**Situation of the Freedom of Peaceful Assembly in Thailand**

**Joint submission to the UN Human Rights Committee for the drafting of its General Comment No.37 on Article 21 (right of peaceful assembly) of the ICCPR**

**Background:**

1. This document was compiled by the following civil society organisations: Thai Lawyers for Human Rights (TLHR); ENLAWTHAI Foundation (EnLAW); Internet Law Reform Dialogue (iLaw); Human Rights Lawyers Association (HRLA); Community Resource Centre Foundation (CRC); Legal Research and Development Center, Faculty of Law, Chiang Mai University (LRDC); with the support of the Center for Civil and Political Rights (CCPR). We take this opportunity to submit the information to the UN Human Rights Committee as per the request of the Committee inviting stakeholders to provide recommendations to the drafted General Comment No.37 on Article 21, the right of peaceful assembly, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).
2. We are pleased that the UN Human Rights Commission has been drafting the General Comment No. 37. In light of the present draft, the abovementioned civil society   
   organisations take this opportunity to provide relevant information on the situation in Thailand.
3. Peaceful assembly is a vital tool for the people and civic space. The freedom of   
   peaceful assembly is a basic constitutional freedom in any democratic society to relay unheard voices to people in positions of power. Peaceful assembly empowers and gives leverage for the public to call for the state to address people's issues or public   
   issues and injustice in society.
4. The 2017 Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand guarantees freedom of peaceful   
   assembly. However, the right is limited and additional conditions are stipulated in other laws, such as the Public Assembly Act B.E.2015 (hereafter “the Public Assembly Act"), a key law to control and govern assemblies in Thailand.
5. The freedom of peaceful assembly has been enshrined in the Kingdom of Thailand Constitution since B.E.2492 (1949). The 2017 Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand, Article 44, notes that, "*A person shall enjoy the liberty to assemble peacefully and without arms*" and "*The restriction of such liberty under paragraph one shall not be   
   imposed except by virtue of a provision of law enacted for the purpose of maintaining security of the State, public safety, public order or good morals, or for protecting the rights or liberties of other persons*."
6. The Public Assembly Act was enacted by the National Legislative Assembly on 13 July 2015 and became effective on 13 August 2015. The National Legislative Assembly members were appointed by the National Council for Peace and Order (hereafter the "NCPO"), who staged a coup d'etat on 22 May 2014. The Public Assembly Act,   
   therefore, passed without any relevant public participation and has been enforced   
   under the military regime. At the same time, the Public Assembly Act was enforced, while the Chief of the NCPO's Order Number 3/2558, Article 12 came into effect, which prohibited any unauthorised political assembly of five or more persons. The unofficial translation of the Public Assembly Act is attached herewith.
7. Currently, although the Chief of the NCPO's Order Number 3/2558, Article 12 has been revoked, the use of the Public Assembly Act to interfere with and restrict the freedom of peaceful assembly has been increasing.
8. One key issue in the Public Assembly Act is its vague and ambiguous legal   
   terminology, giving police officers the authority to arbitrarily interpret the law. The   
   Public Assembly Act can be enforced in the restrictive manner to control the use of the freedom of peaceful assembly and the public expression in public spaces, including but not limited to prohibition of any peaceful assembly and criminalisation of individuals   
   accused of violating the Act.
9. The compiling organisations have prepared this submission for the UN Human Rights Commission to receive comprehensive information about the situation of peaceful   
   assembly in various countries. The submission focuses on the facts and issues related to the situation of peaceful assembly in Thailand from the legal frameworks, for the   
   development of the draft of the General Comment No. 37 of the UN Human Rights Committee.[[1]](#footnote-2)
10. The above-mentioned organisations have compiled this information and observations through seminars and consultations, including: (1) A seminar on 21 November 2018, hosted by ENLAWTHAI Foundation, Thai Lawyers for Human Rights, Internet Law   
    Reform Dialogue (iLaw), Human Rights Lawyers Association, and Social Research   
    Institute Chulalongkorn University, at The Connection Ladprao; (2) A meeting on   
    26 November 2019, hosted by the International Commission of Jurists and the Center for Civil and Political Rights at the Thai Lawyers for Human Rights office in Bangkok.

