



UNITED NATIONS HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL
53rd Session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
October/November 2026

**JOINT SUBMISSION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION OF JURISTS, SHERO
THAILAND AND FEMINIST LEGAL SUPPORT TO THE UNIVERSAL PERIODIC
REVIEW OF THAILAND**

Submitted on 10 April 2026

Composed of 60 eminent judges and lawyers from all regions of the world, the International Commission of Jurists (ICJ) promotes and protects human rights through the Rule of Law, by using its unique legal expertise to develop and strengthen national and international justice systems. Established in 1952, in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council since 1957, and active on five continents, the ICJ aims to ensure the progressive development and effective implementation of international human rights and international humanitarian law; secure the realization of civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights; safeguard the separation of powers; and guarantee the independence of the judiciary and legal profession.

SHero Thailand (pronounced She-Ro) is a survivor-led civil society organization working to advance the elimination of gender-based violence through legal reform, institutional strengthening, and the rule of law. Established in 2016, SHero Thailand provides legal assistance to survivors while driving systemic change to address gaps in the protection and implementation of laws related to gender-based violence. The organization leads strategic legal advocacy, policy reform, and evidence generation to support the development, interpretation, and effective implementation of domestic and international human rights standards. Its work focuses on strengthening justice institutions, promoting accountability, and advancing survivor-centered and trauma-informed approaches across the justice system. Through a multidisciplinary network of legal professionals and practitioners, SHero Thailand works to transform institutional responses, address structural barriers, and ensure that laws and policies are effectively translated into practice, particularly for individuals in vulnerable and marginalized situations.

Feminist Legal Support (FLS) is a Thailand-based organization dedicated to advancing gender justice. It provides legal assistance to survivors of gender-based violence, advocates for stronger protections for women and women human rights defenders, delivers gender-focused training to grassroots organizations, and fosters collaboration between gender equality and democratic movements.

P.O. Box 1270, Rue des Buis, 3, 1211 Geneva 1, Switzerland
Tel: +41(0)22 979 3800 - Fax: +40(1)22 979 3801 – Website: <http://www.icj.org>
E-mail: info@icj.org

I. Introduction

1. The International Commission of Jurists (ICJ), SHero Thailand, and Feminist Legal Support (FLS) welcome the opportunity to contribute to the Human Rights Council's (HRC) Universal Periodic Review (UPR) of Thailand.
2. In this submission, we bring to the attention of the HRC and the UPR Working Group concerns regarding the Thailand's failure to fully comply with the country's international human rights law obligations, particularly in relation to persistent gaps in addressing gender-based discrimination and gender-based violence (GBV), including:
 - Domestic legislation that inadequately addresses gender-based discrimination, including the lack of recognition of sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression (SOGIE) as protected characteristics;
 - Shortcomings in legal provisions addressing GBV, including with respect to rape, sexual harassment, technology-facilitated gender-based violence (TFGBV) and domestic violence; and
 - Barriers to access to justice for GBV survivors, including obstacles such as: (i) the criminalization of abortion, sex work and of undocumented migrants and refugees who are victims/survivors of GBV; (ii) the failure to ensure gender-sensitive procedures; and (iii) the lack of adequate essential services and support for GBV survivors, including those with disabilities.
3. Over more than a decade, the ICJ, SHero Thailand and FLS have identified, researched, documented and legally analysed the concerns raised in this submission. Parts of this submission are also informed by the report *Baseline Study on Access to Justice for Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV) in Thailand*, published by ICJ in November 2025, which may be consulted for further detail and analysis.¹

II. Domestic legislation that inadequately addresses gender-based discrimination

Inadequate Gender Equality Law

4. Following the third UPR cycle in 2021, Thailand supported recommendations to review its gender equality legislation and remove existing exceptions.² However, at the time of writing, the law remained unchanged.
5. The Gender Equality Act B.E. 2558 (2015) contains two overly broad exceptions permitting discrimination on the basis of religious rules or national security. These exceptions remain in place despite Thailand's obligations under international human rights law, with which they are incompatible, including with respect to articles 2(1), 3 and 26 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), which prohibit discrimination without exception.³

