

Mandates of the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association; the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression; the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders; the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers; the Special Rapporteur on minority issues; the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief and the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism

Ref.: AL IND 5/2026
(Please use this reference in your reply)

30 March 2026

Excellency,

We have the honour to address you in our capacities as Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association; Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression; Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders; Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers; Special Rapporteur on minority issues; Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief and Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 59/4, 52/9, 52/4, 53/12, 52/5, 58/5 and 58/14.

In this connection, we would like to bring to the attention of your Excellency's Government information we have received concerning **the alleged prolonged and indefinite detention of Mr. Umar Khalid, an Indian human rights defender and student activist, who was arrested on 13 September 2020 allegedly on politically motivated counter-terrorism charges, and who has remained in detention without trial for more than five years.** Mr. Khalid's detention is based on allegations of conduct violating, among others, the Unlawful Activities Prevention Act (UAPA). We therefore also wish to reiterate concerns regarding the **compatibility of the UAPA with India's obligations under international human rights law**, as previously raised with your Excellency's Government in [IND 7/2020](#) and [IND 10/2023](#). We regret that to date, no response to these communications has been received.

According to the information received:

Umar Khalid is a well-known pro-democracy activist and human rights defender focusing on Muslim minority rights in India. He completed his PhD thesis at the history department of the Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU) on the Adivasis, the Indigenous Peoples of India in the Jharkhand State of India. Mr. Khalid is one of the founders of United Against Hate, a civil society group that seeks equal treatment for all and opposes hate, bigotry, and racism by organizing factfinding missions and awareness campaigns across the country.

In February 2016, Mr. Khalid was accused of shouting anti-Indian slogans, charged with sedition and detained for 24 days following his involvement in JNU student-initiated poetry readings in memory of Afzal Guru, a Kashmiri militant hanged by the Indian Government in secret after being accused of aiding the planning of the 2001 attack on India's parliament.

In December 2019, the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) majority Government introduced and passed the Citizenship Amendment Act (CAA), which excluded Muslims from expedited access to citizenship and from legislative protection against deportation and imprisonment. The passage of the CAA resulted in nationwide peaceful protests over concerns that millions of Muslims could face discriminatory restrictions in accessing citizenship.

Mr. Khalid actively expressed his opposition to the CAA, both on X (formerly Twitter) and through speeches and organized advocacy in Delhi and other cities. During the widespread national protests against the CAA in early 2020, he gave a speech before 700 protesters in Amravati, Maharashtra, calling for peaceful and non-violent participation in the protests, also referring to the heritage of non-violent civil disobedience and non-cooperation of Mahatma Gandhi. He further claimed that despite his promises, India's Minister of Home Affairs had failed to engage in a dialogue with the anti-CAA protesters, stating that "we will not respond to violence with violence, we will not respond to hatred with violence, if they spread hatred, we will respond with love". He then openly criticized President Modi. As a consequence of these activities, Mr. Khalid was among a group of peaceful protesters – most of them Muslim – who were arrested by Delhi Police on 17 February 2020.

On 6 March 2020, Mr. Khalid was charged with 29 offenses under the First Information Report (FIR) 59/2020, alongside 19 others. He was charged under the Indian Penal Code (IPC) with "punishment of criminal conspiracy" (Section 120B IPC; death penalty, imprisonment for two years or more), "punishment for rioting" (Section 147 IPC; imprisonment for maximum 2 years, a fine, or both), "punishment for murder" (Section 302 IPC; death penalty or life imprisonment with fine), "sedition" (Section 124A IPC; life imprisonment with fine, or imprisonment for 3 years with fine), "promoting enmity between different groups on grounds of religion, race, place of birth, residence, language, etc., and doing acts prejudicial to maintenance of harmony" (Section 153A IPC; imprisonment for maximum 3 years, a fine, or both), "fraudulent claim to property to prevent its seizure as forfeited or in execution" (Section 207 IPC; imprisonment for up to two years or fine, or both), "assault or criminal force to deter public servant from discharge of his duty" (Section 353 IPC; imprisonment for up to two years or fine, or both), "obstructing public servant in discharge of public functions" (Section 186 IPC; imprisonment for up to three months or fine, or both), "harbouring offender" (Section 212 IPC; death penalty, life imprisonment, or fine), "punishment for dacoity" (Section 395 IPC; imprisonment for up to 10 years or fine), "mischief causing damage to the amount of fifty rupees" (Section 427 IPC; imprisonment for up to two years or fine, or both), "mischief by fire or explosive substance with intent to cause damage to amount of one hundred or (in case of agricultural produce) ten rupees" (Section 435 IPC; imprisonment for up to seven years or fine), "mischief by fire or explosive substance with intent to destroy house" (Section 436 IPC; imprisonment for up to 10 years or fine), "house-trespass after preparation for hurt, assault or wrongful restraint" (Section 452 IPC; imprisonment for up to seven years or fine), "lurking house trespass or house-breaking in order to commit offence punishable with imprisonment" (Section 454 IPC; imprisonment for up to 10 years), "punishment of abetment

