

**Mandates of the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers; the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders**

Ref.: AL THA 10/2025  
(Please use this reference in your reply)

17 September 2025

Excellency,

We have the honour to address you in our capacities as Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers; Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression and Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 53/12, 52/9 and 52/4.

In this connection, we would like to bring to the attention of your Excellency's Government information we have received concerning allegations regarding irregularities in the trial against lawyer and human rights defender Arnon Nampa.

Mr. Arnon Nampa is a prominent human rights lawyer and defender in Thailand. He is a founding member of Thai Lawyers for Human Rights, a legal organization established to provide free legal aid to individuals charged and/or prosecuted for criticizing the military, government, and/or monarchy following the 2014 coup in Thailand.

Mr. Nampa was convicted of lèse-majesté for the first time on 26 September 2023. Since then, he has been detained in the Bangkok Remand Prison and he has accumulated prison sentences adding up to more than 29 years in connection with 10 subsequent lèse-majesté convictions. All of these convictions stem solely from his peaceful advocacy for democratic and monarchy reforms, conveyed through speeches at pro-democracy rallies and posts on social media platforms. Most recently, on 8 July 2025, the Criminal Court found Mr. Nampa guilty of lèse-majesté for peacefully criticizing the Thai Parliament and monarchy during a public assembly and sentenced him to two years and four months in prison.

Mr. Nampa was awarded the 2025 [Front Line Defenders Award for Human Rights Defenders at Risk](#), established in 2005 to honour the work of defenders who are courageously making outstanding contributions to the promotion and protection of the human rights of others, often at great personal risk to themselves.

Special procedures have written to you before concerning Mr. Nampa: on 24 August 2023 (THA 5/2023) on his disbarment proceedings, and in 2021 (THA 11/2020) and in 2020 (THA 7/2020). We thank you for the replies received to our communications; however, our concerns persist.

According to the information received, Mr. Nampa's trial proceedings have suffered from due process irregularities.

## *Harry Potter I Case*

Throughout these proceedings, the information suggests that Mr. Nampa did not enjoy equality of arms or access to an impartial judge. For example, the Court repeatedly declined to issue subpoenas for evidence crucial to Mr. Nampa's defense. On 27 November 2024, the defense informed the Court that it could not meaningfully cross-examine a prosecution witness because the Court had yet to issue a subpoena for key documents—specifically, King Rama X's travel records and monarchy budget sheets—needed to rebut the allegation that Mr. Nampa had made false statements during his protest speech. The Court justified its refusal by invoking section 6 of the Constitution, which provides that the King is “sacred” and “inviolable,” and that “no person shall expose the King to any sort of accusation or action.” Information suggests that no explanation was provided to Mr. Nampa as to how this provision rendered the requested evidence inadmissible or otherwise barred its disclosure.

Reports describe that, to protest this refusal to summon documents crucial to his defense, Mr. Nampa removed his shirt in the courtroom. In response, the judge ordered that trial be conducted in secret, imposed a gag order prohibiting anyone from disseminating information about what happened in the courtroom to the public, and charged Mr. Nampa with contempt of court.

Unexplained secret trial orders were issued on 27 and 28 November 2024.

On 28 November 2024, Mr. Nampa continued to insist that he would not proceed with examination of defense witnesses because of the secret trial order, the judge's refusal to issue a subpoena for documents crucial to the defense's case, and the prejudice exhibited by the judge. In response, the examination of all defense witnesses was cancelled and the verdict hearing was scheduled for 19 December 2024.

The information further suggests that the presiding judge made several remarks that called his neutrality into question. For example, on 28 November 2024, when Mr. Nampa asked for an explanation of the bases for the secret trial and the gag orders, the judge responded: “A judge's job is to try the case, not to provide reasons.”