**Issues and obstacles to exercising freedom of peaceful assembly in Thailand**

**I. The Definition of "Public Assembly" under the Public Assembly Act**

1. The Public Assembly Act contains provisions restricting the freedom of peaceful   
   assembly through the provision on requirements and responsibilities for participants in a peaceful assembly. Participants who fail to comply with those provisions face criminal punishment. Therefore, the definition of "*public assembly*" under the law must be clear. However, the current definition under the Act uses broad and vague terms. The   
   definition causes confusion and ambiguity for citizens and law enforcement personnel as the definition cannot precisely identify which activities require a notification for peaceful assembly and if activities need compliance with the provision on the definition of “public assemblies” under the Act. In several cases, small gatherings that do not   
   impede the use of public spaces are subjected to restrictions under the Public   
   Assembly Act, which creates an unreasonable burden for organisers.
2. The "Public Assembly", under the Act, means "an assembly of individuals in a public place so as to express their common petition, support, opposition or opinion on any matter to the public and any individual is able to attend such assembly freely   
   irrespective of whether such assembly is composed of public procession or relocation".
3. Interpretations of this definition can cover the cases of the submission of a grievance petition to a state agency responsible for the issue. The submission of a petition may involve many individuals and there is an expression to the public. Participants were   
   intimidated and prosecuted because they allegedly failed to comply with the   
   requirement to give advance notification to the competent authority under the Public Assembly Act, for example, participants who had submitted a grievance petition to Hua Thale Sub-district Administrative Organisation, Bamnet Narong District, Chaiyaphum Province organised by Kon Rak Bankerd Bamnet Narong, on 9 February 2017[[2]](#footnote-3).   
   Additionally, 150 members of Kon Rak Bankerd Group's attended the Khao Luang Subdistrict Administrative Organisation Council meeting on 16 November 2016, at Wang Saphung District, Loei Province. The participants were invited by the President of the Sub-district Administration Organisation. Kon Rak Bankerd participants vetoed the meeting agenda to include a request for a renewal of the permission to use a   
   forested area for gold mining. Two members were charged.[[3]](#footnote-4)
4. It was a small symbolic activity with a small number of participants that has not caused disruption of the use of public areas or traffic. However, the officials and the judges considered the event a “public assembly” under the Public Assembly Act. Organisers were charged and prosecuted for failing to notify competent authorities in advance.   
   Examples of such incidents include: A pantomime performance, seeking justice for people killed during the dispersal of a political gathering, at the Democracy Monument on 10 December 2018[[4]](#footnote-5). In another instance, an activity in which two activists hung   
   garlic, chili, and salt on the fence of the Government's House, then read a petition   
   demanding the Premier to resign on 2 February 2019.[[5]](#footnote-6)
5. Various activities can be interpreted as “public assemblies” under the Public Assembly Act, such as: assembly on the course of traditional activities, local culture or sport events, etc. Therefore, such exempted events may require an advance notification. For instance, in the case of the Rak Wanon Niwat from Wanon Niwat District, who   
   organised a merit and charity walk, with an aim to promote and to invite villagers to join the event "Blessing for Longevity of Huai Toong Stream", members of the group were prosecuted for failing to notify a “public assembly” in advance[[6]](#footnote-7). The organisers of "Run Against Dictatorship" on 12 January 2020 at Bangkok Railway Park and many   
   simultaneous running events in provinces were charged with failing to notify a “public assembly” by the police.[[7]](#footnote-8)

