no reference to historical violence. In determining that the post does not invite others to commit violence, the Board evaluated the same interpretative factors described above, including local context, linguistic usage and the lack of evident intent to commit harm, to find there is no “threatening call to action.” The post also does not indicate “knowledge of or shar[e] sensitive information that could expose others to violence” and only includes allegations of corruption widely discussed by the public. The family photo was reportedly publicly shared on the politician’s social media.

The post similarly does not satisfy the “context signal,” meaning additional context-based information or expert insight confirms the likelihood of violence; the target reports the content; or the target is a child. In this case, the context does not indicate any imminent or likely risk of violence against the politician or his family. The content was not reported by the politician, another possible context signal. Lastly, the post targets the politician with allegations of corruption, and not the children, who are referred to only in the context of those allegations.

Bullying and Harassment Community Standard



The content in this case does not violate the Bullying and Harassment policy. The Board agrees with Meta that the post does not contain allegations about criminal or illegal behavior directed against the private minors themselves, though it insinuates their father may have involved them in his alleged corruption. It also does not violate Meta's internal guidance prohibiting criminal allegations against adults where it may lead to offline harm.

Several factors indicate that the allegations of corruption in the content under review are directed at the politician alone, who is a public figure and an adult, and not at his family members. The post does not name or address the children directly, focusing on the politician. Linguistic experts consulted by the Board noted that the post is calling out potential high-level corruption committed by a politician. It does not make allegations that the children or any other member of his family sought to engage in criminal activities, but rather criticizes the politician's potential involvement of his children. The posting user further expresses some concern for the children and blames their allegedly corrupt parent for involving them in a scheme that may compromise their safety.

The Board notes that the policy prohibiting criminal allegations against private minors should be used to protect children but not to silence corruption allegations where children are used as proxies.

5.2 Compliance With Meta's Human Rights Responsibilities

The Board finds that keeping the content up on the platform is consistent with Meta's human rights responsibilities.

Freedom of Expression (Article 19 ICCPR)



Article 19 of the [International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights \(ICCPR\)](#) provides for broad protection of expression, including political discourse, and protects “even expression that may be regarded as deeply offensive” ([General Comment No. 34](#), paras. 11, 13 and 38). It gives “particularly high” protection to “public debate concerning public figures in the political domain and public institutions” as an essential component of the conduct of public affairs ([General Comment No. 34](#), para. 38, 20). It states explicitly that “all public figures, including those exercising the highest political authority such as heads of state and government, are legitimately subject to criticism and political opposition” ([General Comment No. 34](#), para. 38, 20). The UN Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression noted that freedom of expression “is an important tool for combating impunity and corruption” ([A/HRC/14/23](#)).

When restrictions on expression are imposed by a state, they must meet the requirements of legality, legitimate aim, and necessity and proportionality (Article 19, para. 3, ICCPR). These requirements are often referred to as the “three-part test.” The Board uses this framework to interpret Meta’s human rights responsibilities in line with the [UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights](#), which Meta itself has committed to in its [Corporate Human Rights Policy](#). The Board does this both in relation to the individual content decision under review and what this says about Meta’s broader approach to content governance. As the UN Special Rapporteur on freedom of expression has stated, although “companies do not have the obligations of governments, their impact is of a sort that requires them to assess the same kind of questions about protecting their users’ right to freedom of expression” ([A/74/486](#), para. 41).

I. Legality (Clarity and Accessibility of the Rules)

The principle of legality under international human rights law requires rules that limit expression to be clear and publicly accessible ([General Comment No.34](#), at para. 25).



Rules restricting expression “may not confer unfettered discretion for the restriction of freedom of expression on those charged with [their] execution” and “provide sufficient guidance to those charged with their execution to enable them to ascertain what sorts of expression are properly restricted and what sorts are not” ([A/HRC/38/35](#), at para. 46). People using Meta's platforms should be able to access and understand the rules and content reviewers should have clear guidance on their enforcement.

The Board finds that, as applied in this case, Meta’s policies meet legality standards.

Regarding the Violence and Incitement policy, in response to the Board’s recommendation in the [UK Drill Music](#) decision, the policy now publicly clarifies that for the content to be removed as a veiled threat, both a “threat signal” and a “contextual signal” are required.