if the act abetted is committed in consequence and where no express provision is made for its punishment” (Section 109 IPC; sentenced with the sentence provided for the offense), “abettor present when offence is committed” (Section 114 IPC; sentenced with the sentence provided for the offense), “rioting, armed with deadly weapon” (Section 148 IPC; imprisonment for up to two years or fine, or both), “every member of unlawful assembly guilty of offence committed in prosecution of common object” (Section 149 IPC), and “acts done by several persons in furtherance of common intention” (Section 34 IPC).

He was also charged under the UAPA with “punishment for unlawful activities” (Section 13 UAPA; imprisonment for maximum 5 years, a fine, or both), “terrorist act” (Section 15 UAPA), “punishment for a terrorist act” (Section 16 UAPA; life imprisonment if such act results in the death of any person, or imprisonment for minimum 5 years with fine), “punishment for raising funds for a terrorist act” (Section 17 UAPA; imprisonment for maximum 14 years, or a fine, or both), and “punishment for conspiracy” (Section 18 UAPA; imprisonment for minimum 5 years, which may be extended to life imprisonment, with fine). It is worth noting that human rights groups have argued that the UAPA’s intentionally vague provisions have contributed to prolonged and indefinite detention in violation of international human rights law, particularly the right to liberty and to a fair trial. They have further alleged that the law is selectively used to criminalize human rights defenders like Mr. Khalid.

Finally, he was charged under the Arms Act (1959) with “punishment for certain offences” (Section 25 Arms Act; imprisonment for 7 years to life with fine) and “punishment for using arms” (Section 27 Arms Act; imprisonment for maximum 7 years, which may be extended to life, with fine), and under the Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act (PDPP) 1984, with “mischief causing damage to public property” (Section 3 PDPP; imprisonment for maximum 5 years with fine), and “mischief causing damage to public property by fire or explosive substances” (Section 4 PDPP; imprisonment for 1-10 years with fine).

On 31 July 2020, Mr. Khalid was called for interrogation to the office of the Special Cell of the Delhi Police in Lodhi Colony. On 12 September 2020, the same office called him for another interrogation. After 11 hours of questioning, officials arrested him on 13 September 2020. He was presented with an arrest memo at the time of his arrest but was not allowed to meet with his lawyers and was interrogated without them present, even though they were informed of his arrest and had arrived outside the police station.

On 14 September 2020, Mr. Khalid appeared via video conference before the Karkardooma Court in Delhi. The court approved the Delhi Police’s request to detain Mr. Khalid for 10 days in police custody to carry out an “effective and proper investigation,” and to confront Mr. Khalid with technical evidence. Mr. Khalid’s lawyers were present during the hearing though Mr. Khalid was only allowed to first meet with them on 15 September. The officials accused Mr. Khalid of being a “key conspirator” in the “Delhi riots” and of inciting

communal violence through his speeches in February 2020. He was also labeled a “silent whisperer” and accused of “remote supervision” of the anti-CAA protests. On 24 September 2020, the Karkardooma Court placed Mr. Khalid in custody until 22 October 2020, after which he was transferred to Delhi’s Tihar Jail. The Court repeatedly extended his pre-trial detention, and Mr. Khalid has been repeatedly denied bail.

