



General Assembly

Distr.: General
24 June 2019

English/French/Spanish only

Human Rights Council

Forty-first session

24 June–12 July 2019

Agenda Items 3

**Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political,
economic, social and cultural rights,
including the right to development**

Observations on communications transmitted to Governments and replies received

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

* Reproduced as received.

GE.19-10489(E)



* 1 9 1 0 4 8 9 *

Please recycle 



I. Introduction

1. The present document is submitted by the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 32/32. The document provides observations on the communications addressed by the Special Rapporteur to States and other actors, and on the replies received.
2. In the present addendum, the Special Rapporteur provides observations on communications sent to States and other actors between 1 April 2018 and 25 April 2019. This report further contains observations on responses to the aforementioned communications received from States and other actors until 17 June 2019.
3. In order to avoid duplicating information, the addendum limits itself to reporting on those communications which have not been covered by the extensive addendum “Observations on communications transmitted to Governments and replies received” submitted by the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders to the Human Rights Council during its 40th session on 22 February 2019 (<https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G19/048/00/PDF/G1904800.pdf?OpenElement>). Instead, a list of these communications will be provided at the end of the current document. The Special Rapporteur thanks all of those States and other actors who provided replies to communications sent which are not explicitly reported on in this addendum.
4. Communications sent and responses received during the reporting period are accessible electronically through the hyperlink below. Certain replies received before 17 June 2019 could not be included because translation of these documents was not available at the time of the finalisation of the report. The Special Rapporteur is aware of responses received after the reporting deadline that could not be reflected in the present report and takes this opportunity to highlight the importance of receiving timely replies.
5. Each communication is referenced as an urgent appeal (UA), joint urgent appeal (JUA), allegation letter (AL), joint allegation letter (JAL), other letter (OL) or joint other letter (JOL), followed by the date the communication was issued, the case number and the date of the State reply, if any. The communications included in this report and the replies received from the concerned States, respectively, can be consulted on the following webpage <https://spcommreports.ohchr.org>.
6. The Special Rapporteur is grateful to all States and other actors that have transmitted responses to communications sent. He considers interaction through his communications as an important part of cooperation with States and encourages States (and others) to benefit from this opportunity to have a constructive dialogue through the use of this tool. In this context, the Special Rapporteur recalls paragraph 2 of the Human Rights Council resolution 32/32 that calls upon States “to continue to cooperate fully with and assist him in the performance of his mandate [and] to respond promptly to his urgent appeals and other communications...” Therefore, he urges all States which have not yet replied to his communications to do so without further delay.

II. Summary

7. Between 1 April 2018 and 25 April 2019, the Special Rapporteur sent 130 communications, either individually or jointly with other mandate holders of the Human Rights Council, to 60 States and 13 other actors, of which 22 were urgent appeals, 93 were allegation letters and 15 were other letters.
8. Examined by region, the figures show that 21 communications were addressed to countries in the Africa region (16 per cent), 25 to countries in the Americas region (19 per cent), 26 in the Asia-Pacific region (20 per cent), 26 in the Europe and Central Asia region (20 per cent), and 19 in the Middle East and North Africa region (15 per cent), while 13 communications were addressed to other actors (10.0 per cent).
9. Of the 130 communications sent during the reporting period, the Special Rapporteur received responses to 66, giving an average response-rate of 50 per cent, a slightly higher rate than was noted in the last observations report of the mandate. While certain replies

were simple acknowledgements of receipt, the Special Rapporteur wishes to thank countries who have fully engaged and cooperated with his mandate and provided detailed information in response to the allegations addressed in the communications sent.

10. During the reporting period, the Special Rapporteur sent 14 communications concerning alleged acts of intimidation and reprisals against civil society activists for their cooperation with the United Nations, its representatives and mechanisms in the field of human rights. During the reporting period, he sent communications about alleged acts of reprisals to the following countries: China, Djibouti, India, Iran, Israel, Mauritania, Nicaragua, other actors, Philippines, Poland, Russia and Saudi Arabia. In this context, the Special Rapporteur wishes to reiterate that the Human Rights Council, in resolution 22/6, strongly called upon all States to “refrain from, and ensure adequate protection from, any act of intimidation or reprisals against those who cooperate, have cooperated or seek to cooperate with international institutions, including their family members and associates”. Furthermore, he recalls that in resolution 24/24, the Human Rights Council urges all States to prevent and refrain from all acts of intimidation or reprisal against those who seek to cooperate or have cooperated with the United Nations, its representatives and mechanisms in the field of human rights, or who have provided testimony or information to them. The resolution also urges States to ensure accountability for any acts of such intimidation or reprisal. The United Nations Secretary General, in his 2018 report to the Human Rights Council on cooperation with the United Nations, its representatives and mechanisms in the field of human rights, reiterated that States must end acts of reprisal, investigate all allegations, provide effective remedies and adopt and implement measures to prevent reoccurrence (A/HRC/39/41).

III. Africa Region

Burundi

11. JAL Case no: BDI 3/2018 (Burundi), sent on 10 December 2018, no reply. Allégations de suspension des activités des ONGs internationales par le Conseil National de Sécurité, à partir du 1er octobre 2018 et pour une durée de trois mois.

Comoros

12. JAL Case no: COM 1/2018 (Comoros), sent on 29 November 2018, no reply. Allégations concernant la détérioration de la situation des droits de l'homme aux Comores dans le contexte du référendum constitutionnel de juillet 2018 et l'abolition de la limitation du mandat présidentiel.

Ethiopia

13. OL Case no: ETH 2/2018 (Ethiopia), sent on 17 August 2018, no reply. Allegations concerning the review and re-drafting of Ethiopia's Charities and Societies Proclamation (CSP), Anti-Terror Proclamation (ATP), and Mass Media and Freedom of Information Proclamation.

Malawi

14. JOL Case no: MWI 2/2018 (Malawi), sent on 24 December 2018, no reply. Allegations concerning the Non-Governmental Organisation Amendment Bill 2018 (Amendment Bill), which, if adopted, may have a detrimental impact on non-governmental organisations in Malawi.

Mozambique

15. JOL Case no: MOZ 2/2018 (Mozambique), sent on 18 September 2018, no reply. Allegations concerning media decree 40/2018, issued by the Council of Ministers, which came into force on 22 August 2018, and which imposed exorbitant fees on local and foreign media operating in the country.

Sierra Leone

16. JOL Case no: SLE 1/2019 (Sierra Leone), sent on 22 February 2019, reply received on 1 March 2019. Allegations concerning the Development Cooperation Framework (DCF) (2019-2023), which defines the overall objectives and principles surrounding the development partnership as well as undertakings by the various partners supporting development process in the country and recently submitted to the Cabinet.

South Sudan

17. JAL Case no: SSD 1/2019 (South Sudan), sent on 27 February 2019, no reply. Allegations concerning the arrest, arbitrary detention and investigation of Mr. Peter Biar Ajak.

Sudan

18. JUA Case no: SDN 1/2019 (Sudan), sent on 15 February 2019, reply received on 20 February 2019. Allegations concerning the excessive use of force by security forces and crackdown against protestors, human rights defenders and journalists in Sudan.

Uganda

19. JOL Case no: UGA 3/2018 (Uganda), sent on 11 September 2018, no reply. Allegations concerning legislative amendments introducing the Over-The-Top tax on telecommunication companies, severely restricting the right to freedom of opinion and expression, as well as the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association online in Uganda.

20. JAL Case no: UGA 5/2018 (Uganda), sent on 19 October 2018, no reply. Allegations concerning the killings of civilians, excessive use of force against protestors and attacks against journalists and media outlets by military forces in Uganda.

Zimbabwe

21. JUA Case no: ZWE 1/2019 (Zimbabwe), sent on 29 January 2019, reply received on 30 April 2019. Allegations of the violent repression of protests and excessive use of force by Zimbabwean security forces and the arrest of a number of human rights defenders, including Mr. Japhet Moyo.

Responses to communications

22. During the present reporting period, the Special Rapporteur sent 21 communications to 16 countries in the Africa region, receiving responses to 8 of them. He gladly notes an increased response rate from the region of 38 per cent, a notable improvement on the figure of 12.5 per cent noted during the last reporting period. The Special Rapporteur encourages States to continue with their increased engagement with the Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council and with his mandate. The Special Rapporteur furthermore strongly urges States who have not responded to do so without further delay.

Freedom of peaceful assembly

23. The Special Rapporteur sent communications concerning the right to freedom of peaceful assembly to Uganda (2), Comoros, Zimbabwe and Sudan, among others, during the reporting period. The Special Rapporteur thanks the Government of Zimbabwe for its response dated 30 April 2019 and the Government of Sudan for its response dated 20 February 2019, however he regrets that he received no responses from Uganda or Comoros for the communications sent on 11 September 2018 and 19 October 2018, and 29 November 2018 respectively. He hopes to receive responses to all of the communications sent as soon as possible.

24. The Special Rapporteur raised grave allegations regarding the excessive use of force by security forces in the dispersal of protests, including the use of live fire against protestors, which resulted in a number of deaths (ZWE 1/2019). Between 14 and 16 January 2019, the Zimbabwean Congress of Trade Unions called on its members to carry out a three-day “stay away” strike in protest against rising fuel prices. During the same period, similar protests in Harare and Bulawayo were allegedly violently suppressed by security forces with live ammunition, resulting in 12 deaths, a number of other injuries and widespread arrests against large numbers of trade unionists, opposition members and human rights defenders. The Special Rapporteur wishes to thank the Government of Zimbabwe for the information provided in its response received on 30 April 2019, including the statistics on the number of cases brought before the courts. However, he remains concerned by the failure of the Government to provide detailed information on any investigations which may be underway concerning disproportionate use of force by law enforcement. Indeed, the Government of Zimbabwe abjectly denies such allegations.

25. The Special Rapporteur is also seriously concerned by allegations regarding the targeting of the President and General Secretary of the Zimbabwean Congress of Trade Unions, Messrs. Peter Mutasa and Japhet Moyo, which may seriously undermine their exercise of the right to freedom of association. Furthermore, the Special Rapporteur is greatly preoccupied by the vague wording of the charge against Mr. Moyo (Section 22(a)(iii) of the criminal code), which states that “[a]ny person who... organises or sets up, or advocates, urges or suggests the organisation or setting up of, any group or body with a view to that group or body...coercing or attempting to coerce the Government;... shall be guilty of subverting... constitutional government and liable to imprisonment for a period not exceeding twenty years without the option of a fine”. Given the broad number of actions that the term “coerce” may encompass, the Special Rapporteur notes the ambit for abuse that such legislation may have, and its potential to be used to the detriment of freedom of association in Zimbabwe.

26. Allegations of arbitrary arrests and the excessive use of force including the use of live ammunition in the dispersal of protests were also raised by the Special Rapporteur with the Government of Sudan (SDN 1/2019). According to authorities, at the time of writing the communication, 31 people had been killed by excessive use of force by security forces, including through the use of snipers. According to a particularly grave allegation, security forces pursued a number of protesters who were taking shelter inside a hospital, firing tear gas and live ammunition at them. Reports also allege violations of the right to freedom of association through the systematic arrests of opposition politicians and the targeting of members of the Sudanese Professionals’ and Engineers’ Associations. While the Special Rapporteur thanks the Government for the information provided in its response regarding criminal investigations which have taken place into reports of excessive use of force, he regrets the labelling of protesters as saboteurs and infiltrators. He also notes that while the Government stated that in the majority of cases permits were not obtained for protests, the failure of protesters to obtain a permit does not in and of itself render a demonstration unlawful. The Special Rapporteur takes note of the transition of power following the arrest of President Al-Bashir, which was precipitated by widespread peaceful protests, however he expresses grave concerns over recent allegations regarding further serious acts of violence which followed. He calls upon the Transitional Military Council to prevent any further escalation of violence against peaceful demonstrators, to investigate allegations of excessive use of force by security forces, including the Rapid Support Forces, with a view

to bringing perpetrators to justice, and to safeguard the rights of demonstrators to life, to freedom of peaceful assembly and to freedom of expression, among others.

27. Reports of excessive use of force against protesters were raised with the Government of Uganda (UGA 5/2018), who earlier that year also instituted a presidential decree introducing an Over-The-Top tax on telecommunications companies. Protests broke out in Kamwokya and Mityana following the arrests and killings of a number of members of the political opposition by the Uganda Police Forces and the Special Forces Command, an elite Presidential force. The protests were suppressed with tear gas and live ammunition.