The Bullying and Harassment policy prohibiting allegations about criminal or illegal behavior against private minors is also publicly accessible and clear for users and content reviewers. The Board, however, is concerned that the provision prohibiting criminal allegations made against adults when “escalation context demonstrates the allegations pose offline harm to the named individual” is included only in the internal guidance for reviewers rather than the public version of the policy. The Board has previously recommended that Meta’s internal guidance be reflected in its public-facing policies, so that users can clearly understand what is permitted or prohibited, anticipate how the rules will be applied and adjust their behavior accordingly (see [Sharing Private Residential Information](#), [Colombia Protests](#), [Iran Protest Slogan](#), [Statements Against the Japanese Prime Minister](#), [Violence Against Women](#) and [Iranian Make-up Video for a Child Marriage](#)).

II. Legitimate Aim



In international human rights law as applied to states, any restriction on freedom of expression should also pursue one or more of the legitimate aims listed in the ICCPR, which includes protecting safety and the rights of others.

The Violence and Incitement Community Standard aims to “prevent potential offline harm” by removing content that poses “a genuine risk of physical harm or direct threats to public safety.” This policy serves the legitimate aim of protecting the rights to life and security (Article 6, ICCPR; Article 9 ICCPR) (see [Statements Against the Japanese Prime Minister](#)). The Bullying and Harassment Community Standard states that it aims to protect users from bullying and harassment made through “threats and releasing personally identifiable information [and] sending threatening messages and making unwanted malicious contact.” It serves the legitimate aim to protect the rights of others (see [Gender Identity Debate Videos](#)), including the right to privacy and security (Article 9, ICCPR; Article 17, ICCPR).

III. Necessity and Proportionality

Under ICCPR Article 19(3), necessity and proportionality requires that restrictions on expression “must be appropriate to achieve their protective function; they must be the least intrusive instrument amongst those which might achieve their protective function; they must be proportionate to the interest to be protected” ([General Comment No. 34](#), para. 34).

The Board finds that Meta’s decision to leave the content on the platform aligned with its human rights responsibilities. Removal or other restrictions were not necessary to protect the life, safety and privacy of the people referenced in the post, especially given the specific context in which the content was posted. The fact that the content at hand did not contain a threat or call for violence makes restriction unnecessary.



People should be able to express their political views, including criticism of politicians' conduct. Under international human rights law, such speech lies at the core of protected political expression. Political leaders and public officials are required to tolerate a higher degree of scrutiny and criticism than private individuals, given their influential role in public affairs and the public's right to hold them accountable (see [General Comment No. 34](#), para. 11, 38). These principles reflect the public's right to engage in robust debate without fear of censorship.

The Board has repeatedly highlighted the importance of political speech, even when using figurative language to criticize governments, politicians or public officials (see [Iran Protest Slogan](#), [Iranian Woman Confronted on Street](#), [Reporting on Pakistani Parliament Speech](#) and [Statements About the Japanese Prime Minister](#)). In these cases, the Board noted that expression used to criticize public officials should be evaluated within its social and linguistic context, to understand the risks it may pose. In a public comment submitted to the Board, the anti-corruption organization Transparency International also notes the role of online movements in exposing corruption, highlighting that they can mobilize citizens, demand accountability and challenge abuses of power, even where traditional institutions fall short (see PC-31435).

This is particularly important in environments where freedom of expression to denounce corruption may be restricted or dangerous. In a recent [report](#) on the Philippines, the UN Special Rapporteur on freedom of expression raised concerns about red-tagging, surveillance, harassment and even killings endangering those who speak out against or investigate government abuses. The rapporteur noted that "reporting critically on state policies ... are not acts of terrorism but legitimate activities under international human rights law" and called upon the government to "end the intimidation and harassment of, threats to and attacks on journalists, human rights defenders and civil society actors." Additionally, research conducted by the Board found that people criticizing politicians and exposing corruption are often at a bigger risk of retaliation in the Philippines than politicians themselves.