After several requests between the end of 2020 and the end of 2024, the Karkardooma Court granted Mr. Khalid temporary bail from 28 December 2024 to 3 January 2025 for the purposes of attending a family wedding, on the condition that he not use social media or contact any person in connection with his case, and remain in his home or places where wedding-related programs were to be held. He also had to furnish a personal bond of Rs 20,000 (approximately 229 USD) and two sureties of the same amount.

On 21 January 2025, the Delhi High Court urged the Delhi Police to accelerate their investigations and submissions, and to specify the role of each accused individual during the anti-CAA protests in relation to the UAPA conspiracy charges brought against them. Nevertheless, Mr. Khalid has remained in detention in Delhi’s Tihar Jail without access to a trial in connection with these charges.

On 5 January 2026, the Indian Supreme Court denied bail to Mr. Khalid, thereby allowing his over five years of pre-trial detention to continue. Additionally, the Supreme Court held that Mr. Khalid would have to wait one year before becoming eligible for bail again. Prior to this decision, his bail applications had already been denied at least four times by trial and appellate courts in India.

Without wishing to prejudge the accuracy of the information received, we express serious concern about the well-being and safety of Mr. Khalid. We are concerned that he may be facing arbitrary and indefinite detention in Delhi’s Tihar Jail, with no prospect of trial and no access to any other legal avenue to challenge his detention, in violation of his right to liberty and security and the prohibition on arbitrary detention under article 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), which India ratified on 10 April 1979. We are also concerned that Mr. Khalid may have been targeted because of his activities as an activist, human rights defender and leader in the student movement, in violation of his rights to freedom of expression and opinion, peaceful assembly, and association, and the right to take part in public affairs, under articles 19, 21 22 and 25 of the ICCPR. We are particularly concerned that the Indian judiciary appears to have foreclosed Mr. Khalid’s access to the legal system, and that having already spent more than five years in pre-trial detention, the *de facto* imposition of a one year waiting period before Mr. Khalid can apply for bail again appears inconsistent with India’s obligations under international human rights law, which only permit pre-trial detention as a preventive measure and not as a form of punishment, and with Mr. Khalid’s right to be presumed innocent under article 14 of the ICCPR.

We also wish to reiterate concerns brought to the attention of your Excellency’s Government in previous communications (IND 7/2020 and IND 10/2023) regarding the incompatibility of the UAPA with India’s obligations under international law, including

the requirement of legal certainty under article 15 of the ICCPR. In particular, we emphasized the vague and overbroad definition of “terrorist act” in the UAPA, and raised concern that such definition may lead to “the arrest, detention or harassment of individuals exercising their internationally protected rights, restrictions which could constitute arbitrary deprivations of liberty under international law, and ultimately risk the conflation of domestic protest, dissent, or peaceful defence of human rights with terrorism.”

In connection with the above alleged facts and concerns, please refer to the **Annex on Reference to international human rights law** attached to this letter which cites international human rights instruments and standards relevant to these allegations.

As it is our responsibility, under the mandates provided to us by the Human Rights Council, to seek to clarify all cases brought to our attention, we would be grateful for your observations on the following matters:

1. Please provide any additional information and/or comment(s) you may have on the above-mentioned allegations.
2. Please detail the factual and legal grounds for the arrest and detention of Mr. Khalid, and explain the measures taken by your Excellency’s Government to guarantee Mr. Khalid’s right to a fair trial and due process, as well as timely access to bail.
3. Please describe the steps taken by your Excellency’s Government to carry out an immediate, thorough and transparent investigation into the lawfulness of the initial arrest and continued pre-trial detention of Mr. Khalid.
4. Please describe any additional steps your Excellency’s Government has taken, or plans to take, to safeguard the rights of Mr. Khalid in compliance with international human rights law, in particular his rights to freedom of opinion and expression, peaceful assembly and association, liberty and security, and a fair trial and due process.
5. Please provide any additional information and any comments you may have on the above-mentioned allegations of indefinite pre-trial detention and weaponization of domestic counter-terrorism laws, specifically the UAPA.
6. Please explain what measures have been taken to ensure that all human rights defenders in India, in particular those advocating for the rights of Muslims and minority rights, can carry out their peaceful and legitimate activities without fear of harassment or other restrictions.
7. Please detail the steps taken or envisaged by your Excellency’s Government to review the UAPA and bring it into conformity with international law.