The judge also told Mr. Nampa that “because you overstepped [the monarchy], that's why you are being prosecuted today.” Mr. Nampa persisted in requesting an explanation and was immediately ordered into detention. When his counsel attempted to address the judge on his behalf, the judge curtly declared, “If anyone says anything—if they don't stop—I will imprison all of them.”

On 3 December 2024, Mr. Nampa submitted two petitions to the Criminal Court—one seeking to remove the judge for bias or prejudice and another seeking vacation of the allegedly unlawful proceedings. Both petitions detailed the violations that occurred on 27 and 28 November 2024.

On 19 December 2024, before reading the verdict, the judge informed Mr. Nampa that the recusal petition was dismissed by the same judge who was

presiding his case, acting as chief justice of the Criminal Court. The same judge then dismissed the petition to vacate the proceedings.

### *Contempt of Court Case*

On 27 November 2024, the judge charged Mr. Nampa with contempt of court for removing his shirt in protest. The judge cited Mr. Nampa's actions as disorderly conduct that disrupted the proceedings and showed disrespect toward the Court. The information suggests that Mr. Nampa was not granted adequate and timely access to counsel of his choice for these proceedings; and that he faced limitations to the equality of arms required to prepare an adequate defense.

On 23 January 2025, the Court brought Mr. Nampa from the Bangkok Remand Prison to the Criminal Court for an inquiry in the contempt of court case. Mr. Nampa was not informed of the appointment in advance and was not accompanied by his lawyer. The judge attempted to question Mr. Nampa, asking him if he removed his shirt on 27 November 2024. The judge did not ask for the motivations behind this action. When Mr. Nampa refused to answer in the absence of his lawyer, the judge then ordered that the inquiry be postponed to 5 March 2025.

During the hearing on 5 March 2025, the presiding judge refused to allow the public into the courtroom even though, as Mr. Nampa's lawyers argued, there was no order for a secret trial. The judge then imposed a secret trial order after the defense counsel insisted that the trial must be open to the public unless the judge ordered otherwise. Eventually, the judge permitted the public to be in the courtroom on the condition that they not disturb the proceeding. Every person was required to give their ID card and mobile phone to the Court. At the end of the hearing, their ID cards and mobile phones were returned to them and everyone was asked to sign a court report acknowledging their presence in the courtroom.

During the witness examination on 5 March 2025, Mr. Nampa was denied access to CCTV footage that would verify his motives for removing his shirt on 27 November 2024. At first, body camera footage depicting only the events that took place after Mr. Nampa removed his shirt was played in the courtroom. The defense then requested access to additional courtroom CCTV footage, which would show the full sequence of events that took place that day, including the events leading up to Mr. Nampa's shirt removal. Such evidence would corroborate Mr. Nampa's argument that he removed his shirt to protest the judge's refusal to issue a subpoena for crucial evidence.

Initially, a witness confirmed that such footage existed and was available through the E-Hearing system. However, after the presiding judge granted a short recess for the footage to be retrieved, the witness suddenly reversed testimony and stated that the footage was not available. Rather than questioning why the witness changed testimony, the judge instead ruled that the facts in the case had already been sufficiently established and directed the defense to proceed with cross-examination without the CCTV footage. It is unclear why the CCTV footage from the courtroom on the day of the incident was "not

available."

Another key witness was excluded by the judge on the grounds that they were engaged in testifying in another case. The presiding judge declined to postpone the hearing and excluded the witness from the proceedings altogether. Mr. Nampa objected, requesting a delay to allow the witness to testify and insisting that the defense should only present its case once all witnesses against him had been heard. Instead of rescheduling the testimony, the judge cancelled the defense's examination—including Mr. Nampa and his three academic witnesses—and proceeded to set a date for issuing a ruling on 28 March 2025.

On 28 March 2025, the Criminal Court sentenced Mr. Nampa to six months' imprisonment—the maximum penalty for contempt of court—reasoning that, as a lawyer with full knowledge of the law, he "needed to be taught a lesson."