28. Regarding the Over-The-Top tax introduced in Uganda (UGA 3/2018) in March 2018, the Special Rapporteur raised his joint concerns that such a tax, which would require over-the-top services such as WhatsApp, Skype, Viber and Facebook to pay UGX 200 (approximately USD 0.05) per user per day of access, could result in deleterious consequences for the freedom to assemble peacefully online. He is further concerned that such decree was not preceded by any form of public consultation. As of 1 July 2018, telecommunications companies in Uganda blocked access to social media platforms to all users, requiring them to pay for access in order to cover the tax costs. For some users, this added cost may have prevented them from actively participating in online spaces. The Special Rapporteur notes that restrictions to freedom of peaceful assembly, which includes online assembly, must be prescribed by law. The Special Rapporteur also notes that in the context of the aforementioned protests in Zimbabwe and Sudan, internet shutdowns occurred which also hindered the organisation of assemblies and jeopardised the right to freely assemble peacefully online.

29. In Comoros, the Special Rapporteur expressed his worries over the apparent crackdown on freedom of assembly in the context of a constitutional referendum regarding the abolition of presidential term limits (COM 1/2018). According to allegations received, beginning in the month of May 2018, authorities banned assemblies and demonstrations across the country without justification. These bans were accompanied by a strong police presence, the closing of public spaces which would ordinarily be used for assemblies and the arrest of protest organisers. This crackdown is associated with allegations of the general shrinking of civic space in Comoros, illustrated by the arrests of approximately 80 opposition politicians, writers, lawyers and police officers for their alleged participation in an attempted coup d'état, and comments from the Minister of Interior which threatened the imprisonment of protesters and those with dissenting voices.

Freedom of association

30. The Special Rapporteur sent communications concerning the right to freedom of association to Ethiopia, Mozambique, Burundi, Malawi, Sierra Leone and South Sudan, among others during the reporting period. The Special Rapporteur thanks the Government of Sierra Leone for its reply dated 15 February 2019 and urges those States who have not yet provided responses to do so at the earliest available opportunity.

31. Of the communications listed above, the Special Rapporteur takes note of three communications sent regarding legislation or regulations concerning non-governmental organisations, which may have the effect of unjustly limiting their right to freedom of association.

32. In Burundi (BDI 3/2018), the Special Rapporteur raised concerns over the declaration made by the National Security Council to suspend the activities of international NGOs from 1 October 2018 for three months. According to the declaration, the suspension of these international NGOs was implemented in order to ensure conformity with a 2017 law which regulated them, as allegedly most of the 130 international NGOs in the country were not respecting it. To this end, all of the international NGOs in Burundi were required to submit a number of documents to the Minister of Interior in order to show conformity. Without rendering an assessment on the law, which requires strict financial assessments of these organisations and ethnic quotas of employees, the blanket suspension of all international NGOs in Burundi appears to have been a disproportionate affront to freedom of association in the country. Furthermore, the Special Rapporteur notes that the suspension of the activities of these NGOs may have been done without due regard being given to the

situation of their beneficiaries, many of whom rely on the provision of their services and would find themselves in a disadvantaged position without.

33. In Malawi (MWI 2/2018), concerns were raised regarding the Non-Governmental Organisation Bill 2018 (Amendment Bill), which was allegedly brought for discussion in Parliament without prior consultation with local NGOs. While the bill made a number of improvements, including the removal of double registration requirements for NGOs, a commitment to promote the right to freedom of association in line with Section 32 of the Republican Constitution, and requirements for the independence and gender balance of a new regulatory authority for NGOs, some worrying provisions were also introduced. Most worryingly, the Amendment Bill removed all statutory responsibilities from the Council for Non-Governmental Organisations in Malawi, instead placing them under a new NGO authority. This NGO authority would be granted additional powers, including the ability to inspect NGOs for compliance with the NGO Act or any other law and to revoke certificates of registration. The Amendment Bill would also include a representative of the Secretary for Home Affairs and Internal Security on the NGO authority, raising fears of the body taking on a security-orientated approach rather than an approach which is supportive and enabling. These two points combined raise concerns of possible abuse of the legislation, which is also at times vaguely worded. Furthermore, the Amendment Bill would permit prosecution of the trustees or director of an NGO for the NGOs failure to abide by the act, piercing the organisational veil rather than holding the organisation itself to account.

34. Similarly, the Development Cooperation Framework (DCF) in Sierra Leone (SLE 1/2019) provides a number of sweeping powers to the NGO Supervisory Committee to refuse the registration or halt the operation of NGOs for multiple reasons, including for providing misleading or false information or for being in contravention with their stated objectives. Again, the use of such overbroad language leaves it open to abuse. Furthermore, while there is an appeals mechanism included in the DCF in case of refusal of registration or halt of operations, the appeal is to the Minister of Planning and Economic Development rather than an impartial and independent judicial body. Other restrictions on the right to freedom of association provided for in the DCF include the limitation on NGOs to only register in two categories or sectors, which stymies the functionality of cross-sectoral NGOs and reduces the spread of potential beneficiaries. While the Special Rapporteur thanks the Government of Sierra Leone for its response to his communication, he regrets that the reply was limited to explaining the teleological reasoning behind the DCF, rather than responding to concerns he raised regarding its conformity to international human rights standards. He encourages further cooperation with his mandate on this front.

35. The Special Rapporteur would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the efforts made by Ethiopia to review and re-draft its Charities and Societies Proclamation, Anti-Terror Proclamation and Mass Media and Freedom of Information Proclamation, commend the collaborative process undertaken through the convening of working groups and reaffirm his continued offer to provide technical assistance in this regard (ETH 2/2018).

36. While most of the legislation about which the Special Rapporteur has sent communications in the Africa region pertains specifically to NGOs, in June 2018 the Council of Ministers of Mozambique adopted decree 40/2018, signed by the Prime Minister on 22 July 2018, which established a licencing and registration regime for all types of media (MOZ 2/2018). The decree instituted high fees for media accreditation, including renewal, along with similar fees for media organisations which create new publications and community radio stations, and was instituted without prior consultation with the media. Not only would these high fees create serious impediments to the work of media organisations and limit their freedom of expression, but fees on community organisations may equally limit their right to freedom of association. The Special Rapporteur notes the agreement reached on 24 August 2018 to delay the implementation of the decree while additional regulations regarding fees were developed.

37. The Special Rapporteur raised his serious concerns over the alleged criminalisation of human rights defender Mr. Peter Biar Ajak, who was arrested by security officials at Juba International Airport while traveling to an event organised by the Red Army Foundation, an organisation he helped to found, which supports those who were displaced

by the Second Sudanese civil war as children (SSD 1/2019). Reports indicate that the human rights defender was arrested partly as a result of his association with the South Sudan Young Leaders Forum (SSYLF), given the fact that the activities of the SSYLF were brought up during his interrogation. Authorities in the past had denied the registration of the SSYLF and cancelled two of its events. The Special Rapporteur further reiterates his concerns over alleged irregularities in his investigation, lack of access to adequate legal representation and ill-treatment in detention. He also expresses his utmost grave concern over the fact that Mr. Ajak may face the death penalty if convicted.

IV. Americas Region

Brazil

38. JAL Case no: BRA 15/2018 (Brazil), sent on 31 December 2018, replies received on 9 January 2019 and 20 February 2019. Concerns on the killing of Ms. Marielle Franco and her driver, which took place on 14 March 2018 in Rio de Janeiro, and requests for further information on the status of the investigation.

39. JOL Case no: BRA 3/2019 (Brazil), sent on 25 March 2019, reply received on 29 March 2019. Allegations concerning Decree n. 64.074/2019 which regulates law n. 15.556/2014, issued by the State Government of São Paulo on 18 January 2019, and published on 19 January 2019, which contains a number of provisions restricting the right to freedom of peaceful assembly.

Colombia

40. JAL Case no: COL 2/2019 (Colombia), sent on 25 April 2019, no reply. Información recibida en relación con los desalojos forzosos y violentos de la comunidad Brisas del Cauca en Cali, una comunidad compuesta principalmente por personas de ascendencia africana. Estos informes indican que estos desalojos se han llevado a cabo sin consulta y consentimiento previos y sin garantías de acceso a una vivienda adecuada. Estos informes también indican que estos desalojos son el resultado de la aplicación del plan Jarillón, que tiene por objeto reforzar un dique y establecer infraestructuras de desarrollo comercial y turístico.

Cuba

41. JAL Case no: CUB 1/2019 (Cuba), sent on 13 January 2019, reply received on 21 February 2019. Información recibida en relación con el supuesto filtrado y bloqueo de mensajes llamando al voto negativo en el referéndum constitucional que se celebrará el 24 de febrero de 2019, enviados a través del servicio de mensajes cortos (SMS) de la empresa pública ETECSA (Empresa de Telecomunicaciones de Cuba, Sociedad Anónima).

Ecuador

42. JOL Case no: ECU 5/2018 (Ecuador), sent on 11 December 2018, replies received on 13 December 2018 and 7 February 2019. Información recibida en relación con el “Proyecto de Ley Orgánica de Organizaciones sin Fines de Lucro” que fue expedido por la Comisión Especializada Permanente de Participación Ciudadana y Control Social de la Asamblea Nacional de la República del Ecuador el 4 de julio de 2018 y que de ser aprobado podría ser incompatible con las obligaciones derivadas de las normas y estándares internacionales de derechos humanos contraídas por Ecuador.

Nicaragua

43. JAL Case no: NIC 1/2019 (Nicaragua), sent on 12 March 2019, no reply. Información recibida en relación con los severos actos de represión a las actividades de las organizaciones de derechos humanos de la sociedad civil y limitación al derecho a la libertad de reunión pacífica a través de la cancelación de la personalidad jurídica de varias organizaciones no gubernamentales, allanamientos ilegales a sus oficinas y a las de ciertos medios de comunicación. Hemos recibido también información relativa a alegaciones sobre presuntos actos de intimidación y represalias contra de la Federación Red Nicaragüense por la Democracia y el Desarrollo Local y de sus miembros por su cooperación con las Naciones Unidas, sus representantes y mecanismo en la esfera de los derechos humanos.

Venezuela

44. JAL Case no: VEN 2/2019 (Venezuela), sent on 15 March 2019, no reply. Información recibida en relación con las serias violaciones a los derechos a la libertad de expresión, libertad de reunión pacífica y a la libertad de asociación en Venezuela en el contexto de las manifestaciones recientes, incluso el uso excesivo de la fuerza en contra de manifestantes resultando en muertes y heridos, detenciones arbitrarias masivas, la detención y deportación de múltiples periodistas y la restricción parcial del acceso a Internet.

Responses to communications

45. The Special Rapporteur sent 25 communications to 11 countries in the Americas Region during the reporting period. He received responses to 11 of these communications (44 per cent) and takes note of a decreased response rate from countries in the region in comparison to the previous reporting period. The Special Rapporteur urges states to renew their commitment to engaging with the Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council.

Freedom of peaceful assembly

46. During the reporting period, the Special Rapporteur sent communications regarding the right to freedom of peaceful assembly to Nicaragua, Venezuela, Brazil and Colombia, among others. He thanks the Government of Brazil for its response dated 29 March 2019, and hopes to soon receive responses to the other communications sent.

47. On 18 January 2019, the State Government of São Paulo issued Decree n. 64.074/2019, allegedly in response to protests which occurred in the weeks beforehand (BRA 3/2010). The Decree set out a number of restrictive requirements for the organisation of assemblies involving 300 people or more. These requirements included the prior notification of the military and civil police at least five days in advance of the protest date. In addition, the Decree prohibited masks and facial coverings and stated that their use would be criminalised under the offence of disobedience, codified in Article 330 of the Penal Code. The Special Rapporteur acknowledges the response of the Government of Brazil to the communication sent, however he expresses his concern that the Decree tends towards a prima facie presumption of criminality against those wearing facial coverings. He notes that facial coverings are often used during manifestations to protect against excessive surveillance and to reduce the effects of tear gas. The Special Rapporteur notes that the Government justifies this prohibition by saying that it “curbs possible excesses of individuals who may commit crimes through anonymity”, however he feels that such a blanket ban is disproportionate to the restrictions on the right to freedom of peaceful assembly. He further notes that facial coverings and masks may be removed from individuals who have committed a crime and who are apprehended during the act.

48. The Special Rapporteur also expressed his grave concerns over the excessive use of force in the dispersal of protests in Venezuela, along with the systematic use of arbitrary detention and raids against protesters (VEN 2.2019). Allegedly, between 21 and 29 January 2019, at least 1,069 people were arbitrarily detained in connection with their participation in protests, including at least 120 minors. These arbitrary detentions were accompanied by raids on the houses of participants, usually conducted after the event in poorer

neighbourhoods by security forces or by “collectivos” - loose groups of pro-government paramilitaries. These raids were often characterised by destruction of private property, looting and violence against the occupants. For those who were arbitrarily detained, many experienced irregularities in their legal proceedings including lack of access to a lawyer, were kept in unhygienic cells, and were subjected to torture and ill-treatment. The use of live fire during the dispersal of protests was also reported. Between 22 and 25 January 2019, at least 26 people were killed by live fire during protests, some in indigenous communities. The Special Rapporteur further notes a number of total or partial internet shutdowns between 23 January and 4 March 2019, along with social media interruptions and raids on media offices.