This communication, and any response received from your Excellency's Government, will be made public via the communications reporting [website](#) at the 60 days mark. Should Your Excellency's Government respond within 60 days, both the communication and the response, may be published before the 60 days mark. The communications and responses will also be made available in the subsequent periodic report to be presented to the Human Rights Council.

While awaiting a reply, we urge that all necessary interim measures be taken to halt the alleged violations and prevent their re-occurrence and in the event that the investigations support or suggest the allegations to be correct, to ensure the accountability of any person(s) responsible for the alleged violations.

We may publicly express our concerns in the near future as, in our view, the information upon which the press release will be based is sufficiently reliable to indicate a matter warranting immediate attention. We also believe that the wider public should be alerted to the potential implications of the above-mentioned allegations. The press release will indicate that we have been in contact with your Excellency's Government to clarify the issues in question.

Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of our highest consideration.

Gina Romero

Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association

Irene Khan

Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression

Mary Lawlor

Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders

Margaret Satterthwaite

Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers

Nicolas Levrat

Special Rapporteur on minority issues

Nazila Ghanea

Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief

Ben Saul

Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism

Annex

Reference to international human rights law

In connection with the above alleged facts and concerns, we would like to refer your Excellency's Government to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), to which India is a State Party since 10 April 1979.

Article 9 of the ICCPR guarantees the right to liberty and security of person and provides that "no one shall be deprived of his [or her] liberty except on such grounds and in accordance with such procedure as are established by law."

Article 9(3) of the ICCPR and principle 39 of the Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment (Body of Principles) set a general rule against pretrial detention: pretrial detention should be the exception rather than the norm. The UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention (WGAD) has also noted that pretrial detention should be as short as possible. General comment No. 35 requires that "detention pending trial must be based on an individualized determination that it is reasonable and necessary taking into account all the circumstances, for such purposes as to prevent flight, interference with evidence or the recurrence of crime. The relevant factors should be specified in law and should not include vague and expansive standards such as 'public security'" (para. 38). The officials must examine "whether alternatives to pretrial detention, such as bail, (...) would render detention unnecessary in a particular case" (ibid). The WGAD has also established the requirement for governments to provide documentation justifying the need for prolonged pre-trial detention and, if delays continue, that the judge re-examine the need for pre-trial detention.

Article 9(4) of the ICCPR guarantees the right to take proceedings before a court to challenge the lawfulness of the detention. This is reinforced in principles 11(1) and 32(1) of the Body of Principles. General comment No. 35 states that individuals are also entitled to "receive a decision, and without delay," and that the adjudication of cases should "take place as expeditiously as possible" (para. 47). Moreover, article 8 of the UDHR and article 2(3) of the ICCPR guarantee the right to an effective remedy.

We also wish to recall that the Human Rights Committee has established in its general comment No. 35 on article 9 of the ICCPR that an arrest or detention as punishment for the legitimate exercise of the rights as guaranteed by the Covenant, including freedom of opinion, expression, assembly and association, is arbitrary (para. 17).

Article 19 of the ICCPR guarantees the right to hold opinions without interference and the right to freedom of expression, which includes the right "to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media". This right applies online as well as offline, protects the freedom of the press as one of its core elements and includes not only the exchange of information that is favourable, but also that which may criticize, shock, or offend.

In its [general comment No. 34](#), the Human Rights Committee stated that States parties to the ICCPR are required to guarantee the right to freedom of expression, including “political discourse, commentary on one's own and on public affairs, canvassing, discussion of human rights, journalism, cultural and artistic expression, teaching, and religious discourse” (CCPR/C/GC/34, para. 11). The Committee states that article 19 also covers the right of a free press and other media able to comment on public issues without censorship or restraint and to inform public opinion and a corresponding right of the public to receive media output.