Second, the verdict hearing on 28 March 2025 was held in secret. Mr. Nampa was not brought into the courtroom where his verdict hearing was scheduled, despite the presence of family, observers, and diplomatic representatives. Instead, he was taken to a separate arraignment room—inaccessible to the public—where the verdict was read privately in the presence of only his lawyers, who attempted to leave the room but was prevented from doing so by court marshals. Mr. Nampa pleaded with the presiding judge to grant him five minutes of justice and to read the verdict in open court, in accordance with proper legal procedures. His plea fell on deaf ears.

#### *Obstacles to his work as a lawyer*

Despite his imprisonment since 26 September 2023, Mr. Nampa continues to act as a defense lawyer for many individuals charged in criminal cases stemming from their legitimate exercise of freedoms of expression and peaceful assembly. Since 2020, he has been facing disbarment proceedings that reportedly violate his right to freedom of expression. As of 31 July 2025, he was informed by the LCT that the investigation by the Investigative Committee, established by the Committee on Professional Ethics of the LCT had been completed some time ago. Nevertheless, the final report has not yet been transmitted to the Committee of Lawyers' Council.

In Black Case No. Aor 2366/2565, Mr. Nampa served as the appointed defense lawyer for a defendant, who was charged under, *inter alia*, section 112 (lèse-majesté) of the Criminal Code in connection with the publication of artwork allegedly depicting the monarchy. Despite being lawfully appointed by the defendant, the Court issued an order to deny Mr. Nampa's request to be transferred from the Bangkok Remand Prison on 29 November 2023 to attend the hearings.

On 30 November 2023, Mr. Nampa filed an objection challenging the Court's order on the grounds that he remained a licensed attorney whose conviction is on appeal and, therefore, retains the legal right to represent his client.

In Black Case No. Aor 1308/2562, Mr. Nampa was appointed as defense counsel for four defendants charged under section 116 (sedition) of the Criminal Code and the Public Assembly Act in connection with their participation in public assemblies advocating for the return of democratic elections near Thammasat University and the United Nations building on 21–22 May 2018. The Criminal Court in Bangkok repeatedly questioned his eligibility to serve as counsel due to his ongoing criminal prosecution, going as far as issuing an order for the defendants to find new representation.

The Court submitted two letters to the Lawyers Council of Thailand (LCT), on 24 October 2023 and 16 November 2023, inquiring whether Mr. Nampa could continue practicing law. The LCT responded both times, on 30 October 2023 and again on 28 December 2023, confirming Mr. Nampa’s eligibility, citing his lifelong membership in the LCT and the fact that he had never been subject to disciplinary proceedings.

Despite the confirmation, the Court sent a third letter on 17 January 2024—this time to the Department of Corrections—asking whether his detention could interfere with his duties. The Department of Corrections responded on 29 April 2024 that the law does not prohibit detained individuals from acting as lawyers, but noted that prison regulations require detainees to wear a prescribed uniform consisting of a brown shirt and dark brown pants, which could be inconsistent with the Lawyers Code of Ethics B.E. 2529 (1986).

On 21 May 2024, the Court issued an order for the four defendants to appoint new lawyers, citing the Department of Corrections’s concern regarding the prison uniform.

During the hearing on 8 October 2024, the Court informed Mr. Nampa that he could continue to serve as legal counsel in the case for the time being as to not delay the proceedings. This decision followed Mr. Nampa’s statement that he was unable to comply with the relevant regulations due to his detention, and that he would be able to do so if the Court granted him bail.

Despite having received two written confirmations from the LCT stating that Mr. Arnon Nampa could still practice law, the Criminal Court continued to seek further clarification, requesting the appearance of an LCT representative in at least four subsequent hearings. In every instance, no representative from the LCT appeared in court. In fact, when the representative from the LCT failed to appear for the hearings on 25 November 2024 and 21 January 2025, the Court postponed the hearings, effectively stalling his participation as legal counsel.