Lack of recognition of SOGIE as protected characteristics

6. During its third UPR cycle, Thailand supported recommendations to combat discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity and to ensure the full enjoyment of human rights and equality for LGBTQI+ persons.⁴
7. While Thailand has taken certain welcome measures, including enacting the historic Marriage Equality Act, which provides equal recognition of marriage for same-sex couples, its broader legal framework still fails to explicitly recognize sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression (SOGIE) as protected grounds of discrimination. For example, section 27 of the Constitution prohibits unjust discrimination based on sex and other grounds but does not expressly cover SOGIE.
8. Although the Gender Equality Act includes provisions to prevent “unfair gender discrimination” arising from the issuance or implementation of ordinances, rules, measures, projects, or procedures by State agencies, private entities, or individuals, and defines such discrimination to include discrimination against individuals whose gender expression differs from their sex assigned at birth,⁵ it remains unclear whether its provisions can be relied on to address discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and/or gender identity.⁶

Absence of comprehensive non-discrimination legislation

9. Aside from the Gender Equality Act, Thailand does not currently have a standalone piece of legislation that broadly addresses non-discrimination. As a result, there is no generally applicable law that defines the content of relevant protections and the right to be free from discrimination on broad anti-discrimination grounds, nor the corresponding obligations of the State under the Constitution.

II. Shortcomings in legal provisions addressing GBV

10. Following its third UPR cycle in 2021, Thailand supported recommendations to take all necessary measures, in both law and practice, to combat, prevent, and address violence against women and children; to ensure that cases of such violence are fully investigated and perpetrators prosecuted; and to provide comprehensive reparations for survivors, including in cases of domestic and sexual violence.⁷
11. However, despite some recent, welcomed legislative amendments, which are discussed below, the ICJ, SHero Thailand and FLS remain concerned that several domestic legal provisions still do not adequately or comprehensively prohibit all forms of GBV or otherwise fail to impose effective, proportionate, and dissuasive sanctions for GBV offences. As a result, the legal framework addressing GBV continues to be inconsistent with Thailand’s obligations under international human rights law, including CEDAW and the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (UNCAT), particularly in relation to provisions on sexual violence, such as rape, sexual harassment, TFGBV, as well as on domestic violence.

Rape

Definition of Rape

12. Under international human rights law, rape is a crime and a human rights violation or abuse, and a form of GBV⁸ amounting to torture.⁹
13. Nevertheless, section 276 of the Criminal Code¹⁰ defines rape based on force, threats, inability to resist, or deception, rather than the absence of freely given consent. This is inconsistent with international standards, which require a lack of consent to be the central element of the offence.¹¹ The provision also fails to adequately capture coercive circumstances or clearly define when consent is absent, and the relationship between consent and coercive circumstances.¹²
14. In practice, as a result of this framework, SHero and FLS' experience supporting survivors indicates that law enforcement officials often focus on evidence of physical resistance rather than lack of consent or coercion.¹³ Survivors are frequently questioned about whether they resisted, treating resistance as essential to the offence. Contrary to international human rights obligations, this approach overlooks situations where, notwithstanding the fact that the victims did not offer any physical resistance, consent was absent.¹⁴
15. In addition, while the 2025 amendment to section 1(18) of the Criminal Code broadened the definition of rape to include a wider range of instances of non-consensual sexual penetration—including acts involving objects, body parts other than sexual organs, and surgically constructed genitalia—it still excludes cases where another person uses an object or body part, other than a sexual organ, to penetrate the sexual organ or anus of the perpetrator. To align with international standards, the rape definition should encompass all forms of non-consensual sexual penetration of a sexual nature, however slight.¹⁵
16. Moreover, it is also unclear whether causing non-consensual vaginal, anal, or oral penetration of a sexual nature of the victim's/survivor's body by a third person, or causing the victim/survivor to engage in non-consensual vaginal, anal, or oral penetration of a sexual nature of the body of another person, may amount to criminally proscribed conduct, including as instigating the offence of rape under section 84 of the Criminal Code, despite international standards making clear that they should.¹⁶

Sentencing for Rape

17. Rape resulting in death remains punishable by the death penalty under section 277 bis of the Criminal Code. This is inconsistent with international human rights law, including article 6 of the ICCPR, and violates the right to life¹⁷ and the prohibition of cruel, inhuman or degrading punishment. The 2019 amendment introducing this penalty in rape cases also constitutes an impermissible retrogressive measure under article 6 of the ICCPR.¹⁸
18. Section 276 provides for mitigating circumstances in cases of marital rape where spouses wish to remain together. This is inconsistent with international standards,¹⁹ which provide that, in some instances, rape by a current or former spouse or partner should instead be treated as an aggravating circumstance at sentencing, given the power imbalance that renders the survivor particularly vulnerable.²⁰