49. In Colombia, reports were received regarding the excessive use of force against community members of Brisas del Cauca en Cali, a community principally comprised of people of African descent (COL 2/2019). The members of the community were forcibly evicted after disagreements arose with regards to the compensation paid to them as a result of their displacement. During the eviction, police used tear gas against community members who had formed a human chain around the local church. A number of residents also received bullet wounds, though security forces allegedly refused to provide medical assistance to those wounded. Multiple human rights defenders and social leaders were also heavily beaten and arrested, including Ms. Adriana María España Cuero, who was allegedly beaten by police and arrested while 7 months pregnant. While in detention, Ms. España Cuero stated that she began to feel ill. After being taken to hospital and examined, it was determined that her foetus had tachycardia. She later experienced premature contractions, allegedly as a result of her violent arrest.

Freedom of association

50. Regarding the right to freedom of association, the Special Rapporteur sent communications to Ecuador, Brazil, Nicaragua and Cuba during the reporting period, among others. The Special Rapporteur thanks the Governments of Ecuador, Brazil and Cuba for their responses dated 13 December 2018 and 7 February 2019, 9 January 2019 and 20 February 2019, and 21 February 2019 respectively.

51. In the context of a constitutional referendum in Cuba, reports allege that the state telecommunications provider, ETECSA, filtered and blocked SMS messages containing certain social media tags which advocated for voters to vote “No” (CUB 1/2019). The social media tags had been created by groups who were opposed to the changes proposed in the referendum. The Special Rapporteur raised his concerns with regards to freedom of association, as such necessarily entails the freedom of associations to engage in election-related activities, including seeking, receiving and imparting information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers. The Special Rapporteur thanks the Government for its response to the communication sent, however he regrets that the response represents an outright rejection of the allegations raised. He thanks the Government for information provided regarding large public consultations in the run up to the referendum.

52. In his communication dated 11 December 2018, the Special Rapporteur welcomed a number of promising developments to be introduced by the “Proyecto de Ley Orgánica de Organizaciones sin Fines de Lucro” in Ecuador (ECU 5/2018). The new law would remove a system of legal recognition and supervision of non-profit organisations, replacing it instead with a notification system, characterised by a declaration under oath before a notary. It also would also introduce a number of other positive changes. The Special Rapporteur did however note some concerns over provisions in the law which were insufficiently clear, coherent or precise. In addition, he noted his concerns regarding powers given to the Council of Civic Participation and Social Control to receive complaints made by members against their own organisations and to make determinations on them, as members of associations should be able to freely determine their organisation’s status, structure and activities, as well as take decisions without State interference. The Special Rapporteur thanks the Government of Ecuador for its responses to the communication, and welcomes changes made subsequently in line with a number of his comments, including the removal of the complaints competence from the Council of Civic Participation and Social

Control, opting instead to allow only judicial mechanisms this power. The Special Rapporteur wishes to keep updated on this legislative initiative.

53. The Special Rapporteur raised his serious concerns with regards to the climate for NGOs in Nicaragua, following the alleged cancellation of at least seven organisations in the space of three days in December 2018 as a result of decrees issued by the National Assembly for reasons linked to illicit use of funds for terrorist and narco-trafficking activities (NIC 1/2019). In at least one instance, proceedings were also brought against the Director of one of these organisations on the same basis. Once shut down, the assets of these organisations were liquidated and allegedly passed to the State. At the time the communication was sent, at least nine human rights organisations had been shut down in this manner. Reports also allege a systematic pattern of harassment against NGOs through the delegitimisation of their work, along with cancellation of organisations through seemingly discretionary Ministry of Interior reports which provide no avenue for appeal. On 7 February 2019, agents of the Ministry of Interior allegedly raided the offices of the Federación Red Nicaragüense por la Democracia y el Desarrollo Local, an NGO network, without a warrant, seizing documents, a safe and a vehicle and illegally arresting two employees. The raid occurred only six days after representatives of member organisations met with officials of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in Geneva. Representatives of these organisations had also met with the Special Rapporteur in Mexico just weeks beforehand. The Special Rapporteur expresses his utmost concerns that these acts may have been carried out in reprisal for the network's interaction with United Nations human rights mechanisms, including with his mandate. The Special Rapporteur stresses the absolute necessity of ensuring that civil society organisations and human rights defenders are able to interact with UN human rights mechanisms without fear of threats, violence or harassment of any sort.

54. The Special Rapporteur thanks the Government of Brazil for its response to his communication dated 31 December 2018, and for information provided regarding the investigation of the death of Ms. Marielle Franco and Mr. Pedro Anderson Gomes (BRA 15/2018). He also thanks the Government for the information it provided regarding the Program for the Protection of Human Rights, Communicators and Environmental Defenders, Communicators and Environmentalists (PPDDH).

V. Asia Pacific Region

Bangladesh

55. JUA Case no: BGD 5/2018 (Bangladesh), sent on 6 June 2018, no reply. Allegations concerning more than 132 people who have been killed by security forces in Bangladesh since 15 May 2018 in the context of the announcement of a 'war on drugs'; that more than 13,000 individuals have been arrested and a number of others have been subjected to enforced disappearance in the same context; that drug users have been facing increasing difficulties to access health care services; and that the draft Narcotics Control Act, 2018 extends the death penalty to additional drug offenses.

Cambodia

56. JOL Case no: KHM 5/2018 (Cambodia), sent on 12 June 2018, no reply. Allegations concerning the Code of Conduct for media in the Election Process, issued by the National Election Committee on 12 March 2018, as well as statements that link the language of the code to calls for boycott of the elections. Further allegations received concerning information related to the Inter-ministerial Proclamation (*Prakas*) on Publication Controls of Website and Social Media Processing via Internet in the Kingdom of Cambodia adopted on 28 May 2018.

India

57. JAL Case no: IND 28/2018 (India), sent on 20 December 2018, no reply. Allegations concerning raids on the offices of Greenpeace India and Amnesty International India by members of the government of India's Enforcement Directorate, as well as the freezing of Amnesty International India's bank account for allegedly violating the Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Act (FCRA) and levelling accusations against Greenpeace India of violating the Foreign Exchange Management Act (FEMA), and allegations concerning a smear campaign targeting Amnesty International India.

Indonesia

58. JAL Case no: IDN 1/2019 (Indonesia), sent on 6 February 2019, no reply. The alleged failure to protect against human rights abuses linked to coal mining operations in East Kalimantan Province, including violations of rights to life, to water and sanitation, to food, and to a clean and safe environment. Further information concerning alleged harassment and attacks against JATAM (Mining Advocacy Network), an environmental non-governmental organisation, for denouncing this situation.

59. JAL Case no: IDN 4/2019 (Indonesia), sent on 15 March 2019, reply received on 29 March 2019. Allegations concerning the arson attack against, and attempted murder of, environmental rights defender Mr. Murdani and members of his family by unknown assailants. He has opposed illegal sand mining activities in the Menemeng, Bilebante and Pringgarata subdistricts, the Central Lombok regency, and West Nusa Tenggara province.

Philippines

60. JUA Case no: PHL 11/2018 (Philippines), sent on 7 December 2018, reply received 10 December 2018 (acknowledgement of receipt). Alleged extrajudicial or arbitrary killing of Mr. Benjamin Ramos Jr., a human rights lawyer. Further reports received concerning death threats against Mr. Felipe Levy Gelle Jr., Ms. Enrita Caniendo and Ms. Clarizza Singson-Dagatan, human rights defenders working with Mr. Ramos.

61. JAL Case no: PHL 10/2018 (Philippines), sent on 13 December 2018, reply received 14 December 2018 (acknowledgement of receipt). Alleged extrajudicial or arbitrary killing of thirty-two individuals (twenty six men, five women and one child) in the context of intensifying counter-insurgency operations carried out by members of the Armed Forces, paramilitaries or individuals linked to them. The victims are members of farmers' organizations, indigenous persons advocating for access to, and protection of, their ancestral lands and their family members.

Responses to communications

62. During the present reporting period, the Special Rapporteur sent 26 communications to 12 countries in the Asia Pacific region, receiving responses to 7 of them. He unfortunately notes a decreased response rate from the region of 29 per cent, a deterioration from the figure of 47 per cent noted in the last reporting period. The Special Rapporteur encourages States to improve their interaction with his mandate in line with resolution 32/32 and with the Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council overall. The Special Rapporteur reiterates the importance of providing replies to the communications sent in order to foster a greater spirit of engagement and to better safeguard human rights in the region.

Freedom of peaceful assembly

63. The Special Rapporteur sent communications regarding freedom of peaceful assembly to Bangladesh and Cambodia, among others, during the reporting period. He regrets that no response was received to either communication and hopes to receive replies to these communications soon.

64. The Special Rapporteur raised his concerns with the Government of Cambodia (KHM 5/2018) over alleged violations of the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association online, occasioned by the issuance of the Code of Conduct for media in the Election Process by the National Election Committee on 12 March 2018. The Code of Conduct listed a number of prohibitions for the media, including the expression of personal opinion regarding the reporting of ongoing events and the broadcasting of news leading to confusion and confidence loss in the election or affecting national security or political stability. On 28 May 2018, the Ministry of Interior, the Ministry of Posts and Telecommunication and the Ministry of Information adopted an Inter-ministerial Proclamation (*Prakas*) on “Publication Controls of Website and Social Media Processing via Internet in the Kingdom of Cambodia”, which gave wide discretion to block online content on a number of vague and overbroad premises, such as the creation of “turmoil by will” and “breaking solidarity”. The *Prakas* would be enforceable against website publications and any kind of online social media networks in Cambodia. Due to the *Prakas*, Internet Service Providers in Cambodia were required to equip surveillance tools to filter and block social media accounts which were posting in contravention of regulations and to cooperate with Ministry of Information or relevant ministries in this regard. These regulations allegedly had a highly detrimental impact on the ability to assemble and associate online, as sites and online communities could be closed through the application of the broad language contained in the regulations. The lack of legal certainty may also have led to a climate of self-censorship.

65. Concerns were also raised by the Special Rapporteur with the Government of Bangladesh with regards to shrinking civic space in the country in the context of the “war on drugs”, during which over 13,000 individuals were allegedly arrested and a number of persons were killed and forcibly disappeared (BGD 5/2018). On 1 June 2018, the Daily Star media outlet was blocked for 20 hours, allegedly as a result of publishing an article related to an extrajudicial killing, and, on 3 June 2018, a public rally and march organised in protest against such killings was dispersed due to the organisers’ alleged failure to seek permission from authorities to hold it. The Special Rapporteur notes that, while national security and public health are legitimate reasons to limit the right to freedom of peaceful assembly, the sole fact that permission was not sought in order to hold a protest does not give grounds for its dispersal. Indeed, assemblies should not be subject to an authorisation procedure from authorities, rather they should be subject at most to a notification procedure which is as straightforward possible.

Freedom of association

66. The Special Rapporteur sent communications concerning the right to freedom of association to the Philippines, India and Indonesia, among others during the reporting period. The Special Rapporteur thanks the Government of the Philippines for its responses dated 10 and 13 December 2018, however he regrets that these responses were limited to acknowledgements of receipt. He looks forward to receiving detailed responses to the communications sent soon. The Special Rapporteur also thanks the Government of Indonesia for its reply received on 29 March 2019 and hopes to similarly receive a reply at the Government’s earliest convenience to the communication sent on 6 February 2019 (IDN 1/2019). The Special Rapporteur regrets that no reply was received to the communication sent to the Government of India (IND 28/2018) and urges the Government’s increased cooperation with his mandate and the Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council in general.

67. In two communications sent to the Government of the Philippines (PHL 10/2018 & PHL 11/2018), the Special Rapporteur raised his most serious concerns regarding the alleged extrajudicial killing of members of farmers’, indigenous and land rights organisations. These alleged killings seemingly form part of a coordinated and systematic attack against these organisations and their work, through the mislabelling and false conflation of them as elements of the communist party of the Philippines or the New People’s Army. The attacks on the members of these human rights organisations also reportedly include death threats, arbitrary arrests and smear campaigns. Moreover, these attacks and acts of harassment take place in a climate of impunity in the Philippines, with perpetrators rarely being brought to justice. In one of the two communications (PHL

10/2018), the Special Rapporteur listed the unlawful killings of 32 members of farmers', indigenous and land rights organisations, or their families, including five women and one child, by members of the Armed Forces or paramilitaries, or by people linked to them. The Special Rapporteur stresses the need for full investigations into these killings and for the perpetrators to be brought to justice. The Special Rapporteur further urges the Government of the Philippines to ensure that farmers', indigenous and land rights organisations are protected from attacks, threats or other forms of harassment and are not targeted for their human rights work, especially in the context of continued, intense counter-insurgency operations.