When the representative from the LCT failed to appear for the hearing on 11 February 2025, the Court eventually conceded, allowing Mr. Nampa to continue to act as legal counsel. This decision appeared to be a reluctant concession to prevent any further delays. Nevertheless, the continued inquiries into his eligibility—despite confirmations from the LCT that he retains his professional status—indicate an ongoing effort to bar him from practicing law.

In Black Case No. Aor. 1486/2566, Mr. Nampa served as an appointed lawyer to a defendant who was charged under, *inter alia*, section 112 of the Thai Criminal Code in connection with 10 posts published on X (formerly Twitter). During the hearing on 11 June 2024, Mr. Nampa was not brought to the Criminal Court to represent the defendant. The Court had previously denied Mr. Nampa's motion, dated 3 May 2024, to appear in Court to represent his client, citing Mr. Nampa's status as a defendant and detainee in criminal cases, and his wearing of prison uniform contravening the Lawyers Code of Ethics B.E. 2529 (1986) and the Barrister's Robe Act B.E. 2479 (1936) as reasons to deny his motion.

While we do not wish to prejudge the accuracy of these allegations, we are seriously concerned about the allegations that Mr. Nampa has been repeatedly targeted for his work as a lawyer and has faced interference and obstacles to his work.

We take the opportunity to reiterate our concerns about the disbarment proceedings against Mr. Nampa, which appear to be an arbitrary reprisal for the legal services he provides to, *inter alia*, dissenting civil society activists, as well as for exercising his right to freedom of expression. If confirmed, the events described above would amount to a serious breach of a number of international and regional standards relating to the free and independent exercise of the legal profession.

We are seriously concerned about the allegations that Mr. Nampa has not been granted all the due process guarantees in the proceedings against him. We recall that international standards provide a general guarantee of equality before courts and tribunals and the right of every person to a fair and public hearing by a competent, independent and impartial tribunal established by law. In addition, it provides a set of procedural guarantees that must be made available to persons charged with a criminal offence, including the right of accused persons to have access to, and communicate with, a counsel of their own choosing.

Further, we are concerned that the principle of public trials has not been upheld in relation to Mr. Nampa. Article 10 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights affirms that "everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal". This foundational right is echoed in article 14 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), which guarantees all persons the right to a fair and public hearing by a competent, independent, and impartial tribunal established by law. The public character of judicial proceedings serves as a critical safeguard for judicial independence. It permits oversight of judicial conduct, deters misconduct or abuse, and reassures the public that justice is not only done, but seen to be done. A public trial also serves to protect the rights of those accused of crimes, ensuring that legal proceedings adhere to the highest standards of fairness, due process, and equality before the law. Without such openness, there is a heightened risk of secret trials, arbitrary detention, and denial of access to justice.

As it relates to his work as a lawyer, according to international standards, States must put in place all appropriate measures to ensure that lawyers are able to perform all of their professional functions without intimidation, hindrance, harassment or improper interference.

Lawyers are, like other individuals, entitled to freedom of expression. International standards provide that lawyers “shall have the right to take part in public discussion of matters concerning the law, the administration of justice and the promotion and protection of human rights without suffering professional restrictions” (see annex). The imposition of restrictions to lawyers’ freedom of expression, and the possibility that these restrictions may translate into criminal accusations, is incompatible with human rights standards. 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 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 (CCPR/C/GC/34).

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 provide detailed information on the facts that led to the disbarment proceedings brought against Mr. Nampa and explain how their disbarment may be regarded as compatible with Thailand’s obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.
3. Please provide detailed information on the measures taken to ensure Mr. Nampa is assured of all due process guarantees.
4. Please provide detailed information on the legislative and other measures adopted by Thailand to ensure that lawyers able to perform all of their professional functions without intimidation, hindrance, harassment or improper interference (principle 16 (a) of the Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers) and to prevent them from being subject to, or being threatened with, prosecution or administrative, economic or other sanctions as a result of their identification with their clients or their clients’ causes as a result of discharging their functions (principle 18); and ensure that lawyers enjoy their rights to freedom of expression, belief, association and assembly (principle 23).
5. Please explain what measures have been taken to ensure that all human rights defenders in Thailand, in particular those defending freedom of opinion and expression, can carry out their peaceful and legitimate activities without fear of judicial harassment, retaliation, or other restrictions.