**II. Notification of a peaceful assembly and authorities’ receipt of notification**

1. The Public Assembly Act requires an individual who wishes to organise a “public   
   assembly” to notify the competent authority, namely, the chief of the local police station in the area where the assembly will be organised, at least twenty-four hours in   
   advance. Violation of this requirement can result in the maximum fine of not exceeding ten thousand Baht. The assembly without advance notification will be deemed an   
   illegal assembly, that officials can announce the assembly to be dispersed immediately without considering the facts whether the assembly caused damage and public   
   disturbance.
2. At the present, officials routinely use the charge of failing to notify a “public assembly” in advance to prosecute participants.
3. Compiling organisations noted that there were instances of officials arresting   
   demonstrators in an event for which the assembly organiser has not give an advance notice. Public assembly participants are arrested for flagrant offences. Subsequently, the officials will issue an order to end and dissolve a peaceful assembly without   
   compliance to the protocol under the Public Assembly Act (Section 21-24). For   
   instance, on 27 April 2016, Mr. Anon Nampha,[[8]](#footnote-9) the organiser and protester of “Just Standing Still” symbolic activity at a Victory Point Square in Victory Monument were   
   ordered to cease the event demanding releases of political activists. The event was deemed an unnoticed public assembly. The police arrested Mr. Anon Nampa and   
   terminated the peaceful assembly without the process to order the participants to   
   dissolve the assembly. The termination of the assembly was made without applying for a motion for the Court to issue a termination of a public assembly order.[[9]](#footnote-10)
4. Under the law, notification of the assembly can only be performed through specified three channels only. An organiser may give a notification in person at a relevant police station, where a “public assembly” will be organised, or in writing by facsimile, or by an email. A technical problem occurs when police stations’ email addresses are not   
   published. Several police stations do not have an official email account, or the police officers do not or cannot check the email. In most cases, officials request the   
   notification be submitted through a facsimile. These conditions are burdensome to peaceful assembly organisers, in particular, in provinces, where individuals are   
   attending from various areas. In addition, there are cases where officials request   
   organisers or participants to notify a peaceful assembly in person at a police station.   
   In certain cases, the notification of a peaceful assembly in person results in officials exerting pressure to the notifier to cancel the assembly even though the officials only have the mandate to facilitate the notification.
5. It is found that officials do not understand the guidelines for the case of an assembly covering several police jurisdictions. Notifiers were asked to notify all relevant police stations, in spite of the fact that the Prime Minister’s Office Notification Regarding   
   Determination of the Method of Public Assembly Notification, specified to notify a   
   “public assembly” just to one relevant police station.
6. Under the Public Assembly Act, the notification process involves rigid protocol and   
   various requirements for organizing peaceful assemblies. If the officials consider that an assembly may violate the law, the officials shall order the notifier to change certain aspects of the assembly to comply with the law. In practice, however, there are many cases where police officers have issued an objection order, immediately after the   
   notification was made, even though the law did not give the authority for the police to do so. There are also cases, where officials issue objections based on reasons, which are not listed as the causes for prohibitions under the law, such as, the Seby River   
   Basin Conservation Group notifying officials that there would be a meeting at the   
   Yasothon City Hall on 15 August 2018 to request the Yasothon Provincial Governor to appoint a working group to study the impact of the sugar factories and Biomass   
   power-plants[[10]](#footnote-11), or, the Run Against Dictatorship organisers in Ubon Ratchathani   
   Province hosted a running even on 12 January 2020.[[11]](#footnote-12)

**III: Application for the Extension of Notification for the Public Assembly**

1. Although Article 12 under the Act allows organisers to apply for a notification in less than twenty-four hours prior to the planned assemblies, the compiling organisations have found that applications for extension of notification period have never been   
   granted.
2. Enforcing strict conditions for notifying public assemblies more than twenty-four hours is problematic. The practice is undertaken solely at officials' discretion. It is extremely problematic for impromptu assemblies based on officials' interpretation of the provision. For instance, the Songkhla-Pattani People Anti-Coal-fired Power Plants Network   
   submitted a petition to the Prime Minister in Songkhla province on 24-28 November 2017 without an advance notification, because organisers did not consider petitioning as a “public assembly”. Later, officials interpreted petitioning as a “public assembly” that had to comply with the Act, organisers could neither give an advance notice nor apply for an exemption of advance notification.[[12]](#footnote-13)Furthermore, on 1 May 2018, officials obstructed Northern P-MOVE members on the way of their trip to an assembly, which has been notified to officials, in Bangkok. Participants were stopped at Mae Ta Checkpoint, Lamphun Province and kept at the checkpoint, as officials interpreted the group of participants were having a “public assembly” without notification. Then the official   
   issued a notice for the group to apply for extension of notification period.[[13]](#footnote-14)