Compoundable offence

19. Section 281 classifies certain instances of marital rape as compoundable, allowing survivors to withdraw complaints or reach settlements with alleged perpetrators, resulting in the termination of proceedings.²¹ This enables perpetrators to evade accountability and undermines the State's due diligence obligations to prevent, investigate, prosecute, punish, and provide reparations for GBV.²²
20. The compoundable nature of these offences also imposes a three-month limitation period for filing complaints, calculated from the date of the incident and identification of the offender.²³ This timeframe is clearly insufficient for many survivors, including those in spousal relationships with the perpetrator, due to ongoing fear, trauma, or dependence on the abuser.²⁴

Sexual Harassment

21. On 30 December 2025, amendments to Thailand's Criminal Code (No. 30) B.E. 2568 (2025) entered into force, criminalizing sexual harassment—conduct that had long remained in a legal grey area in the country. Under the newly introduced section 3(19) of the Criminal Code, "sexual harassment" is defined as "any act committed by physical means, words, sounds, gestures, communication, watching, stalking, or by any other means—including acts carried out through computer systems, telecommunications devices, or other electronic devices—capable of conveying meaning to another person, that has a sexual connotation and is likely to cause that person distress, annoyance, embarrassment, humiliation, fear, or a sense of sexual insecurity."
22. Upon conviction, an offender may be liable to imprisonment for up to one year, a fine not exceeding 20,000 THB (approximately USD 637), or both, unless aggravating circumstances are present. Such circumstances include repeated or continuous acts; acts committed in public or through publicly accessible computer systems; acts committed against children under 15 years of age regardless of consent; and acts involving abuse of power or authority, such as those committed by employers, supervisors, or other persons in positions of control over survivors.
23. Nevertheless, ICJ, SHero Thailand and FLS are concerned that the application of these provisions may not be fully consistent with international human rights law and standards. While certain forms of sexual harassment may warrant criminal sanctions, not all conduct necessarily justifies penalties such as imprisonment—particularly where the conduct is isolated or does not amount to a violation of a survivor's physical, sexual, or psychological integrity.²⁵ As currently framed, the provision may be overly broad and vague,²⁶ as, for example, not all conduct likely to cause "sexual insecurity," "annoyance," or "embarrassment" meets this threshold (*i.e.*, a violation of a survivor's physical, sexual, or psychological integrity). Justice sector actors should therefore be fully aware of this threshold and take it into account in enforcing the criminalization of sexual harassment.
24. On the other hand, in the absence of adequate tools or guidelines to support its implementation, coupled with a lack of awareness of the consent-based nature of sexual offences, the abovementioned broad and vague terms may result in

victims/survivors facing challenges in accessing justice, as justice sector actors may interpret the conduct as not amounting to sexual harassment even when it does amount to a violation of a survivor’s physical, sexual, or psychological integrity.

Technology-facilitated gender-based violence

25. In cases of technology-facilitated gender-based violence (TFGBV), the newly enacted Section 284/4 of the Criminal Code empowers the Court to order the removal of obscene data from computer systems accessible to the general public, upon a motion filed by the injured person or a competent official. This includes orders requiring the person who imported such data to suspend its dissemination and remove it from the computer system or requiring service providers or platforms to suspend dissemination and remove the data. Failure to comply within a period specified by the Court may result in imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months, a fine not exceeding 10,000 baht (approximately USD 305), or both.
26. However, concerns remain, particularly in cases involving service providers or platforms located outside Thailand, where the implementation of Section 284/4 may be difficult. Concerns also persist regarding the lack of safeguards to ensure that, rather than addressing TFGBV, this provision is used to target individuals who provide consensual adult sexual services in a manner that violates their human rights, including their right to freedom of expression as guaranteed, *inter alia*, under Article 19 of the ICCPR.