68. Communications sent to the Government of Indonesia also raised serious concerns over attacks on members of non-governmental organisations in more rural areas. In both of the communications sent (IDN 1/2019 & IDN 4/2019), the victims of attacks were members of environmental organisations campaigning against human rights abuses stemming from mining industries in rural areas of Indonesia. JATAM (Mining Advocacy Network), during the course of its advocacy activities, has campaigned for accountability and compensation in cases of fatal accidents associated with mining pits in East Kalimantan Province. On 5 November 2018, their office in Samarinda city was ransacked by a group of approximately 30 people. Although fortunately no staff were present, the group damaged the office's window and a motorbike, along with a neighbour's house. The organisation's members have also been the subjects of multiple acts of intimidation and harassment in the past.

69. In a similar case, Mr. Murdani, the executive director of Wahana Lingkungan Hidup Indonesia (Indonesian Forum for Environment), had allegedly been subjected to repeated threats, including death threats, for his work opposing human rights abuses related to illegal sand mining activities in West Nusa Tenggara Province, however no investigations had been carried out. On 28 January 2019, Mr. Murdani was the victim of an arson attack which set fire to his house while he and his family were sleeping. Although he and his family were able to escape unharmed, the fire caused significant damage to his house. Despite registering a police complaint, investigators made statements to the effect that they were exploring the possibility that the human rights defender had started the fire himself. The Special Rapporteur thanks the Government of Indonesia for the information provided in its response with regards to the investigation which is underway and invites the Government to share the results of this investigation as it proceeds.

70. It is clear from the above-mentioned cases that organisations in rural areas in the region are subject to greater degrees of risk than their urban counterparts as a result of reduced visibility, increased levels of impunity and friction between their work in defence of human rights and more powerful industrial concerns. The Special Rapporteur urges States to pay special attention to such organisations due to their heightened levels of vulnerability, ensuring also that their members are free from threats or acts of violence and other harassment. He also urges States to create an enabling environment for such organisations, including by allowing and helping them to expand their networks in rural areas so as to increase their collective security.

71. The Special Rapporteur raised his concerns with the Government of India regarding raids on the offices of Greenpeace India and Amnesty International India, along with the freezing of both of the organisations' bank accounts (IND 28/2018). In both cases, the raids conducted on the organisations' offices related to foreign funding laws which limit certain flows of NGO funding emanating from outside the country. In the case of Greenpeace India, all twelve bank accounts of its subsidiary Greenpeace India Society were frozen due to allegations that it had incorporated and received funding from a commercial entity called Direct Dialogues Initiatives India (DDII), which engages in ethical fundraising and NGO marketing. Greenpeace India was accused by the Enforcement Directorate of violating the Foreign Exchange Management Act (FEMA) for accepting funds from abroad through DDII. In Amnesty International India's case, the Enforcement Directorate accused the organisation of bypassing the Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Act, by receiving funding from abroad after it was denied permission by the Home Ministry to do so. On 22 November 2018, the Karnataka High Court granted Amnesty International India interim relief to use funds collected domestically for specific purposes, however despite this, all

research and campaigns were reportedly forced to stop and a number of staff were asked to resign.

72. The Special Rapporteur notes that the above-mentioned foreign funding restrictions take place in the context in an increased usage of this type of legislation globally. He stresses that international NGOs receive considerable portions of their funding from fundraising efforts abroad, and that organisations should be free to apportion resources collected globally without excessive domestic control over their financial flows. The Special Rapporteur further highlights that foreign funding regulations, and by extension the freezing of organisations' bank accounts as a result of these regulations, has serious effects on beneficiary communities who could otherwise avail of the important services which these organisations provide.

VI. Europe and Central Asia

Belarus

73. JAL Case no: BLR 2/2019 (Belarus), sent on 22 March 2019, reply received on 16 May 2019 (no translation available). Alleged judicial harassment against Mr. Uladzimir Vialičkin, a human rights defender and member of the non-governmental organisation "Viasna" and Mr. Vital Kazak, environmental rights defender, as well as the alleged arbitrary detention of Mr. Aliaksandr Kabanau, environmental rights defender and blogger, for their participation in peaceful protests against the construction of a battery plant in Brest.

Denmark

74. JAL Case no: DNK 2/2018 (Denmark), sent 20 December 2018, no reply requested. Allegations concerning the case of Mr. Dennis Christensen, a Danish citizen, and a member of the religious minority Jehovah's Witnesses, detained on 25 May 2017, in Oryol, Russian Federation, and who remains in pre-trial detention, reportedly until 1 February 2019.

France

75. JAL Case no: FRA 2/2019 (France), sent on 11 February 2019, reply received on 11 April 2019. Allégations d'usage excessif de la force au cours de diverses manifestations du mouvement des «gilets jaunes», organisées depuis mi-novembre 2018, ayant occasionné des blessures de plusieurs manifestants, mais aussi des arrestations et des violations aux droits à la liberté d'expression et de réunion pacifique.

Russia

76. JAL Case no: RUS 15/2018 (Russia), sent on 26 July 2018, reply received on 4 October 2018. Allegations concerning the detention of five Scientologist leaders in St. Petersburg; Ms. Anastasia Terentieva, Ms. Galina Shurinova, Mr. Ivan Matsitskiy, Ms. Konstancia Esaulkova and Mr. Sakhiliev and the Government's refusal to register Scientology churches as religious organisations in the Russian Federation.

77. JAL Case no: RUS 19/2018 (Russia), sent on 14 September 2018, reply received on 5 October 2018. Allegations concerning the continued criminalisation of Jehovah's Witnesses in the Russian Federation.

78. JAL Case no: RUS 22/2018 (Russia), sent 20 December 2018, reply received on 16 January 2019. Allegations concerning the arbitrary detention of Mr. Dennis Christensen, a Danish national and member of the religious minority Jehovah's Witnesses, by armed police and agents of the Federal Security Service; the continued criminalisation of members

of the Jehovah's Witnesses confession through the application of counter-extremism provisions of the Criminal Code, which has led to significant members of this religious group being subject to pre-trial detention; as well as other restrictive measures.

79. JUA Case no: UKR 4/2018 (Ukraine), sent on 30 October 2018, reply received 23 May 2019. Allegations concerning a series of acts of violence which appear to contravene the internationally-recognised right to freedom of religion and belief: they include attacks against and seizure of places of worship belonging to the Ukrainian Orthodox Church (UOC); acts of intimidation and harassment, including death threats made against one priest and editor of the Union Orthodox Church news agency; the disruption of the All-Ukrainian Cross Procession as well as violence against peaceful believers.

Spain

80. JAL Case no: ESP 2/2018 (Spain), sent on 28 January 2019, replies received on 28 February 2019 and 8 May 2019. Información recibida en relación con la prisión preventiva del Sr. Jordi Cuixart.

Turkey

81. JAL Case no: TUR 3/2019 (Turkey), sent on 4 March 2019, replies received on 6 May 2019 (acknowledgement) and 15 May 2019. Allegations concerning the sentencing of 47 members of Academics for Peace between 11 December 2018 and 24 January 2019, including Ms. Şebnem Korur Fincancı and Mr. Gençay Gürsoy, as the result of their signing a peace petition.

United Kingdom of Great Briatain and Northern Ireland

82. JAL Case no: GBR 13/2018 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), sent on 1 February 2019, no reply. Allegations concerning the prosecution on alleged terrorism related charges of fifteen individuals, known as the Stansted 15, for the exercise of their right to peaceful and non-violent protest and freedom of expression.

Responses to communications

83. The Special Rapporteur sent 26 communications to 13 countries in the Europe and Central Asia region during the present reporting period, of which 23 received replies, marking a response rate of 92 per cent for those communications where replies were requested. This marks a slight increase in comparison to the previous reporting period. The Special Rapporteur hopes to receive replies to the two outstanding communications soon, taking note that no response was requested from the communication sent to Denmark.

Freedom of peaceful assembly

84. The Special Rapporteur sent communications concerning freedom of peaceful assembly to Spain, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Turkey, France and Belarus in the Europe and Central Asia region during the reporting period. He thanks the Governments of Spain, Turkey, France and Belarus for their responses dated 28 February 2019 and 8 May 2019, 6 and 15 May 2019, 11 April 2019 and 16 May 2019 respectively.

85. Regarding the case of Mr. Jordi Cuixart, the Special Rapporteur raised his concerns with the Government of Spain over the continued administrative detention of the human rights defender, which is linked to his organisation of peaceful protests in Cataluña in 2017 (ESP 5/2018). The Special Rapporteur further raised concerns over the extremely serious charge of "rebellion" which Mr. Cuixart faces, and takes account of the alleged fact that Mr. Cuixart was at no stage culpable of inciting violent acts, instead specifically calling for peaceful protests. The Special Rapporteur acknowledges the response of Spain to his communication and notes the reasons proffered for his continued detention. However, given

the fact that Mr. Cuixart acted in a peaceful manner with regards to the protests which occurred, the Special Rapporteur believes that the proportionality of such administrative detention may be reassessed. He looks forward to the Government of Spain's continued engagement with his mandate, on this matter and others in the future.

86. The Special Rapporteur also raised his concerns with regards to alleged violations of the right to freedom of peaceful assembly in the context of the widespread "gilets jaunes" protests in France, including the alleged excessive use of force by French security forces and arbitrary arrests of protesters (FRA 2/2019). Reports allege that certain tactics were put into place by French security forces aiming to reduce the number of participants taking part in demonstrations, through excessive interrogations, identity checks, systematic police detentions (*garde à vue*), searches, and confiscation of protection equipment such as goggles and gas masks, telephones, journalistic equipment and material and in some cases medical supplies. Indeed, according to figures received, in the two months since the beginning of the protests on November 2018, there had been 5,339 detentions and 144 serious injuries (of which 92 resulted from the use of "flash balls" or LBDs), with 14 protesters losing eyes and 4 losing hands, allegations which are prima facie symptomatic of a disproportionate use of non-lethal weapons. The Special Rapporteur further raised concerns regarding the measures against unauthorised protests and "casseurs" (*provocateurs*) which may also disproportionately affect the right to freedom of peaceful assembly. The Special Rapporteur thanks the Government of France for its response dated 11 April 2019, and takes note of the legitimate security considerations that the Government faces with regards to acts of violence which occur during the "gilets jaunes" protests. However, he must note that the dichotomy made by the Government between manifestations and riots (*attroupements*) risks branding all manifestations where violence occurs as the latter category. The Special Rapporteur reminds the Government that the acts of a small number of violent individuals do not render an entire manifestation violent. The Special Rapporteur further notes the investigations undertaken by the Government of France to ascertain the legitimacy of the injurious use of non-lethal weapons and looks forward to receiving the results soon as well as a reply on the measures taken to implement the recommendations issued by the Ombudsman (*Défenseur des droits*) on his report related to "Policing with respect to the rules of professional conduct" ("*Le maintien de l'ordre au regard des règles de déontologie*") of December 2017.

87. The Special Rapporteur rests preoccupied by the alleged judicial harassment against Mr. Uladzimir Vialičkin and Mr. Vital Kazak, along with the arbitrary detention of Mr. Aliaksandr Kabanaŭ for their participation in a peaceful protest (BLR 2/2019). Allegedly, the judicial harassment and arrests of the human rights defenders are a result of their participation in unauthorised protests against environmental damage which may result from the construction of a battery plant in Brest. The Special Rapporteur further notes that authorisation for these protests had been sought from authorities 89 times, but only granted once. The Special Rapporteur underlines that the systematic denial of authorisation for peaceful protests amounts to an impermissible restriction on the right to freedom of peaceful assembly, which, if allegations are true, the Government should immediately rectify. Furthermore, the Special Rapporteur stresses that peaceful protests should be subject to a notification regime, rather than an authorisation regime, and even failure to notify authorities of a protest does not, in and of itself, render a protest unlawful. The Special Rapporteur thanks the Government of Belarus for its response dated 16 May 2019, however he regrets that no translation of the response was available at the time of writing.