**IV: Public Assembly Venue**

1. The Public Assembly Act Article 7 and 8 prohibit any public assembly in certain   
   venues, namely: (1) No public assembly shall be held within the radius of one hundred and fifty meters from the boundary of the Grand Palace, Royal Palace, Royal   
   Residence of the Heir to the Throne or of His or Her Royal Highness Prince or Princess (Article 7, first paragraph); (2) the National Assembly, the Government House and the Courts, whereby the Commissioner General of the Royal Thai Police may, after having considered the numbers of participants and related circumstances of each public   
   assembly, have the power to notify no public assembly zone within the radius not   
   exceeding fifty meters from the boundary of the aforementioned places (Article 7,   
   paragraphs two and four), and; (3) No public assembly shall obstruct the gateway of, impede the performance of duties of, or hinder access to service of State agencies’   
   office, airport, wharf, rail station or any other public transport station, hospital,   
   education institution and religious establishment, embassy or consulate of foreign State or office of international organisation or other places as notified by the Minister (Article 8).
2. The one hundred and fifty metre radius from the boundary of the Grand Palace or the Royal Palace under Article 7, the first paragraph, lacks clarity. In Bangkok, some   
   government buildings or public places that people may choose to use for a peaceful assembly may be near the said areas. People may not know which buildings are under the provision of Article 7, the first paragraph. Furthermore, they would not know how the one hundred and fifty metre distance is measured, where is the boundary and the end of the boundary.Officials did not announce or indicate prohibited zones.   
   Consequently, lack of identification of the zone presents a condition where participants in peaceful assemblies in such areas cannot hold assemblies, or they could be arrest for violation of the said provision. For instance, thirty-nine participants in a peaceful   
   assembly, organised in front of the Bangkok Arts and Cultural Centre by Thais Want Election Group on 27 January 2018, faced the charge of holding a “public assembly” within the radius of one hundred and fifty meters from the boundary of a Royal   
   Palace.[[14]](#footnote-15)
3. Furthermore, the police officers have the power to announce a prohibition of the   
   assembly in additional areas such as the 50 metre radius outside of the Government House which the participants frequently use at the venue of the assembly because it is an official office of the Prime Minister and the Government who are the targets of the communications from the participants and the general public. As a result, it is difficult to organise an assembly in the area surrounding the Government House, the organisers were pressured and facing risks of prosecutions based on this additional   
   announcement by the police which is considered a restriction on the right to peaceful assembly and is not in line with the legal threshold tests on necessity, proportionality, and the manners of the each individual participants. For example, such problem was faced at the peaceful assembly of the Network to Protect Andaman from Coal Power on 9 February 2018 to demand the authority to cancel the coal fired power plant project in Krabi Province; the public assembly of the Thailand Pesticide Alert Network on 5 June 2018 to demand the authorities to prohibit the use of three agricultural chemicals, and; the public assembly of the Network to Protect Se-Buy Delta on 19-20 September 2018 to demand a stop on the biomass powerplant in Yasothon Province.
4. Assemblies organised in the venues listed under Article 8 of the Public Assembly Act are usually subjected to a broad interpretation of the law enforcement officer claiming that the assembly may impede the entrance and exit of the venue or disrupt the   
   operation or the service of the facilities which usually caused the authority to suggest or order a change of the venue of the peaceful assembly or a prohibition of the assembly, including imposing the venue of the assembly without taking into account the needs of the participants, for example, the peaceful assembly of the group “We Love the   
   National Health Security” on 6 June 2017 to urge the government to halt the   
   amendments of the National Health Security Act;[[15]](#footnote-16) the peaceful assembly to demand the government to cancel the development of the coal-fired power plants in Thepa   
   District and Krabi Province between 12-20 February 2018 in front of the office of the United Nations in Bangkok, and;.[[16]](#footnote-17) the walk to submit petitions collected from the public for the drafted law on the revocation of 35 announcements and orders of the NCPO on 24 June 2019.[[17]](#footnote-18)

**V: Appeal the Official Order to Act in Compliance with or to Prohibit the Public Assembly**

1. Article 11 of the Public Assembly Act states that, “In the case where the authority is of opinion that such notification of the public assembly may be contrary to section 7 or section 8 (on the condition of the venue of the assembly), he shall order the person who made that notification to act in compliance therewith within specific period. If the person who made notification fails to comply with the order, the authority shall have the power to prohibit that public assembly and shall notify that person in writing. If the   
   person who made notification does not agree with the order of the authority, he shall appeal against such order to the superintendent of that authority.  The superintendent shall in this case complete and notify his decision on such appeal to the appellant   
   within twenty-four hours. If suspension order is given, no public assembly shall be held during an appeal procedure. Whoever violates Article 11 shall be liable to   
   imprisonment for a term of not exceeding six months or to a fine of not exceeding ten thousand Baht or to both.”
2. The prohibition of peaceful assemblies waiting for the result of the appeal procedure is an obstacle to organise a peaceful assembly according to their schedule and activity plan especially for peaceful assemblies planned for a short period of time. In addition,   
   if the timeframe for deciding on the appeal procedure twenty-four-hour period expires but the authority is still unable to deliver the decision on such appeal, the actions that the participants are allowed to take are limited. In addition, if the authority makes a   
   decision on a notified assembly that it is not in compliance with the Public Assembly Act, there is no well-defined legal mechanism to regulate whether the participants are eligible to appeal the decision or not, to which authority, and the time period of   
   submitting and receiving the decision on the appeal. The time period of the decision has direct effects on the organisation of peaceful assemblies.