Domestic Violence

27. Thailand’s Domestic Violence Victim Protection Act B.E. 2550 (2007) (hereafter “the Act”)—the primary legal framework addressing domestic violence—remains inconsistent with international human rights law. Several of the shortcomings outlined below were also raised by the Committee against Torture in its 2024 Concluding Observations,²⁷ as well as by the CEDAW Committee in its 2025 Concluding Observations on Thailand.²⁸ While steps have been taken to amend the law, the draft law, as it stands at the time of writing, still contains several of the shortcomings outlined below.²⁹

Definitions of “domestic violence” and “person in the family”

28. The Act defines “domestic violence” narrowly, limiting it to physical and psychological harm, and excluding sexual abuse and “economic violence,” such as restricting a survivor’s ability to work or access financial resources. The omission of these forms of violence is inconsistent with international human rights law and standards, including as articulated by the CEDAW Committee.³⁰
29. Further, while the CEDAW Committee has recognized that domestic violence includes intimate partner violence regardless of marital status or cohabitation, section 3 of the Act limits protection to “persons in the family,”³¹ as interpreted and applied by justice sector actors to exclude individuals in intimate or *de facto* relationships who do not live together, or have not previously cohabited.³²

Compoundable offence

30. Section 4 of the Act classifies domestic violence as a compoundable offence, allowing complaints to be withdrawn and settlements to be reached, resulting in the termination of proceedings. It also affects related offences—such as physical and mental assault that do not amount to grievous bodily harm,³³ under section 295 of the Criminal Code—which may likewise be discontinued. This constitutes a substantial barrier to justice.
31. In addition, violent acts under section 295 are considered non-compoundable when committed outside the context of domestic violence. This distinction risks reinforcing harmful norms that treat domestic violence as less serious than other forms of violence.

Ex-officio investigation

32. Section 6 of the Act conditions investigations on the survivor's willingness to pursue legal action,³⁴ thereby enabling impunity where survivors are unable or unwilling to lodge a complaint. Although an exception allows officials to act on behalf of survivors in limited circumstances, this does not meet the obligation to initiate investigations *ex officio* upon becoming aware of domestic violence, regardless of the survivor's expressed willingness to complain.³⁵

Statute of limitations

33. Section 7 of the Act imposes a three-month limitation period for filing complaints.³⁶ This period is insufficient for many survivors, as fear, trauma, coercive control, and dependency often delay reporting. In addition, under general criminal law, offences such as causing bodily or mental harm not amounting to grievous bodily harm are subject to a 10-year statute of limitations, further reinforcing unequal treatment.

The "Reconciliation "Approach

34. Section 15 of the Act prioritizes mediation and settlement at all stages of proceedings, contrary to international standards, which require that such measures be used only in exceptional cases with the survivor's free and informed consent, and that they do not serve as a barrier to access to formal justice mechanisms.³⁷ This approach risks exposing survivors to further harm and undermines access to justice.
35. Further, while under international human rights law and standards considerations such as marital unity or cohabitation should never be determinative in establishing whether an act of domestic violence has occurred or whether to prosecute, the same section of the Act further requires the court to promote the "peace and co-existence of the family" during settlement proceedings, often at the expense of the survivor's safety.

Penalties

36. The Act prescribes disproportionately lenient penalties compared to general criminal law. Domestic violence offences carry a maximum penalty of six months'

imprisonment or a fine of 6,000 baht (approx. 175 USD), whereas comparable offences under section 295 of the Criminal Code—causing bodily or mental harm that does not amount to grievous bodily harm—carry penalties of up to two years' imprisonment or a fine of 40,000 baht (approx. 1,180 USD). This disparity reflects a legal framework that treats domestic violence less seriously than comparable criminal conduct outside the domestic sphere.

III. Barriers to accessing justice for GBV survivors

37. In addition to the legal shortcomings in combatting GBV outlined above, several other factors contribute to barriers to justice for GBV survivors, including: (i) laws that create additional barriers by exposing survivors to the risk of arrest or prosecution; (ii) persistent gender stereotyping among justice sector actors and the lack of gender-sensitive procedures; (iii) inadequate essential services and support for survivors; and (iv) a lack of tailored support for GBV survivors with disabilities.