88. The Special Rapporteur has also expressed his serious concerns regarding the sentencing of at least 87 members of Academics for Peace between 11 December 2018 and 21 February 2019 (TUR 3/2019). Those sentenced were found guilty of the creation of "terrorist propaganda", under article 7(2) of the Anti-Terrorism Law, while, at the time of writing of the communication, at least 493 members had had their first hearing. The Special Rapporteur notes that concerns regarding the criminalisation of members of Academics for Peace have been raised on four previous occasions (TUR 13/2017, TUR 1/2017, TUR 4/2016, TUR 3/2016), however, at the time of writing, allegations regarding further trials persist. The Special Rapporteur in this communication highlighted that the right to freedom of peaceful assembly does not only apply to physical gatherings of people, but also to analogous interactions taking place online, or in this context, the signing of the petition.

The Special Rapporteur thanks the Government of Turkey for its replies dated 6 and 15 May 2019 and notes the explanation proffered that an “independent judiciary deemed it necessary in a democratic society to initiate proceedings against certain persons who supported, propagated and glorified the methods of PKK by way of signing the declaration”. However, he must respectfully disagree that the freedom of expression of a group of people expressing peacefully dissenting views regarding government policy, including views regarding international human rights law, may seriously jeopardise national security.

89. On 28 March 2017, 15 individuals were arrested by British police for their participation in a non-violent protest in a restricted area of Stansted Airport (GBR 13/2018). The individuals were protesting the alleged deportation of 60 people believed to be asylum-seekers. Although the charges against them were initially brought under the Stansted Airport Bylaws, they were upgraded to offences under the Aviation and Maritime Security Act 1990, raising the possibility of potential life-sentences. On 10 December 2018, they were found guilty. The Special Rapporteur raises his concerns on what *prima facie* seems to be an abusive and disproportionate use of national security legislation in order to criminalise those who took part in the peaceful assembly. He further takes note of the fact that an appeals process against these convictions is underway and looks forward to closely monitoring its progression.

Freedom of association

90. During the reporting period, the Special Rapporteur sent communications regarding the right to freedom of association to Russia (3), Ukraine and Denmark in the Europe and Central Asia region. He thanks the Governments of Russia and Ukraine for their responses to all of the above-mentioned communications, again noting that no request for a response was made to the Government of Denmark.

91. The Special Rapporteur wishes to highlight a concerning pattern of alleged violations of the right to freedom of association suffered by certain religious organisations in Russia. In three communications sent (RUS 15/2018, RUS 19/2018 and RUS 22/2018), he raised his concerns with the Government of Russia with regards to the criminalisation of members of religious communities for their affiliation with particular religious organisations. In each case, detention and/or raids were carried out on the basis that the members of these religious communities were carrying out “extremist” activities. In the communication sent on 26 July 2018 (RUS 15/2018), the Special Rapporteur noted that the denial of registration by Russian authorities of the Moscow Church of Scientology had been the object of a 2007 decision by the European Court of Human Rights, which stated that the Russian Federation had violated Article 11 of the European Convention on Human Rights. In addition, following a raid on the premises of the Church of Scientology in St. Petersburg, five members of the Church were detained. While one of these members had been released subject to travel restrictions, at the time of writing of the communication four others were still detained. The Special Rapporteur thanks the Government of Russia for its response dated 4 October 2018, however concerns remain over the extent to which the term “extremism” may be used in order to criminalise religious communities.

92. In communications sent to the Government of Russia on 14 September 2018 and 20 December 2018 (RUS 19/2018 and RUS 22/2018), the Special Rapporteur raised similar concerns with regards to the alleged application of “counter-extremism” legislation in the criminalisation of Jehovah’s Witnesses in the country. Between 16 and 18 May, reports allege that four Jehovah’s Witnesses were arrested, later being charged with either “financing extremist activity” or “organising the activity of an extremist organisation”. On 17 May alone, in a number of operations code-named “Judgement Day”, the homes of 22 Jehovah’s Witnesses were raided and searched by Federal Security Services, while tablets, cell phones and money were seized. The Special Rapporteur acknowledges the responses of the Government of Russia dated 5 October 2018 and 16 January 2018, and looks forward to continuing dialogue on the matter.

93. The Special Rapporteur also raised his concerns with the Government of Ukraine over a series of acts of violence, intimidation and harassment, including death threats, against members of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church (UOC), along with the seizure of

places of worship belonging to the organisation (UKR 4/2018). Between 2014 and 2017, there had allegedly been at least 70 acts of Vandalism against UOC churches. Reports state that the aim of these attacks was the closing and seizure of the churches, and, indeed, following the attacks many of the churches have remained sealed. Despite complaints made to authorities, at the time the communication was written, no investigations had taken place. Furthermore, during a procession organised by the UOC on 27 July 2016, authorities allegedly used excessive force against participants. As a result, 14 of them were injured, including fractured limbs and severe head injuries. Taken cumulatively, the Special Rapporteur expresses his preoccupation that the right to freedom of association of the UOC may be being systematically violated. The Special Rapporteur thanks the Government of Ukraine for its response dated 23 May 2019, and for the comprehensive information provided regarding criminal investigations underway in relation to acts of harassment against members of the Church and acts of vandalism against the churches themselves. He regrets however that no information was provided regarding allegations of excessive use of force by authorities during the procession which took place on 27 July 2016.

VII. Middle East and North Africa

Algeria

94. JAL Case no: DZA 4/2018 (Algeria), sent on 4 October 2018, no reply. Informations reçues concernant les barrières administratives et judiciaires auxquelles font face les membres de la minorité chrétienne protestante, notamment, le refus des autorités de statuer sur l'approbation du nouveau Bureau exécutif de l'Église protestante d'Algérie, la fermeture d'Églises protestantes ainsi que les poursuites judiciaires entreprises à l'encontre des leurs membres pour l'importation de matériel religieux chrétien.

Egypt

95. JOL Case no: EGY 12/2018 (Egypt), sent on 24 August 2018, reply received 25 October 2018. Allegations concerning the draft law approved by the House of Representatives of Egypt that would grant amnesties to a designated cadre of high-ranking military officers.

96. JUA Case no: EGY 4/2019 (Egypt), sent on 20 March 2019, no reply. Allegations concerning the arbitrary arrest and detention of transgender woman and LGBTIQ human rights defender, Ms. Malak Al-Kashif.

Israel

97. JAL Case no: ISR 10/2018 (Israel), sent on 25 May 2018, no reply. Allegations concerning the refusal to grant exit permits to leave Gaza to Mr. Yousef Al-Kronz and Mr. Mohammed Al-'Ajouri as part of an Israeli military punitive policy denying Gaza residents that participated in the recent protests access to life-saving medical treatment in the West Bank. Both Mr. Yousef Al-Kronz and Mr. Mohammed Al-'Ajouri were severely injured while covering and participating in the Land Day protests on 30 March 2018, and were in need of urgent medical treatment in Ramallah to save their legs.

98. JAL Case no: ISR 14/2018 (Israel), sent on 20 December 2018, no reply. Allegations concerning the targeting of the Israeli Information Centre for Human Rights in the Occupied Territories, known as B'Tselem and its staff, including allegations of reprisals against Mr. Hagai El-Ad and harassment of Ms. Manal Al-Ja'bri.

99. JAL Case no: ISR 1/2019 (Israel), sent on 26 March 2019, no reply. Allegations concerning the killing by the Israeli security forces of two persons with disabilities, Mr. Tahreer Mahmoud S'aed Wahba and Mr. Fadi Hasan Soliman Abu Selmi, who were participating in demonstrations along the fence between Gaza and Israel on 1 April 2018 and 14 May 2018 respectively.

Saudi Arabia

100. JUA Case no: SAU 13/2018 (Saudi Arabia), sent on 11 October 2018, replies received on 21 November 2018 (acknowledgement of receipt) and 11 January 2019. Allegations concerning Mr. Ali al-Nimr, Mr. Dawood al-Marhoon, Mr. Abdullah al-Zaher, Mr. Mujtaba al-Sweikat, Mr. Salman Qureish and Mr. Abdulkarim al-Hawaj (a total of 6 individuals), who face imminent execution as a result of the criminalisation of the exercise of fundamental rights exercised when they were under the age of 18.

Tunisia

101. JAL Case no: TUN 4/2018 (Tunisia), sent on 7 January 2019, reply received on 15 March 2019. Informations reçues concernant des entraves observées lors de la procédure d'enregistrement de l'organisation Shams, ainsi que le harcèlement et les menaces dont seraient victimes les membres de cette organisation.

102. JAL Case no: TUN 2/2019 (Tunisia), sent on 28 February 2019, reply received on 15 March 2019. Informations reçues concernant des tentatives d'entrave à l'exercice de la liberté d'association de l'association Shams.

Responses to communications

103. During the present reporting period, the Special Rapporteur sent 19 communications to 9 countries in the Middle East and North Africa region, receiving responses to 8 of them. The response rate for the region was 42 per cent, a slight decrease from the response rate noted in the previous reporting period. The Special Rapporteur encourages States to continue their engagement with his mandate and looks forward to receiving responses to the other communications in the near future.

Freedom of peaceful assembly

104. In the Middle East and North Africa region, the Special Rapporteur sent communications regarding freedom of assembly to Egypt (2), Israel (2) and Saudi Arabia, among others during the reporting period. He thanks the Governments of Egypt and Saudi Arabia for their replies dated 25 October 2018, and 21 November 2018 and 11 January 2019 respectively and looks forward to receiving a response to the communication sent to the Government of Egypt on 20 March 2019. The Special Rapporteur hopes to receive replies to communications sent to the Government of Israel soon.

105. The Special Rapporteur notes with concern the case of transgender woman and LGBTIQ human rights defender Ms. Malak Al-Kashif, who was arrested on 6 March 2019 by National Security forces (EGY 4/2019). It is alleged that Ms. Al-Kashif was arrested in connection with her calls for protests following the Ramses Station train accident in Cairo, which occurred on 27 February 2019. After being interrogated, Ms. Al-Kashif was held by authorities in an unknown location for three consecutive days, and, on 10 March 2019, she was allegedly referred to a hospital for a medical examination, which included a coercive anal examination. Ms. Al-Khashif faces charges of "aiding a terrorist organisation" and "misusing social media to commit a crime punishable by law with the intention of disrupting public order". According to allegations received, Ms. Al-Khashif's case is not alone in this regard, and indeed over 60 cases of arbitrary arrest have occurred in relation to peaceful protests over the incident. Those arrested also face the same charges as Ms. Al-Khashif. The Special Rapporteur stresses that the right to freedom of peaceful assembly must be guaranteed by the Government of Egypt, and an expression of collective will calling for solidarity and accountability should not be criminalised. He notes that public order offences are often used in order to criminalise assemblies and the Special Rapporteur urges the Government to Egypt to ensure that they are not used to prosecute people for the legitimate expression of their rights.

106. The Special Rapporteur also expressed concern over the introduction of a draft law, approved by the Egyptian House of Representatives, which would grant amnesty to certain high-ranking military officers (EGY 12/2018). The "Law Governing the Treatment of

Certain Senior Commanders of the Armed Forces”, which was promulgated on 25 July 2018, provides amnesty for any acts committed in the discharge of their duty between July 2013 and January 2016. This gave particular cause for apprehension to the Special Rapporteur as such amnesty would cover grave human rights abuses committed during the dispersals of sit-ins in Raba’a al-Adaweya in Cairo and Nahda Square in Giza, which resulted in hundreds of deaths and thousands of injuries. The Special Rapporteur thanks the Government of Egypt for its response dated 25 October 2018, which clarifies that judicial proceedings may indeed be taken against officers covered by the amnesty law with the permission of the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces, however he expresses his concern over the potential lack of impartiality that the Supreme Council may have. The Special Rapporteur notes that a climate of impunity in the face of human rights abuses, including violations against the right to freedom of peaceful assembly, must not be fostered, as allowing this to happen may have ramifications not only with regards to a shrinking of civic space, but, also in some cases, on the loss of human life.

107. The Special Rapporteur expressed his grave concern over the excessive use of force by Israeli Security forces during demonstrations between 30 March and 31 December 2018 near the Gaza fence. Between these dates, at least 180 Palestinians were killed by Israeli Security forces while participating in protests, including Mr. Tahreer Mahmoud S’aed Wahba, an 18 year old deaf person who was shot in the head and died from his injuries 22 days later, and Mr. Fadi Hasan Soliman Abu Selmi, a 29 year old person with disabilities who had previously lost his legs in a separate incident, who was allegedly shot in the chest while praying and died immediately (ISR 1/2019). He furthermore expressed his serious concerns over a punitive policy instituted by the Israeli military Coordinator of Government Activities in the Territories (COGAT), which denied Gaza residents who were injured while participating in protests from accessing life-saving medical treatment in the West Bank (ISR 10/2018). Mr. Yousef Al-Kronz, a media and journalist student who was reporting on the protests was shot in both of his legs, while Mr. Mohammed Al-‘Ajouri, a high school student, was shot in one leg. Both were in immediate danger of losing their legs and were referred to Ramallah for treatment to save their limbs, however their request for transfer was denied by COGAT, who stated that its refusal was due to their participation in protests. Mr. Al-Kronz was eventually permitted to leave Gaza for treatment following a Supreme Court decision, however, due to the delay in receiving treatment, he lost one of his legs. Mr. Al-‘Ajouri’s leg unfortunately could not be saved as he was not permitted to travel to the West Bank for adequate treatment.