This communication and any response received from your Excellency's Government will be made public via the communications reporting [website](#) within 60 days. They will also subsequently be made available in the usual 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's to clarify the issue/s in question.

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

Margaret Satterthwaite  
Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers

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

## Annex

### Reference to international human rights law

In connection with above alleged facts and concerns, and while we do not wish to prejudge the accuracy of these allegations, we would like to refer your Excellency's Government to the international norms and standards applicable to the present case. We would like to refer to articles 14, 19 and 21, inter alia, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), acceded to by Thailand on 29 October 1996.

Article 14 of the ICCPR sets out a general guarantee of equality before courts and tribunals and the right of every person to a fair and public hearing by a competent, independent and impartial tribunal established by law. In addition, it provides a set of procedural guarantees that must be made available to persons charged with a criminal offence, including the right of accused persons to have access to, and communicate with, a counsel of their own choosing.

In its general comment No. 32 (2007), the Human Rights Committee explained that the right to communicate with counsel enshrined in article 14(3)(b) requires that the accused is granted prompt access to a lawyer. Counsel should be able to meet their clients in private and to communicate with the accused in conditions that fully respect the confidentiality of their communications. They should also be able "to advise and to represent persons charged with a criminal offence in accordance with generally recognised professional ethics without restrictions, influence, pressure or undue interference from any quarter" (CCPR/C/GC/32, para. 34).

Regarding the right to freedom of peaceful assembly we would like to refer to general comment No. 37 of the Human Rights Committee on Right of peaceful assembly ([CCPR/C/GC/37](#)), which stressed that "the possibility that a peaceful assembly may provoke adverse or even violent reactions from some members of the public is not sufficient grounds to prohibit or restrict the assembly. [...] States are obliged to take all reasonable measures that do not impose disproportionate burdens upon them to protect all participants and to allow such assemblies to take place in an uninterrupted manner".

In this regard, we would like to refer to Human Rights Council Resolution 24/5 which "reminds States of their obligation to respect and fully protect the rights of all individuals to assemble peacefully and associate freely, online as well as offline, including in the context of elections, and including persons espousing minority or dissenting views or beliefs, human rights defenders, trade unionists and others".

The right to freedom of opinion and expression, enshrined in article 19 of the ICCPR, entails that "everyone shall have the right to hold opinions without interference" as well as that "everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media of his choice." This right includes not only the exchange of information that is favorable, but also that which may shock or offend. In its general comment No. 34 on Freedoms of opinion and expression (CCPR/C/GC/34), the Human Rights Committee stated that States parties to the ICCPR are required to guarantee the

right to freedoms of opinion and expression, including inter alia ‘political discourse, commentary on one’s own and on public affairs, canvassing, discussion of human rights, journalism’, subject only to admissible restrictions as well as the prohibition of propaganda for hatred and incitement to hatred, violence and discrimination. In its general comment No. 25 on Participation in Public Affairs and the Right to Vote (CCPR/C/21/Rev.1/Add.7), the Human Rights Committee set out that: “In order to ensure the full enjoyment of rights protected by article 25, the free communication of information and ideas about public and political issues between citizens, candidates and elected representatives is essential. [...] It requires full enjoyment and respect for the rights guaranteed in articles 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant, including freedom to engage in political activity individually or through political parties and other organizations, freedom to debate public affairs, to hold peaceful demonstrations and meetings, to criticize and oppose, to publish political material, to campaign for election and to advertise political ideas.”