The Committee further asserts that there is a duty of States to put in place effective measures to protect against attacks aimed at silencing those exercising their right to freedom of expression (para. 23). Recognizing how journalists and persons who engage in the gathering and analysis of information on the human rights situation and who publish human rights-related reports, including judges and lawyers, are frequently subjected to threats, intimidation and attacks because of their activities, the Committee stresses that “all such attacks should be vigorously investigated in a timely fashion, and the perpetrators prosecuted, and the victims, or, in the case of killings, their representatives, be in receipt of appropriate forms of redress” (para. 23).

Any restriction on the right to freedom of expression must be compatible with the requirements set out in article 19(3) ICCPR. Under these requirements, restrictions must (i) be provided by law; (ii) pursue one of the legitimate aims for restriction, which are the respect of the rights or reputations of others and the protection of national security or of public order (*ordre public*), or of public health or morals; and (iii) be necessary and proportionate for those objectives. The State has the burden of proof to demonstrate that any such restrictions are compatible with the Covenant, and restrictions must always be “the least intrusive instrument among those which might achieve their protective function” ([CCPR/C/GC/34, para. 34](#)).

Article 19(3) may never be invoked to justify the muzzling of any advocacy of democratic tenets and human rights (para. 23). Nor, under any circumstance, can an attack on a person, because of the exercise of their freedom of opinion or expression, including such forms of attack as arbitrary arrest and torture, be compatible with article 19 (para. 23). The Human Rights Committee also explicitly noted that the penalization of a media outlet or journalist solely for being critical of the government or the political social system espoused by the government can never be considered to be a necessary restriction of freedom of expression (para. 42).

The right to freedom of peaceful assembly is furthermore enshrined in article 21 of the ICCPR. Peaceful assemblies are protected under this provision wherever they take place: outdoors, indoors and online; in public and private spaces; or a combination thereof. Such assemblies may take many forms, including demonstrations, protests, meetings, processions, rallies, sit-ins, candlelit vigils and flash mobs (general comment No. 37, para. 6). Article 22 of the ICCPR protects the right to freedom of association.

Read in conjunction with article 2(1) of the ICCPR, articles 21 and 22 provide that States not only have a negative obligation to abstain from unduly interfering with the rights of peaceful assembly and of association but also have a positive obligation to facilitate and protect these rights in accordance with international human rights standards (A/HRC/17/27, para. 66, A/HRC/29/25/Add.1). This means ensuring that the

rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association are enjoyed by everyone, without discrimination on the basis of race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status (A/HRC/41/41, para. 13). States furthermore have an obligation not only to refrain from violating the rights of individuals involved in an assembly, but to ensure the rights of those who participate or are affected by them, and to facilitate an enabling environment (A/HRC/31/66 para. 13).

We wish to remind your Excellency's Government that any restrictions to the exercise of these rights must be provided by law and be necessary and proportionate to the aim pursued (ICCPR, articles 19(3) and 21). Articles 21 and 22(2) of the ICCPR require restrictions on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and association to be provided by law and to be "necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security or public safety, public order (*ordre public*), the protection of public health or morals or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others." Activities that fall within the right to participate in public affairs under article 25 of the ICCPR include, inter alia, the "criticism of the government, publishing material containing political content, or engaging in meetings or debates concerning political affairs."

The former Special Rapporteur on the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association has emphasized that for the effective enjoyment of the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association and to ensure full accountability, States should halt negative narratives, criminalizing and stigmatizing activists and protesters. Protecting those rights through robust and timely accountability is vital for preserving the ever-shrinking civic space as a whole, countering expanding authoritarianism and preventing deterioration of peace and security. Accountability has a deterrent effect, is crucial for ending the cycle of violence and preventing atrocities against activists and protesters and is vital for sustainable transition and peacebuilding" (A/HRC/53/38, para. 80).

Article 14(3)(b) ICCPR guarantees everyone the right to communicate with a counsel. Guideline 8 of the United Nations Basic Principles and Guidelines on Remedies and Procedures on the Right of Anyone Deprived of Their Liberty to Bring Proceedings Before a Court states that the right to legal assistance is to be afforded "without delay... immediately after the moment of deprivation of liberty and at the latest prior to any questioning by an authority." A fair trial must be adjudicated by an "independent and impartial" tribunal, as enshrined in article 10 of the UDHR, article 14(1) of the ICCPR, and principle 36(1) of the Body of Principles.