108. Between 2014 and 2017, Messrs. Ali al-Nimr, Dawood al-Marhoon, Abdullah al-Zaher, Mujtaba al-Sweikat, Salman Qureish and Abdulkarim al-Hawaj were arrested and sentenced to death for their participation in Arab Spring protests (SAU 13/2018). All six individuals were allegedly under the age of 18 at the time of their arrest, and were reportedly subjected to torture and ill-treatment in detention. It is reported that no investigations were carried out by authorities into these allegations. It is with deep concern that the Special Rapporteur has since received allegations that Messrs. Mujtaba al-Sweikat, Salman Qureish and Abdulkarim al-Hawaj were executed on 23 April 2019 allegedly for actions taken in the exercise of their right to freedom of peaceful assembly. The Special Rapporteur thanks the Government of Saudi Arabia for its replies dated 21 November 2018 and 11 January 2019, however he regrets that the Government’s responses were limited to providing information on Mr. Qureish and Mr. Al-Sweikat. The Special Rapporteur takes note of the fact that the Government refutes that Mr. Qureish was a minor at the time of his arrest, but equally takes note of the fact that no such refutation was made with regards to the age of Mr. Al-Sweikat. The Special Rapporteur further notes that unfortunately the response did not address his concerns expressed with regards to violations of international human rights law, including the rights to life and to freedom of peaceful assembly.

Freedom of association

109. The Special Rapporteur sent communications on freedom of association in the region to Algeria, Israel and Tunisia (2), among others during the reporting period. The Special Rapporteur thanks the Government of Tunisia for its reply to both of the communications sent, received on 15 March 2019. He urges the Governments of Algeria and Israel to provide replies to the communications sent.

110. Allegations regarding obstacles to association encountered by the Protestant Church of Algeria (l'Église Protestante d'Algérie or EPA) were raised with the Government of Algeria by the Special Rapporteur in October 2018, along with allegations regarding the closure of a number of their churches (DZA 4/2018). The EPA has tried a number of times to obtain authorisation to operate as an association, however they have been unable to do so. According to Algerian law, non-Muslim religious groups must obtain authorisation from the National Commission for Places of Worship, as religious gatherings outside of these designated places is illegal. Although the EPA had submitted an application in July 2014 for approval of a new executive office, a requirement for registration as an association, they received no response regarding the outcome of their application, other than an acknowledgement of receipt in August 2015. In November 2017, a number of EPA affiliated churches were closed by Algerian authorities. Although some were subsequently reopened, a number remained closed at the time of writing of the communication. The Special Rapporteur wishes to remind the Government of Algeria that the right to freedom of peaceful assembly extends equally to religious gatherings, and similarly the right to freedom of association applies equally to religious organisations. He reiterates that no restrictions may be placed on the exercise of this right other than those imposed in conformity with the law and which are 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.

111. In Tunisia, Shams, an organisation which campaigns for the decriminalisation of homosexuality, has faced repeated obstacles to its registration as an association, which have been raised with the Government by the Special Rapporteur (TUN 4/2018). Although it fulfilled all necessary legal procedures for the official publication of the creation of the association in the Official Journal of the Tunisian Republic (Journal Officiel de la République Tunisienne or JORT), and despite the fact that its registration was confirmed by the Director General of Associations, the Official Printer of the Tunisian Republic, who edits the JORT, refused to publish this announcement. Such an announcement must be published in order for the organisation to be recognised as a legally constituted association. On 20 February 2019, Shams was requested to appear before the Tunis Court of Appeals (TUN 2/2019). This request was a result of an appeal lodged by the Attorney General against a court decision in February 2016 which judged that the association was not in contravention of any law and which lifted a previous suspension imposed on the organisation in January 2016. The decision considered whether the organisation was in contravention of Article 230 of the Criminal Code which criminalises homosexuality. At the time of writing of the most recent communication on this matter, the registration of the organisation had still not been published in the JORT, preventing Shams from being considered as a legally constituted association.

112. In addition to the obstacles against registration experienced by Shams, its members have been subjected to repeated homophobic attacks. The director of the organisation's radio station has been the subject of multiple death threats, by email and phone and on social media, and the organisation's programme manager also received death threats from an Imam in Monastir during his sermon. Following the sermon, a group of the Imam's followers gathered in front of his parents' house calling for his death.

113. The Special Rapporteur thanks the Government of Tunisia for its response to the two communications sent, dated 15 March 2019, and for the information provided regarding the investigation into a violent attack against a member of Shams. The Special Rapporteur further takes note of the explanation offered by the Government that the publication of the announcement in the JORT on the creation of the association cannot be made as the case is still under consideration. He urges the Government, however, to ensure that no unnecessary impediments exist regarding Shams' exercise of its right to freedom of association, and underlines that long judicial proceedings may disproportionately affect the right of the organisation to associate freely.

114. The Special Rapporteur expresses his serious concerns over incendiary statements allegedly made against Mr. Hagai El-Ad, the Executive Director of B'Tselem, and against B'Tselem itself by high-ranking Israeli officials, including the Prime Minister (ISR 14/2018). Further concern is expressed over the targeting of Ms. Manal Al-Ja'bri, a field

researcher for B'Tselem, who was detained, forced to strip in public and beaten by Israeli Border Police in Hebron after revealing her affiliation with B'Tselem. The Special Rapporteur must underscore that when high-level public officials publicly make disparaging remarks against human rights organisations and their members, it disparages them in the eyes of the public and creates impediments to their work. In addition, it puts the safety of members in jeopardy, as may have been the case with the harassment of Ms. Al-Ja'bri. Indeed, following the incendiary remarks made against Mr. El-Ad in October 2016, a Likud member of the Knesset posted an image of him on social media with writing which said "Wanted dead or alive", an act which surely created a heightened risk for the human rights defender in terms of violence and other harassment.

115. The below listed communications are those which were sent jointly with Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders between 1 April 2018 and 30 November 2018, and which have already been reported on in his "Observations on communications transmitted to Governments and replies received" addendum, submitted to the Human Rights Council at its 40th session on 22 February 2019 (<https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G19/048/00/PDF/G1904800.pdf?OpenElement>).

VIII. Annex

Algeria

116. **JAL Case no: DZA 2/2018 (Algeria), sent on 18 June 2018, no reply.** Allégations concernant la condamnation à une peine de dix ans de prison et à une amende de 50 000 dinars algériens (environ 365 euros) du blogueur, Merzoug Touati, qui semblent représenter une criminalisation de l'exercice de son droit à la liberté d'opinion et d'expression.

Argentina

117. **JUA Case no: ARG 4/2018 (Argentina), sent on 17 September 2018, reply received on 15 November 2018.** Información recibida en relación con las alegaciones de detención y violencia hacia el abogado y defensor de derechos humanos, el Sr. Iván Bordón.

Belarus

118. **JAL Case no: BLR 1/2018 (Belarus), sent on 16 May 2018, reply received 19 July 2018.** Allegations of the arbitrary arrest of seven human rights defenders, all observers from the Human Rights Centre Viasna and members of the Belarusian Helsinki Committee.

Brazil

119. **JUA Case no: BRA 7/2018 (Brazil), sent on 19 June 2018, reply received on 10 August 2018.** Allegations of intimidation and death threats made against environmental human rights defenders, Messrs. Ageu Lobo Pereira, Pedro Braga da Silva and Francisco Firmino da Silva (known as Chico Caititu), in relation to their human rights activities on behalf of Montanha and Mangabal communities.

120. **JAL Case no: BRA 12/2018 (Brazil), sent on 14 September 2018, no reply.** Allegations of the conviction on 16 July 2018 of 23 human rights defenders for belonging to a political organisation called "Frente Independente Popular" and for exercising their rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association during protests which happened in Brazil in 2013 and 2014, among others the "Ocupaba Cabral" demonstration and the "Ocupa Camara".

Burundi

121. **JAL Case no: BDI 1/2018 (Burundi), sent on 4 May 2018, no reply.** Allégations relatives à la condamnation de M. Germain Rukuki, défenseur des droits de l'homme burundais, à 32 années de prison par le Tribunal de Grande Instance de Ntahangwa.

Cambodia

122. **JAL Case no: KHM 6/2018 (Cambodia), sent on 27 September 2018, no reply.** Alleged deprivation and clearance of agricultural and forest land from at least 946 families in 25 villages of Preah Vihear Province and the alleged impact on the source of their drinking water due to concession of their lands to five Cambodian subsidiaries of a China-based sugarcane enterprise, Guangdong Hengfu Group, without prior consultation with the affected communities.

Cameroon

123. **JAL Case no: CMR 5/2018 (Cameroon), sent on 15 November 2018, reply received on 3 January 2019.** Allégations de restrictions des libertés publiques, notamment la liberté d'expression et de réunion pacifique durant la récente période électorale et post-électorale. Allégations faisant état de situations d'intimidation par les autorités publiques de ceux qui expriment pacifiquement leur dissension.

Chad

124. **JAL Case no: TCD 1/2018 (Chad), sent on 27 July 2018, no reply.** Allégations de restrictions des libertés publiques, notamment la liberté d'expression, de réunion pacifique et d'association. En particulier, allégations d'interdictions de manifestations pacifiques à N'Djamena et de l'usage excessif de la force par les policiers, gendarmes et militaires contre des manifestants. Finalement, allégations de restrictions de l'accès à l'information par le biais de coupures d'Internet, d'accès aux réseaux sociaux et de suspensions réalisées par les opérateurs téléphoniques qui auraient été effectuées sur instruction des autorités.

China

125. **JAL Case no: CHN 11/2018 (China), sent on 26 June 2018, reply received on 16 August 2018.** Allegations concerning the kidnapping and threats against five Ecuadorian human rights defenders, who advocate for the rights of indigenous peoples, the rights to a healthy environment, and safe drinking water in the face of activities being carried out by the China-based mining company, Junefiled Mineral Resources Holding Limited.

126. **JAL Case no: CHN 13/2018 (China), sent on 11 July 2018, reply received on 31 July 2018.** Alleged reprisals against Uyghur human rights defender, Mr. Dolkun Isa, and the Society for Threatened Peoples, of which he is a member, for his engagement with the UN human rights bodies.

127. **JOL Case no: CHN 15/2018 (China), sent on 22 August 2018, reply received on 23 November 2018.** Allegations concerning the use of Residential Surveillance in a Designated Location (RSDL) as amended in the 2012 Criminal Procedure Law Article 73, in relation to persons suspected of endangering state security, of terrorist activities or of involvement in major bribery and where confinement in their own home may "impede the investigation".

128. **JAL Case no: CHN 17/2018 (China), sent on 28 August 2018, reply received on 23 November 2018.** Alleged excessive use of police force against Tibetan environmental human rights defenders participating in a peaceful protest against mining operations in Kham Yushul, Yushul Tibetan Autonomous prefecture, Qinghai Province.

129. **JAL Case no: CHN 18/2018 (China), sent on 27 August 2018, no reply.** Alleged deprivation and clearance of agricultural and forest lands from at least 946 families in 25 villages of Preah Vihear Province in Cambodia due to concession of their lands to the five Cambodian subsidiaries of China-based sugarcane enterprise, Guangdong Hengfu Group, without consultation with the affected communities, including indigenous peoples

Colombia

130. **JAL Case no: COL 6/2018 (Colombia), sent on 23 October 2018, reply received on 2 January 2019.** Allegations of individual cases of attacks against Afro-Colombian and indigenous communities, including human rights defenders, sexual gender-based and other violence committed against Afro-Colombian indigenous women and lack of consultation with Afro-Colombian and indigenous peoples and non-compliance with the Peace Accord as it relates to these population groups and a context of excessively violent disputes over land and territory.

Djibouti

131. **JAL Case no: DJI 1/2018 (Djibouti), sent on 24 July 2018, reply received on 24 September 2018.** Allégations de représailles à l'encontre de M. Kadar Abdi Ibrahim, qui se manifestent par une interdiction de voyager.

Ecuador

132. **JAL Case no: ECU 3/2018 (Ecuador), sent on 5 June 2018, replies received on 14 June 2018 and 16 August 2018.** Alegaciones sobre las presuntas investigaciones ilegales, faltas al debido proceso judicial, amenazas, intimidaciones y agresiones contra tres líderes indígenas y defensores de los derechos humanos medioambientales: Sr. Agustín Wachapá, Sr. José "Pepe" Acacho, Sra. Patricia Gualinga.