**VI: The Conditions of the Public Assembly, Duties and Powers of the Law   
Enforcement Officers.**

1. Article 19 of the Public Assembly Act states that, “The law enforcement officer shall, in order to maintain public facilitation, to surveil the public assembly and to protect public order or good morals, have the following powers and duties:

(1) to provide facilitation to the public in using of the public place in which the public assembly is held;

(2) to provide safety, facilitation or lessening nuisance to the people living nearby the public place in which public assembly is held;

(3) to provide safety and facilitation to the participants present in a public assembly;

(4) to provide facilitation to traffic and public transportation in the place where public assembly is held as well as the adjacent area with a view to lessen impacts to the public caused by that public assembly; including an authority to impose condition or order to be complied with by the promoter, the participant or any other person   
staying within the place where the public assembly is held for the performance of duties under (1), (2), (3) or (4).”

1. However, in practice, the exercise of power of the law enforcement officer authorized by Article 19 of the Public Assembly Act is more likely to restrict the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly by prohibiting the assembly or impose conditions that hinder the   
   organising of the assembly, in contradiction to the objectives of the participants. The authority invoked Article 8 to prohibit assemblies that obstruct the gateway of, impede the performance of duties of, or hinder access to service of public facilities. The   
   authorities in several cases have imposed written conditions in the letter of summary of the public assembly which are incompatible with the power authorized by the Public Assembly Act but which participants are required to comply with. In some cases, the conditions imposed are not relevant to provide safety and facilitation to the public or to the participants presenting in the assembly. Specifically, the conditions imposed on the content and the methods of expression of the participants are problematic.
2. For example, the conditions which are considered restrictive to the freedom of peaceful assembly and in contradiction with the duties and powers authorized by the law and the rationale of the Constitution are as follows: the authority imposing the conditions for the participants to travel only with the vehicles provided by the authority; prohibition of participants from walking to the destination of the assembly; specifying the directions of the walking; prohibiting the participants from using sound amplifiers and displaying   
   banners; prohibiting the participants from wearing t-shirts with campaign messages; prohibiting participants from speaking publicly to criticise the government; the demand that banners displayed at the public assembly must not contain messages against the performance of duties of the government and the National Council for Peace and   
   Order; prohibiting cooking at the venue of the public assembly, particularly in the case of the assembly including overnight stays. In some cases, the authority ordered the participants to send their representatives to negotiate and submit a complaint to the government agencies instead of organizing a public assembly.
3. Additionally, in some cases, the authority imposed legal conditions that create   
   additional and repetitive burdens for the organisers and participants. For instance, the authority imposed a condition that, to use the sound amplifiers, participants are   
   required to obtain a permission under the Controlling Public Advertisement by Sound Amplifier Act B.E. 2493, despite the fact that the organizer had already submitted the notification including the details of the assembly to the authority. Peaceful   
   assemblies can be expected to use sound amplifiers to communicate to the public and manage the assembly with large number of participants. If the participants fail to obtain a permit to use the sound amplifiers, the authority will prohibit the use of sound amplifiers, confiscate the equipment and subsequently prosecute the   
   organiser of the peaceful assembly.
4. Another concerning issue is that the authority in several cases imposes conditions as written in the summary of the public assembly with the language of “suggestion” or “request for cooperation” without implying a clear prohibition with a legal basis. This has caused confusion and fear among the public whether such language   
   contains legal implication and enforcement or not, and what are the crimes and   
   punishment if the participants violate the conditions.
5. Article 16 of the Public Assembly Act states that the participants are required to   
   “not (be) dressed to conceal or camouflage himself from being identified intentionally; provided that, there is usual traditional dressing”. Whoever violates this Article shall be liable to a fine of not exceeding ten thousand Baht. However, in several cases,   
   participants of peaceful assembly are not only using masks or other materials to   
   conceal themselves as part of the symbolic action to express their demands but also wearing masks for health concerns such as to protect from pollutions and infections. Thus, this Article is not reflective of the needs and actual context of the normal aspects of a peaceful assembly.