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. 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” (CCPR/C/GC/34, 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, proving “in specific and individualized fashion the precise nature of the threat, and the necessity and proportionality of the specific action taken, in particular by establishing a direct and immediate connection between the expression and the threat” (CCPR/C/GC/34, para. 35). The Human Rights Committee recalled that the relation between right and restriction and between norm and exception must not be reversed. In this regard, the Human Rights Committee stated that the restrictions must be “the least intrusive instrument among those which might achieve their protective function” ([CCPR/C/GC/34, para. 34](#)).

We also wish to refer to Human Rights Council Resolution 12/16, which calls on States to refrain from imposing restrictions which are not consistent with article 19(3), including: discussion of government policies and political debate; reporting on human rights; engaging in peaceful demonstrations or political activities, including for peace or democracy; and expression of opinion and dissent, religion or belief, including by persons belonging to minorities or vulnerable groups.

We would also like to refer to the report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and association in which he considered that the prohibition to publish material online solely on the basis that it may be critical of the

government or the political social system espoused by the government is inconsistent with the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly, association and expression (A/HRC/41/41 para. 42).

We would like to reiterate the recommendations made by the Human Rights Committee during Thailand's second periodic review in 2017, in which it called upon your Excellency's Government to refrain from using the Computer Crimes Act (2007), the Sedition Act and other regulations to suppress freedom of speech and freedom of peaceful assembly, as well as guarantee and respect the rights to these freedoms (CCPR/C/THA/CO/2, paras. 35, 36, 39, 40).

In connection with the arrest of activists, we would like to refer to the right not to be arbitrarily deprived of liberty and to fair proceedings before an independent and impartial tribunal, as set forth in articles 9 and 14 of the ICCPR. We wish to highlight that deprivation of liberty resulting from the exercise of the rights or freedoms guaranteed by the ICCPR is arbitrary. Article 9 establishes in particular 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, and that anyone who is arrested shall be informed, at the time of arrest, of the reasons behind such arrest and be brought promptly before a judge for the purpose of legal assessment of detention.

In relation to the allegations indicating that the individual mentioned above is being targeted because of his activities defending human rights, we would like to refer your Excellency's Government to 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 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. Article 5 and 6 of this Declaration are also relevant as they provide for the rights, individually or in association with others, at the national and international levels to meet, assemble peacefully; seek, obtain, receive and hold information on human rights including remedies to claim those rights; and freely publish and impart or disseminate to others view, information and knowledge on human rights.

We would also like to refer to Human Rights Council Resolution 13/13, which urges States to put an end to and take concrete steps to prevent threats, harassment, violence and attacks by States and non-State actors against all those engaged in the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Finally, we would like to recall the Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers, adopted by the Eighth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders (Havana (Cuba), 27 August-7 September 1990).

Principle 16 requires governments to take all appropriate measures to ensure that lawyers are able to perform all of their professional functions without intimidation, hindrance, harassment or improper interference, and to prevent that lawyers be

threatened with prosecution or administrative, economic or other sanctions for any action taken in accordance with recognized professional duties, standards and ethics. Principle 18 provides that lawyers shall not be identified with their clients or their clients' causes as a result of discharging their functions. This principle must be read in conjunction with principle 16 (c), referred to above, which requires national authorities to adopt all appropriate measures to ensure that lawyers are not subject to, or threatened with prosecution or any other administrative, economic or disciplinary sanctions for actions undertaken in good faith in the exercise of their professional duties and responsibilities.

Principle 23 provides that lawyers like other citizens are entitled to freedom of expression, belief, association and assembly. In particular, they shall have the right to take part in public discussion of matters concerning the law, the administration of justice and the promotion and protection of human rights and to join or form local, national or international organizations and attend their meetings, without suffering professional restrictions by reason of their lawful action or their membership in a lawful organization. In exercising these rights, lawyers shall always conduct themselves in accordance with the law and the recognized standards and ethics of the legal profession.