133. **JAL Case no: ECU 4/2018 (Ecuador), sent on 26 June 2018, reply received on 7 September 2018.** Alegaciones del secuestro y las amenazas contra los defensores de derechos humanos el Sr. Yaku Pérez Guartambel, Sr. Mario Gonzalo, Sr. Fárez Ramon, Sr. Víctor Hernández Siavichay y Sr. Manuel Gayllas, en el contexto de las actividades mineras en la región de Cuenca.

Egypt

134. **JAL Case no: EGY 6/2018 (Egypt), sent on 26 April 2018, no reply.** Alleged short-term enforced disappearance for several days, arbitrary detention, and charges against human rights defenders Mr. Ezzat Eid Taha Fadl Ghomeim and Mr. Ahmed Tarek Ibrahim Ziada.

135. **JUA Case no: EGY 9/2018 (Egypt), sent on 24 May 2018, no reply.** Alleged arrest and continuous harassment of Ms. Amal Fathy, a prominent women human rights defender, who has campaigned for women's rights and against torture, enforced disappearance, and extrajudicial killings.

France

136. **JAL Case no: FRA 9/2018 (France), sent on 4 October 2018, reply received on 19 December 2018.** Allégations d'entraves aux activités des individus prêtant assistance aux migrants, mais aussi à la multiplication des mesures d'intimidation à leur rencontre par les forces de sécurité et les autorités locales.

Guatemala

137. **JOL Case no: GTM 8/2018 (Guatemala), sent on 27 April 2018, reply received on 23 July 2018.** Alegaciones sobre la Iniciativa de Ley 5257 para reformar el Decreto 02-2003 del Congreso de la República, la Ley de Organizaciones No Gubernamentales para el Desarrollo, que son incompatibles con las obligaciones y estándares internacionales de derechos humanos contraídas por Guatemala.

138. **JAL Case no: GTM 10/2018 (Guatemala), sent on 24 July 2018, no reply.** Alegaciones sobre asesinatos, ataques y actos de intimidación contra defensores de derechos humanos que se están registrando en un contexto político y legislativo cada vez más restringido para los defensores y defensoras de los derechos humanos.

Haiti

139. **JUA Case no: HTI 1/2018 (Haiti), sent on 10 May 2018, no reply.** Allégations concernant de menaces à l'encontre de M. Pierre Espérance, défenseur des droits de l'homme, Directeur exécutif du Réseau national de défense des droits de l'homme (RNDDH) et à l'encontre du RNDDH.

140. **JAL Case no: HTI 2/2018 (Haiti), 20 September 2018, no reply.** Allégations de menaces de mort que M. Jean Nazaire Gentil aurait reçues de la part d'une autorité publique locale pour ses activités de journalisme, ainsi que l'échec de la part des autorités judiciaires pour mener une enquête appropriée sur ces allégations.

Hungary

141. **JAL Case no: HUN 7/2018 (Hungary), sent on 10 September 2018, no reply.** Allegations concerning the recent adoption of a series of laws that introduce undue restrictions on the rights to freedom of association, peaceful assembly and freedom of expression in Hungary and risk to further fuel the already existing xenophobic and discriminatory public discourse on migration and negative narrative about civil society, in particular when its activities are related to migration issues.

India

142. **JUA Case no: IND 12/2018 (India), sent on 29 May 2018, no reply.** Alleged killing of 12 demonstrators following excessive use of force by police in the district of Turicorin, State of Tamil Nadu, during a protest demanding the closure of the Sterlite Copper Smelting Plant and revocation of the proposed extension of its capacity.

143. **JAL Case no: IND 14/2018 (India), sent on 31 May 2018, no reply.** Alleged intimidation and reprisals against the Centre for Promotion of Social Concerns (CPSC) and the executive director of one of its sub-programmes (People's Watch), Mr. Henri Tiphange.

144. **JAL Case no: IND 11/2018 (India), sent on 8 June 2018, no reply.** Alleged attacks against human rights defender Mr. Lenin Raghuvanshi and his brother Mr. Kanad Raghuvanshi.

145. **JAL Case no: IND 16/2018 (India), sent on 31 July 2018, no reply.** Allegations concerning the arrest and detention of Mr. Surendra Gadling, Mr. Rona Wilson, Ms. Shoma Sen, Mr. Sudhir Dhawale, and Mr. Mahesh Raut, and allegations concerning a smear campaign targeting Ms. Sudha Bhardwaj.

Irak

146. **JAL Case no: IRQ 1/2018 (Iraq), sent on 13 April 2018, reply received on 14 June 2018.** Allegations regarding the forced entry and search of the Organisation of Women's Freedom in Iraq (OWFI) shelter in Al Saadoon, the abduction of a male staff

member of OWFI, and the removal of a victim of domestic violence, who was receiving psychological support from OWFI, by approximately 50 armed persons including police officers.

Iran

147. **JUA Case no: IRN 9/2018 (Iran), sent on 16 May 2018, no reply.** Allegations concerning the continuous judicial harassment of Ms. Raheleh Rahemipor, in reprisal for her legitimate right to exercise her right to freedom of expression, freedom of peaceful assembly, and for her efforts to uncover the fate of her brother and his infant daughter, whose disappearances have been registered with the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances since June 2016.

148. **JAL Case no: IRN 10/2018 (Iran), sent on 6 July 2018, no reply.** Allegations concerning the arrest and charges against human rights defender, Ms. Nasrin Sotoudeh, who was allegedly arrested at her home in Tehran on 13 June 2018.

Italy

149. **JAL Case no: ITA 2/2018 (Italy), sent on 12 November 2018, reply received 20 May 2019.** Allegations concerning the criminalisation of activities of migrant rights defenders involved in search and rescue operations in the Mediterranean Sea including the refusal to allow disembarkation to NGO vessels, as well as vessels belonging to the Italian Coastguard, in Italian ports.

Kazakhstan

150. **JAL Case no: KAZ 4/2018 (Kazakhstan), sent on 15 August 2018, reply received 19 October 2018.** Allegations regarding the arbitrary arrest and detention of Ms. Elena Semenova.

Kyrgyzstan

151. **JUA Case no: KGZ 1/2018 (Kyrgyzstan), sent on 13 June 2018, reply received on 11 October 2018.** Alleged detention, threat of extradition and denial of adequate medical care to Mr. Muratbek Tungishbayev, a Kazakhstani blogger and human rights defender.

Lebanon

152. **JAL Case no: LBN 5/2018 (Lebanon), sent on 7 September 2018, reply received 17 June 2018 (no translation available).** Alleged summoning of Mr. Wadih Al-Asmar, the Secretary General of the Lebanese Centre for Human Rights (CLDH), and other human rights defenders by Lebanese security agencies for posts made on social media.

Mauritania

153. **JAL Case no: MRT 2/2018 (Mauritania), sent on 28 August 2018, no reply.** Allégations de représailles sous forme de confiscation de passeport et interdiction de voyager, à l'encontre de cinq défenseurs, alors qu'ils devaient participer à l'examen de la Mauritanie à la 64ème session du Comité contre la torture des Nations Unies (CAT) à Genève.

Mexico

154. **JAL Case no: MEX 7/2018 (Mexico), sent on 4 July 2018, reply received on 18 October 2018.** Alegaciones relacionadas con las condenas de seis defensores del medio ambiente por el presunto homicidio de un empresario español en 2003, quienes habrían trabajado activamente por y en defensa del derecho al agua de la comunidad indígena de San Pedro Tianixco, Estado de México.

155. **JAL Case no: MEX 9/2018 (Mexico), sent on 5 October 2018, no reply.** Alegaciones sobre los asesinatos de los Sres. Alejandro Antonia Díaz Cruz, Ignacio Basilio Ventura Martínez, Luis Martínez, y Abraham Hernández González, el intento de asesinato en contra del Sr. Abraham Ramírez Vásquez, y la detención de los Sres. César Luis Díaz y Rosalino Luis Díaz.

Myanmar

156. **JOL Case no: MMR 1/2018 (Myanmar), sent on 29 May 2018, reply received 6 August 2018.** Information concerning a draft law on International Non-Governmental Organisations (INGOs) which, if adopted, may have serious implications for civil society, in particular for INGOs operating in Myanmar.

Nepal

157. **JOL Case no: NPL 1/2018 (Nepal), sent on 11 July 2018, no reply.** Information concerning the National Integrity and Ethics Policy 2074, which could have a serious impact on the activities of civil society as it would impinge on the right to freedom of expression and freedom of association, which are guaranteed under international human rights law.

158. **JAL Case no: NPL 5/2018 (Nepal), sent on 12 November 2018, no reply.** Allegations concerning the arrest of human rights defender, Mr. Ram Manohar Yadav, and his subsequent death in custody, and the travel ban against human rights defender, Mr. Lenin Bista.

Nicaragua

159. **JUA Case no: NIC 1/2018 (Nicaragua), sent on 25 April 2018, no reply.** Alegaciones sobre el uso excesivo de la fuerza por parte de la Policía Nacional con el fin de dispersar manifestaciones pacíficas en relación a la reforma de la seguridad social, que habrían resultado en la muerte de al menos 30 personas y en decenas de personas heridas, detenidas y desaparecidas. Alegaciones de discurso estigmatizador de altos funcionarios del Estado en contra de manifestantes, estudiantes, periodistas y defensores/as de derechos humanos.

160. **JAL Case no: NIC 2/2018 (Nicaragua), sent on 9 May 2018, no reply.** Alegaciones de violaciones de los derechos a la libertad de reunión pacífica y a la libertad de expresión por parte de la Policía Nacional nicaragüense en el marco de manifestaciones pacíficas en relación al incendio forestal de la reserva biológica Indio Maíz.

161. **JAL Case no: NIC 3/2018 (Nicaragua), sent on 6 June 2018, no reply.** Alegaciones de uso excesivo de la fuerza por parte de cuerpos de seguridad del Estado y grupos armados pro-gubernamentales en contra de manifestantes, la cual ha causado al menos 120 muertos y aproximadamente 1200 personas heridas.

162. **JAL Case no: NIC 4/2018 (Nicaragua), sent on 5 November 2018, no reply.** Alegaciones de campaña de desprestigio, hostigamiento, amenazas, ataques, detenciones y cargos criminales contra diez defensoras de derechos humanos y en relación a la detención de personas que caminaban hacia una manifestación.

163. **JAL Case no: NIC 5/2018 (Nicaragua), sent on 7 November 2018, no reply.** Alegaciones de detención arbitraria, así como agresiones, intimidaciones y amenazas en contra de defensores de derechos humanos, incluyendo alegaciones de que ciertas de estas violaciones serían actos de represalias por comunicación y cooperación con organismos internacionales de derechos humanos.

Niger

164. **JAL Case no: NER 1/2018 (Niger), sent on 3 July 2018, reply received on 5 September 2018.** Allégations d'arrestations et de détentions de plusieurs défenseurs des droits de l'homme pour avoir exercé leurs droits à la liberté d'expression y de réunion pacifique et d'association ; ainsi que des allégations d'interdiction de manifestations et d'atteintes à la liberté d'expression des journalistes.

Poland

165. **JOL Case no: POL 3/2018 (Poland), sent on 23 April 2018, reply received on 23 May 2018.** Allegations concerning the law "On specific solutions related to the organisation of sessions of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in the Republic of Poland", which appears to restrict significantly the exercise of human rights by environmental human rights defenders and members of the public.

166. **JAL Case no: POL 4/2018 (Poland), sent on 7 September 2018, reply received on 6 November 2018.** Alleged judicial harassment of the non-governmental organisation, the Open Dialog Foundation, and the deportation of authorities via the Schengen Information System (SIS) database, to deny Ms. Kozlovska access to the countries of the Schengen zone.

Philippines

167. **JAL Case no: PHL 5/2018 (Philippines), sent on 8 June 2018, no reply.** Allegations concerning a petition filed by the Philippine Department of Justice proscribing the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army as "terrorist" organisations, along with the inclusion in the petition of the names of a number of human rights defenders, defining them de facto as "terrorists" in possible reprisal for their engagement with UN human rights mechanisms.

Russia

168. **JAL Case no: CHN 11/2018 (China), sent on 26 June 2018, reply received on 16 August 2018.** Allegations concerning the kidnapping and threats against five Ecuadorian human rights defenders, who advocate for the rights of indigenous peoples, the rights to a healthy environment, and safe drinking water in the face of activities being carried out by the China-based mining company, Junefiled Mineral Resources Holding Limited.