**VII: The Authority’s Request the Court for the Order to Adjourn the Public   
Assembly**

1. Article 21 and 22 of the Public Assembly Act state that if there is an illegal “public   
   assembly”, and in cases where participants fail to comply within the period of time after the notice of the law enforcement officer or fail to make corrections or to adjourn the assembly after the notice from the authority within a period of time, the law   
   enforcement officer shall request the Civil Court with the jurisdiction over the place where the assembly is held for the order to adjourn that assembly. The Court shall,   
   upon receiving the request from the authority, consider that request urgently. The order of the Court may be appealed to the Appeal Court. The order of the Appeal Court shall be final and conclusive.
2. We are concerned about the case where the authority submitted the request to the Court to adjourn assemblies which were taking place during the weekends or the public holidays outside the official working hours of the Court. As a result, people were unable to exercise their right to appeal and ensure the immediate protection of the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly, especially, in the case of a short-term assembly.   
   In some cases, the Court did not provide a subpoena nor did the Court summon the participants to participate in a preliminary hearing which resulted in the participants’ loss of the opportunity to defend their rationale. In some cases, the Court only   
   considered the testimonies from the law enforcement officers.

**VIII: Criminal Liability and Criminal Punishment**

1. The Public Assembly Act imposes criminal liabilities for organizing and participating in an illegal “public assembly”. Several articles impose severe criminal punishments which contradict and are irrelevant to the exercise of the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and the freedom of expression in a democratic society which is protected under the Constitution. Some actions that are penalised are considered only mere   
   violations of the conditions imposed by the legal procedures to facilitate the “public   
   assembly” but are not serious crimes that are dangerous to public safety.
2. For example, Articles 10 and 28 of the Public Assembly Act penalize anyone who fails to notify of the “public assembly” in advance with a fine of up to ten thousand Thai Baht. Article 8 and 27 state that a public assembly that obstructs the gateway of,   
   impedes the performance of duties of, or hinders access to the service of public   
   facilities shall be liable to imprisonment for a term of not exceeding six months or to a fine of not exceeding ten thousand Baht or to both. Article 19 (5) states that failure to comply with the order or announcement of the law enforcement officers managing the “public assembly”, if that individual is an organizer of the assembly, shall be liable to imprisonment for a term of not exceeding one year or to a fine of not exceeding twenty thousand Baht or to both;
3. The Public Assembly Act prescribes the duties and responsibilities, charges and   
   criminal liability for the organiser of the “public assembly” higher than other participants. However, the authority in some cases uses the broader and extended definition of who is considered an organizer of the assembly. For instance, anyone who shares or   
   passes on the information promoting the assembly on social media with a message of invitation to attend the assembly will be considered an organiser of the assembly.
4. In another example, observers of the public assembly who were carrying out their   
   duties at the scene of the assembly with no intention to take part in the assembly and were wearing symbols to demonstrate their observer status were considered   
   participants of the assembly and prosecuted alongside the participants, for example, the prosecutions of the documentation officers of the Thai Lawyers for Human Rights who observed the demonstration of the activists group named “People Who Want the Election” in front of Thammasat University in Bangkok between 21-22 May 2018[[18]](#footnote-19)

**IX: The Operation of Law Enforcement Officers**

1. Apart from a vague definition of the organizer, the notification of the assembly, the   
   imposition of the conditions to restrict the freedom of assembly as mentioned above, there are examples of the law enforcement officers who exercise their power before, during, or after the assembly which consequently limit and restrict the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly, for example; (1) The deployment of a large number of officers to block the passage of the participants who took part in We Walk, Walk for Friendship on 20 January 2018 and prevented the participants from leaving the venue which was the meeting point of their gathering to the destination; (2) Law enforcement officers   
   prevented the participants of “People Who Want the Election” from walking to the   
   Government House on 22 May 2018.[[19]](#footnote-20); and (3) The military and police officers blocked the members of P-Move in Lampoon Province from traveling to participate in the public assembly in front of the Government House in Bangkok.[[20]](#footnote-21)
2. The law enforcement officers have employed other measures to pressure, threaten, and frighten people who want to exercise the right to freedom of peaceful assembly, for example, officers ordering an identity check, a car search, or prevented other   
   participants from attending peaceful assemblies. In several occasions, the law   
   enforcement officers who did not wear uniforms and did not carry official identification surveilled on the participants by taking photos, recording videos, detaining participants or the driver, and some requested to the participants to fill out personal criminal   
   records. There are also officers who followed and monitored participants of peaceful assemblies or their families to their residences and threatened or pressured the   
   participants or their family members, causing a chilling effect among the people who want to take part in peaceful assemblies.
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6) Legal Research and Development Center, Faculty of Law, Chiang Mai University (LRDC)

With the support of the Centre for Civil and Political Rights (CCPR).
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