Articles 9(3) and 14(3)(c) of the ICCPR read together require that a criminally charged person be tried "within a reasonable time" or be released pending trial, and "without undue delay." Principle 38 of the Body of Principles echoes these provisions. General comment No. 35 requires that the complexity of the case, the accused's conduct, and the way the matter was dealt with by the judicial authorities are considered when assessing the reasonableness of any delay in bringing the case to trial. Furthermore, under article 11(1) of the UDHR, article 14(2) of the ICCPR, and principle 36(1) of the Body of Principles, a criminally charged person has the right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty. The same principle is enshrined in article 20(3) of the Indian Constitution.

Article 2 of the UDHR and article 2(1) of the ICCPR grant everyone the rights and freedoms outlined in the UDHR and the ICCPR, respectively, without any form of discrimination, including on the basis of political or other opinions. Article 26 of the ICCPR further provides that all persons are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to the equal protection of the law. It requires that the law “prohibit any discrimination and guarantee to all persons equal and effective protection against discrimination on any ground such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.”

Although no universal treaty generally defines “terrorism”, States should ensure that counter-terrorism legislation is limited to criminalizing conduct which is properly and precisely defined on the basis of the international counter-terrorism instruments,¹ the General Assembly’s Declaration on Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism (1994), and Security Council resolution 1566 (2004). Based on these authoritative sources, the model definition of terrorism advanced by the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism provides clear, “best practice” guidance, by identifying conduct that is genuinely terrorist in nature and precisely defining the elements (A/HRC/16/51 (2010) as revised by A/HRC/61/52 (2026)).

The principle of legality under article 15(1) of the ICCPR requires that criminal laws are sufficiently precise so that it is clear what types of behaviour constitute a criminal offence and what would be the legal consequences. This principle seeks to prevent ill-defined and/or overly broad laws which are open to arbitrary application and abuse, including to target civil society on political or other unjustified grounds (A/70/371, para. 46(b)) and suppress the exercise of fundamental rights and freedoms (A/HRC/40/52).

Many resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly, Security Council and Human Rights Council reaffirm that any measures taken to combat terrorism and violent extremism must comply with the obligations of States under international law, in particular international human rights law, refugee law and international humanitarian law.² Counter-terrorism measures must conform to fundamental requirements of legality, legitimate aim, necessity, proportionality, and non-discrimination. Disregard for these principles can have exceptionally harmful effects on the protection of fundamental rights, particularly for minorities, historically marginalized communities, and civil society. States must ensure that measures to combat terrorism do not hinder the work and safety of individuals, groups and organs of society engaged in promoting and defending human rights (A/HRC/RES/22/6, para. 10(a)).

We also would like to bring to your attention the fundamental principles set forth in the Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, also known as the UN Declaration on Human Rights Defenders. In particular we would like to refer to articles 1 and 2 of the Declaration, which state that everyone has the right to promote and to strive for the protection and

¹ See https://treaties.un.org/Pages/DB.aspx?path=DB/studies/page2_en.xml.

² Security Council resolutions 1373 (2001), 1456 (2003), 1566 (2004), 1624 (2005), 2178 (2014), 2242 (2015), 2341 (2017), 2354 (2017), 2368 (2017), 2370 (2017), 2395 (2017) and 2396 (2017); Human Rights Council resolution 35/34; and General Assembly resolutions 49/60, 51/210, 72/123 and 72/180, among others

realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms at the national and international levels and that each State has a prime responsibility and duty to protect, promote and implement all human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Additionally, we would like to refer to the following provisions of the UN Declaration on Human Rights Defenders:

- article 5(a) and (b), providing for everyone's right, individually and in association with others, to meet or assemble peacefully and to form, join and participate in non-governmental organizations, associations or groups.
- article 6(b), which states that everyone has the right, individually and in association with others, to freely publish, impart or disseminate to others views, information and knowledge on all human rights and fundamental freedoms.
- article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3, which provide that the State shall take all necessary measures to ensure the protection of everyone against any violence, threats, retaliation, de facto or de jure adverse discrimination, pressure or any other arbitrary action as a consequence of his or her legitimate exercise of the rights referred to in the Declaration.