

Submission in the UPR review of The Kingdom of Bhutan

Legal and Statutory framework:

The Kingdom of Bhutan maintains **criminal sanctions against sexual activity between consenting adults**. The Bhutan Penal Code 2004 provides :

Unnatural sex :

Section 213. "A defendant shall be guilty of the offence of unnatural sex, if the defendant engages in sodomy or any other sexual conduct that is against the order of nature."

Grading of unnatural sex

Section 214. "The offence of unnatural sex shall be a petty misdemeanor."

Classes of crime

Section 3. "For the purpose of this Penal Code, the classes of crimes shall be as follows:

(c) A crime shall be petty misdemeanor, if it is so designated in this Penal Code or other laws and provides for a maximum term of imprisonment of less than one year and a minimum term of one month for the convicted defendant."

The Kingdom of Bhutan's international human rights obligations:

Provisions against sexual activity between consenting adults have been found to constitute **a clear violation of international human rights law**.

In *Toonen v Australia*, the **UN Human Rights Committee** in March 1994 confirmed that laws criminalizing consensual same-sex activity violate both the right to privacy and the right to equality before the law without any discrimination, contrary to articles 17(1) and 2 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.¹

The Committee further considered that such laws interfere with privacy rights, whether or not they are actively enforced, and "run counter to the implementation of effective education programmes in respect of HIV/AIDS prevention" by driving marginalised communities underground.

The UN Human Rights Committee has affirmed this position on many occasions, either urging States to repeal laws which criminalize consensual same-sex activity or commending them for bringing their legislation into conformity with the Covenant by repealing such provisions.² The United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention has also found that arrests for consensual homosexual conduct are, by definition, human rights violations.

This position is consistent with other **regional and national jurisprudence**, including decisions of the European Court of Human Rights³ and of the Constitutional Court of South Africa.⁴

States' international obligations to respect the human rights of all persons, irrespective of sexual orientation and gender identity, were recently articulated in the "***Yogyakarta Principles on the Application of International Human Rights Law in relation to Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity***". The Principles were developed and unanimously adopted by a distinguished group of human rights experts, from diverse

¹ *Toonen v Australia*, CCPR/C/50/D/488/1992, April 4, 1994.

² See Human Rights Committee Concluding Observations: United States of America, A/50/40, October 3, 1995; Cyprus, CCPR/C/79/Add.88, April 6, 1998; Ecuador, CCPR/C/79/Add.92, August 18, 1998; Chile, CCPR/C/79/Add.104, March 30, 1999; Lesotho, CCPR/C/79/Add.106, April 8, 1999; Romania CCPR/C/79/Add.111, July 28, 1999; Australia, A/55/40, July 24, 2000; Egypt, CCPR/CO/76/EGY, November 28, 2002; Kenya, CCPR/CO/83/KEN, March 28, 2005; United States of America, CCPR/C/USA/CO/3, September 15, 2006; BArabdos, CCPR/C/BRB/CO/3, May 11, 2007; Chile, CCPR/C/CHL/CO/5, May 18, 2007.

³ *Dudgeon v United Kingdom*, Series A no. 45., 1981; *Norris v Ireland*, 1991; *Modinos v Cyprus*, 1993.

⁴ *National Coalition for Gay and Lesbian Equality and another v Minister of Justice and others*, 1998.

regions and backgrounds. These experts included judges, academics, a former UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, UN Special Procedures, members of treaty bodies, members of civil society and others.

Principle 2 of the Yogyakarta Principles affirms the right of all persons to equality before the law without discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity, and specifically confirms the obligation of States to “repeal criminal and other legal provisions that prohibit or are, in effect, employed to prohibit consensual sexual activity among people of the same sex who are over the age of consent, and ensure that an equal age of consent applies to both same-sex and different-sex sexual activity.”

Principle 6 of the Yogyakarta Principles affirms the right of all persons, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity, to the enjoyment of privacy without arbitrary or unlawful interference, and confirms States’ obligation to “repeal all laws that criminalise consensual sexual activity among persons of the same sex who are over the age of consent, and ensure that an equal age of consent applies to both same-sex and different-sex sexual activity.”⁵ The Principles also call on States to “ensure that criminal and other legal provisions of general application are not applied to *de facto* criminalise consensual sexual activity among persons of the same sex who are over the age of consent.”

The **UN High Commissioner for Human Rights**, Ms. Navanethem Pillay, in a statement to a High-level Meeting on Human Rights, Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity, United Nations (New York) Thursday, 18 December 2008, affirmed: “The principle of universality admits no exception. Human rights truly are the birthright of all human beings. (...) Sadly, ... there remain too many countries which continue to criminalize sexual relations between consenting adults of the same sex in defiance of established human rights law. Ironically many of these laws, like Apartheid laws that criminalized sexual relations between consenting adults of different races, are relics of the colonial era and are increasingly becoming recognized as anachronistic and as inconsistent both with international law and with traditional values of dignity, inclusion and respect for all... It is our task and our challenge to move beyond a debate on whether all human beings have rights – for such questions were long ago laid to rest by the Universal Declaration – and instead to secure the climate for implementation... Those who are lesbian, gay or bisexual, those who are transgender, transsexual or intersex, are full and equal members of the human family, and are entitled to be treated as such.”

Recommendation:

We therefore recommend that the Human Rights Council, in its upcoming review, urge the Kingdom of Bhutan to bring its legislation into conformity with its international human rights obligations by repealing all provisions which criminalise sodomy or other sexual activity between consenting adults.

This information is submitted jointly by:

- **ILGA** (International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association), a global association of over 600 lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (“LGBTI”) groups in over 110 countries
- **ILGA-Europe**, an NGO with ECOSOC consultative status that is recognized by the EU, COE and OSCE;
- **ILGA-Asia** which brings together LGBTI activists from over 20 countries in Asia and recently elected a board with representatives from all five Asian regions (Western, Central, Southern, Southeast and Eastern).
- **International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission**, a non-profit NGO which seeks to secure the full enjoyment of the human rights of all people and communities subject to discrimination or abuse on the basis of sexual orientation or expression, gender identity or expression, and/or HIV status;
- **ARC International**, an NGO with a full-time presence in Geneva which engages with the UN Human Rights Council and related mechanisms to advance respect for human rights, including on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity.

⁵ Available in all 6 UN languages at: www.yogyakartaprinciples.org.