169. **JAL Case no: CHN 13/2018 (China), sent on 11 July 2018, reply received on 31 July 2018.** Alleged reprisals against Uyghur human rights defender, Mr. Dolkun Isa, and the Society for Threatened Peoples, of which he is a member, for his engagement with the UN human rights bodies.

170. **JOL Case no: CHN 15/2018 (China), sent on 22 August 2018, reply received on 23 November 2018.** Allegations concerning the use of Residential Surveillance in a Designated Location (RSDL) as amended in the 2012 Criminal Procedure Law Article 73, in relation to persons suspected of endangering state security, of terrorist activities or of involvement in major bribery and where confinement in their own home may "impede the investigation".

171. **JAL Case no: CHN 17/2018 (China), sent on 28 August 2018, reply received on 23 November 2018.** Alleged excessive use of police force against Tibetan environmental

human rights defenders participating in a peaceful protest against mining operations in Kham Yushul, Yushul Tibetan Autonomous prefecture, Qinghai Province.

172. **JAL Case no: CHN 18/2018 (China), sent on 27 August 2018, no reply.** Alleged deprivation and clearance of agricultural and forest lands from at least 946 families in 25 villages of Preah Vihear Province in Cambodia due to concession of their lands to the five Cambodian subsidiaries of China-based sugarcane enterprise, Guangdong Hengfu Group, without consultation with the affected communities, including indigenous peoples.

Saudi Arabia

173. **JAL Case no: SAU 7/2018 (Saudi Arabia), sent on 14 June 2018, no reply.** Allegations concerning the arrest of and charges against a number of women's human rights defenders, along with the alleged enforced disappearance of Mr. Mohammed Saleh Al-Bajadi and acts of reprisals against Ms. Loujain Al-Hathloul.

174. **JUA Case no: SAU 9/2018 (Saudi Arabia), sent on 26 July 2018, reply received on 23 October 2018.** Allegations concerning the incommunicado detention of human rights defender, Mr. Khalid Al-Omair.

175. **JUA Case no: SAU 11/2018 (Saudi Arabia), sent on 10 October 2018, reply received on 29 October 2018.** Alleged arbitrary arrests and detention of six woman human rights defenders.

Sudan

176. **JAL Case no: SDN 1/2018 (Sudan), sent on 13 February 2019, no reply.** Allegation of excessive use of force by security forces leading to arrests, deaths and injuries, including of human rights defenders, during a number of demonstrations that took place in different cities of Sudan from 6 January to 31 January 2018.

Tanzania

177. **JAL Case no: TZA 2/2018 (Tanzania), sent on 25 April 2018, no reply.** Allegations on the arrest, detention, and prosecution of human rights defender Sophia Donald, as well as the arrest and detention of Ms. Donald's mother.

178. **JAL Case no: TZA 3/2018 (Tanzania), sent on 9 July 2018, no reply.** Allegations of infringements on the right to life, the right to freedom of expression, as well as the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association in Tanzania, indicating a pattern of restrictions to civic space in Tanzania.

Thailand

179. **JAL Case no: THA 4/2018 (Thailand), sent on 25 June 2018, no reply.** Alleged arrest, detention and charges against peaceful protestors, in relation to the legitimate exercise of their rights of peaceful assembly and association and freedom of expression during a protest taking place in Thammasat University (Bangkok), on 22 May 2018.

Togo

180. **JAL Case no: TGO 2/2018 (Togo), sent on 8 June 2018, reply received 2 August 2018.** Allégations d'usage excessif de la force au cours de manifestations, de restrictions du droit à la liberté de manifester pacifiquement, mais aussi d'arrestations, de détentions et intimidations de manifestants et de défenseurs des droits de l'homme, enregistrées au Togo depuis avril 2018. Allégations concernant des cas de détentions et intimidations de manifestants et de défenseurs des droits de l'homme, dont M. Assiba Johnson, Président de REJADD-Togo.

Turkey

181. **JAL Case no: TUR 12/2018 (Turkey), sent on 18 September 2018, reply received on 8 November 2018.** Allegations concerning an indefinite ban on public LGBTI-related gatherings or events by the Governor of Ankara.

182. **JAL Case no: TUR 16/2018 (Turkey), sent on 14 November 2018, reply received on 10 January 2019.** Alleged detention of 24 construction workers on 19 September 2018 and an additional arrest of 10 construction workers and trade union officials in October 2018, for the exercise of their rights to freedom of expression and freedom of assembly and association.

Uganda

183. **JAL Case no: UGA 2/2018 (Uganda), sent on 19 July 2018, reply received 22 October 2018.** Allegations of threats, intimidation, judicial harassment, use of force against and ill-treatment of Ms. Betty Nambooze, Member of Parliament (MP), for the peaceful exercise of her right to freedom of expression.

United Arab Emirates

184. **JAL Case no: ARE 1/2018 (United Arab Emirates), sent on 4 May 2018, reply received on 5 July 2018.** Alleged continued arbitrary detention of human rights defenders Mr. Osama Al-Najjar and Mr. Ahmed Mansoor, along with charges against Mr. Mansoor.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

185. **JUA Case no: GBR 5/2018 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), sent on 29 May 2018, reply received on 24 July 2018.** Allegations concerning the killing of 12 demonstrators following excessive use of force by police in the district of Tuticorin, in the state of Tamil Nadu, during a protest demanding the closure of the Sterlite Copper Smelting Plant, a subsidiary of Vedanta Resources, which is based in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

United States of America

186. **JUA Case no: USA/2018 (United States of America), sent on 25 May 2018, no reply.** Allegations concerning the arrest and charges against Mr. Scott Warren.

Ukraine

187. **JAL Case no: UKR 1/2018 (Ukraine), sent on 8 June 2018, reply received on 9 August 2018.** Alleged use of force by police against demonstrators, as well as the arrest and detention of more than 100 people.

Vietnam

188. **JAL Case no: VNM 7/2018 (Vietnam), sent on 9 July 2018, no reply.** Allegations concerning acts of violence and intimidation against three human rights defenders, who were involved in defending labour rights.

189. **JUA Case no: VNM 6/2018 (Vietnam), sent on 17 July 2018, no reply.** Allegations concerning the deteriorating health condition of Mr. Nguyen Van Tuc, a human rights defender who was sentenced to 15 years in prison in 2017.

Other Actor

190. JUA Case no: OTH 37/2018 (Other Actor), sent on 29 May 2018, no reply.

Letter sent to Vedanta Resources in relation to information received concerning the killing of 12 demonstrators following excessive use of force by Police in the district of Tuticorin, State of Tamil Nadu, during a protest demanding the closure of the Sterlite Copper Smelting Plant and revocation of the proposed extension of its capacity.

191. JUA Case no: OTH 35/2018 (Other Actor), sent on 29 May 2018, no reply.

Letter sent to Vedanta Limited concerning allegations of the killing of 12 demonstrators following excessive use of force by Police in the district of Tuticorin, State of Tamil Nadu, during a protest demanding the closure of the Sterlite Copper Smelting Plant and revocation of the proposed extension of its capacity.

192. JUA Case no: OTH 36/2018 (Other Actor), sent on 29 May 2018, no reply. Letter sent to the Chief Executive of Sterlite Copper concerning allegations of the killing of 12 demonstrators following excessive use of force by Police in the district of Tuticorin, State of Tamil Nadu, during a protest demanding the closure of the Sterlite Copper Smelting Plant and revocation of the proposed extension of its capacity.

193. JUA Case no: OTH 34/2018 (Other Actor), sent on 14 June 2018, no reply. Letter sent to Sibuglemet Holding regarding information received concerning the surveillance, intimidation and harassment against Ms. Yana Tannagasheva and her husband Mr. Vladislav Tannagashev, including from Yuzhanaya mining company, for speaking out about adverse impact of open pit coal mining company on indigenous people in South West Siberia and in possible reprisal for their communication with United Nations mechanisms.

194. JAL Case no: OTH 40/2018 (Other Actor), sent on 26 June 2018, reply received on 27 August 2018. Letter sent to Russian Copper Company (RMK) concerning allegations of potentially grave detrimental effects of the Tominsk Ore Mining and Processing Integrated Plant (Tominsk GOK) on the environment and health of communities in the Chelyabinsk region; constraints on freedom of expression, access to information and public participation in the context of the approval of the project, as well as violations to the right of peaceful assembly and threats and intimidation against environmental human rights defender, Sergey Belogorokhov, of "STOP GOK".

195. JAL Case no: OTH 39/2018 (Other Actor), sent on 26 June 2018, no reply. Letter sent to Junfield Group S.A. Ecuagoldmining South America concerning allegations of kidnapping and threats against the human rights defenders Mr. Yaku Pérez Guartambel, Mr. Mario Gonzalo, Mr. Fárez Ramón, Mr. Víctor Hernández Siavichay and Mr. Manuel Gayllas, due to their work defending indigenous people rights and the rights to health environmental and to safe water in the context of a China-based mining company activities, Junefiled Mineral Resources Holding Limited.

196. JAL Case no: OTH 38/2018 (Other Actor), sent on 26 June 2018, no reply. Letter sent to Junefiled Mineral Resources Holding Limited concerning allegations of kidnapping and threats against the human rights defenders Mr. Yaku Pérez Guartambel, Mr. Mario Gonzalo, Mr. Fárez Ramón, Mr. Víctor Hernández Siavichay and Mr. Manuel Gayllas, due to their work defending indigenous people rights and the rights to health environmental and to safe water in the context of a Chinabased mining company activities, Junefiled Mineral Resources Holding Limited.

197. JAL Case no: OTH 49/2018 (Other Actor), sent on 27 September 2018, no reply. Letter sent to the Heng Rui (Cambodia) International Company Limited regarding the alleged deprivation and clearance of agricultural and forest lands from at least 946 families in 25 villages of Preah Vihear due to concession of their lands to the five Cambodian subsidiaries of a China-based sugarcane enterprise, Guangdong Hengfu Group, without consultation with affected community's members, including indigenous peoples and with regards to information received concerning the alleged judicial harassments suffered by some communities' members for raising their concerns in this context.

198. **JAL Case no: OTH 50/2018 (Other Actor), sent on 27 September 2018, no reply.**Letter sent to the HENG NON (Cambodia) International Company Limited regarding the alleged deprivation and clearance of agricultural and forest lands from at least 946 families in 25 villages of Preah Vihear due to concession of their lands to the five Cambodian subsidiaries of a China-based sugarcane enterprise, Guangdong Hengfu Group, without consultation with affected community's members, including indigenous peoples and with regards to information received concerning the alleged judicial harassments suffered by some communities' members for raising their concerns in this context.

199. **JAL Case no: OTH 51/2018 (Other Actor), sent on 27 September 2018, no reply.**Letter sent to the HENG YUE (Cambodia) International Company Limited regarding the alleged deprivation and clearance of agricultural and forest lands from at least 946 families in 25 villages of Preah Vihear due to concession of their lands to the five Cambodian subsidiaries of a China-based sugarcane enterprise, Guangdong Hengfu Group, without consultation with affected community's members, including indigenous peoples and with regards to information received concerning the alleged judicial harassments suffered by some communities' members for raising their concerns in this context.

200. **JAL Case no: OTH 52/2018 (Other Actor), sent on 27 September 2018, no reply.**Letter sent to the Guangdong Hengfu Group Sugar Industry Co. Ltd Limited regarding the alleged deprivation and clearance of agricultural and forest lands from at least 946 families in 25 villages of Preah Vihear due to concession of their lands to the five Cambodian subsidiaries of a China-based sugarcane enterprise, Guangdong Hengfu Group, without consultation with affected community's members, including indigenous peoples and with regards to information received concerning the alleged judicial harassments suffered by some communities' members for raising their concerns in this context.

201. **JAL Case no: OTH 53/2018 (Other Actor), sent on 27 September 2018, no reply.**Letter sent to Rui Feng International Company Limited regarding the alleged deprivation and clearance of agricultural and forest lands from at least 946 families in 25 villages of Preah Vihear due to concession of their lands to the five Cambodian subsidiaries of a China-based sugarcane enterprise, Guangdong Hengfu Group, without consultation with affected community's members, including indigenous peoples and with regards to information received concerning the alleged judicial harassments suffered by some communities' members for raising their concerns in this context.

202. **JAL Case no: OTH 54/2018 (Other Actor), sent on 27 September 2018, no reply.**Letter sent to the LAN FENG (Cambodia) International Company Limited regarding the alleged deprivation and clearance of agricultural and forest lands from at least 946 families in 25 villages of Preah Vihear due to concession of their lands to the five Cambodian subsidiaries of a China-based sugarcane enterprise, Guangdong Hengfu Group, without consultation with affected community's members, including indigenous peoples and with regards to information received concerning the alleged judicial harassments suffered by some communities' members for raising their concerns in this context.