The rights to safety and privacy are key concerns, but restricting expression is not necessary in this case. In determining the potential risks for the safety or privacy of the individuals mentioned in the post, the Board assessed several factors. Regarding safety, contextual elements suggest that the language used is political discourse criticizing a public official for alleged acts of corruption and doesn't contain a threat of violence. With respect to privacy, the content references the politician's family in the context of allegations that the politician concealed assets through them. The photo does not contain private or sensitive information and [appears](#) to have been previously publicly shared by the politician on his social media. Aside from the politician, no family member is named in the post.

At the policy level, assessing risks to privacy and safety, particularly relating to children, demands careful consideration. The UN Committee on the Rights of the Child stated that “content moderation and content controls should be balanced with the right to protection against violations of children's other rights, notably their rights to freedom of expression and privacy” (see [General Comment no.25](#)). However, the Board believes that this protective aim may not be used as a tool by public officials to shield themselves from scrutiny.

Meta informed the Board that it sometimes receives “pushback from the politicians to remove this type of content” when it references their family members, including children, and highlighted the challenges it faces in evaluating freedom of expression in such situations. Requests to remove social media posts exposing alleged corruption by high-level public officials should be highly scrutinized (see public comment by Transparency International, PC-31435). While allegations of corruption can sometimes occur in the context of threatening attacks (see [Content Targeting Human Rights Defenders in Peru](#)), Meta should recognize that when no threat of violence is present - as in this case - such requests may not always aim to protect children, but rather serve as an attempt by powerful figures to shield themselves from accountability and



suppress legitimate debate. While the rights and safety of children must always be safeguarded, these protections cannot serve as a pretext to silence allegations of official misconduct. The appropriate response must be necessary and proportionate, assessing contextual signals carefully, and recognizing the very high public interest in transparency and accountability and corresponding protection for speech alleging corruption by public officials.

In this case, escalated enforcement led to the correct outcome. Meta’s automated enforcement identified the content as potentially violating the Community Standards. Had it been prioritized for human review, the outcome would have depended on at-scale reviewers’ ability to interpret local context and language. In previous cases, the Board has repeatedly highlighted the inconsistent at-scale enforcement of its policies in relation to non-literal threats and has called on Meta to rely on local and contextual expertise to make difficult calls (see [Call for Women’s Protests in Cuba](#), [Statements About the Japanese Prime Minister](#), [Iran Protest Slogan](#) and [Iranian Woman Confronted on the Street](#)). While Meta reported progress on implementing these recommendations, they have not all been fully implemented. Meta informed the Board that it continues its “work more broadly on Violence and Incitement and remain[s] committed to conducting policy development” to achieve a better balance between violent speech and political expression (see [Meta’s Bi-Annual report on the Oversight Board, H1 2025](#) and [Statements About the Japanese Prime Minister](#)). The Board reiterates the ongoing importance of those recommendations here.

6. The Oversight Board’s Decision

The Board upholds Meta’s decision to leave the content up.

7. Recommendations



1. The Oversight Board reiterates its previous recommendations that Meta improve enforcement based on contextual analysis related to potentially threatening language, issued in the [Iran Protest Slogan](#), [Call for Women's Protests in Cuba](#) and [Statements About the Japanese Prime Minister](#) cases. This includes updating internal guidance provided to content reviewers, where relevant, so that the company addresses any lack of clarity, gaps or inconsistencies.

***Procedural Note:**

- The Oversight Board's decisions are made by panels of five Members and approved by a majority vote of the full Board. Board decisions do not necessarily represent the views of all Members.
- Under its [Charter](#), the Oversight Board may review appeals from users whose content Meta removed, appeals from users who reported content that Meta left up, and decisions that Meta refers to it (Charter Article 2, Section 1). The Board has binding authority to uphold or overturn Meta's content decisions (Charter Article 3, Section 5; Charter Article 4). The Board may issue non-binding recommendations that Meta is required to respond to (Charter Article 3, Section 4; Article 4). Where Meta commits to act on recommendations, the Board monitors their implementation.
- For this case decision, independent research was commissioned on behalf of the Board. Linguistic expertise was provided by Lionbridge Technologies, LLC, whose specialists are fluent in more than 350 languages and work from 5,000 cities across the world.*