Obstacles in the legal framework

38. Several laws create significant barriers to justice for GBV survivors, constitute discrimination against women, and deter reporting due to fear of arrest or prosecution. These include laws criminalizing abortion, sex work, as well as those targeting undocumented migrants and refugees—areas where the CEDAW Committee has called for repeal.³⁸

Criminalization of abortion

39. The criminalization of abortion disproportionately affects women and may deter victims/survivors from reporting GBV due to fear of prosecution for involvement in abortion. International human rights law also requires States to decriminalize abortion and ensure access to safe and legal abortion services as part of their obligations to eliminate discrimination and protect the right to health, among other human rights.³⁹

40. Nevertheless, section 301 of the Criminal Code continues to criminalize abortion after 12 weeks of pregnancy,⁴⁰ while section 305 provides limited exceptions, including where the pregnancy threatens the woman's physical or mental health, involves severe foetal impairment, or results from a sexual offence. For pregnancies between 12 and 20 weeks, abortion is permitted only following medical examination and counselling by trained professionals.⁴¹ However, broader decriminalization efforts aiming to take abortion entirely out of the purview of the criminal law remain limited, despite the CEDAW Committee's 2025 recommendations that Thailand decriminalize abortion and remove mandatory counselling requirements beyond 12 weeks.⁴²

41. A combination of barriers also contributes to the limited access to safe and legal abortion services. For example, public health facilities providing abortion services are insufficient and unevenly distributed, particularly outside urban areas, thereby restricting availability for many women. Even where services are legally permitted,

access is often hindered by limited awareness and stigma, including among healthcare providers, resulting in delays or denial of care.⁴³

Criminalization of sex work

42. UN human rights experts have raised concerns about the criminalization of sex work, noting its harmful impact on the enjoyment of human rights. It forces individuals to operate in unsafe conditions, deters reporting due to fear of arrest, and increases exposure to violence.⁴⁴ The CEDAW Committee has also recognized the criminalization of sex workers as a form of GBV⁴⁵ and has called for the repeal of such laws,⁴⁶ including in its 2025 Concluding Observations on Thailand.⁴⁷
43. Nevertheless, sex work and related activities remain criminalized under Thai law.⁴⁸ The Prevention and Suppression of Prostitution Act B.E. 2539 (1996) penalizes prostitution in brothels and public advertising, with criminal sanctions including imprisonment.⁴⁹ In addition, the Criminal Code provides for criminal liability for individuals who “procure, seduce, or assist in prostitution”⁵⁰ or benefit financially from the earnings of sex workers.⁵¹ These laws deter survivors from reporting GBV, as they risk prosecution for their involvement in sex work.⁵²
44. In addition, laws criminalizing production, possession, import, export, or dissemination of “obscene” content—under the Criminal Code⁵³ and the Computer-Related Crimes Act B.E. 2550 (2007)⁵⁴—may be applied to consensual adult conduct, raising concerns under article 19(3) of the ICCPR on freedom of expression.

Criminalization of undocumented migrants and refugees

45. International human rights bodies, including the CEDAW Committee and the UN Working Group on Discrimination against Women and Girls,⁵⁵ have highlighted the heightened vulnerability of undocumented women migrants to exploitation and GBV. The CEDAW Committee has called for the repeal of legal provisions that discriminate against women and facilitate or tolerate GBV, including immigration laws that deter migrant domestic workers from reporting violence and other abuse.⁵⁶
46. Nevertheless, undocumented migrants, asylum seekers, and refugees remain at risk of arrest and deportation under the Immigration Act B.E. 2522 (1979). This legal framework discourages survivors from seeking assistance from authorities or filing complaints about abuse or exploitation. In the rare instances where undocumented migrants sought assistance, some survivors were arrested and threatened with deportation on charges of “illegal immigration.” Even in cases where legal proceedings were initiated against GBV perpetrators, many ended in settlements due to lengthy legal processes, or survivors withdrew from the proceedings because they did not feel safe engaging with law enforcement or justice sector officials.
47. Documented migrant workers may also face restrictions on movement—particularly border workers⁵⁷—and limited ability to change employers.⁵⁸ These conditions can trap individuals in abusive situations both at work and at home, creating conditions

that facilitate or tolerate GBV. Leaving such employment may result in a breach of their work permit conditions, leading to the loss of legal status and rendering them “undocumented”.

Failure to ensure gender-sensitive procedures

48. Negative attitudes among justice sector actors often result in victim-blaming and secondary victimization, obstructing access to justice for GBV survivors. Such conduct contravenes articles 2(d), 2(f), and 5(a) of CEDAW. The CEDAW Committee has therefore recommended the adoption of confidential and gender-sensitive procedures to prevent stigmatization,⁵⁹ while the Committee against Torture has emphasized the need for gender-sensitive complaint and investigation processes to ensure effective redress without secondary victimization.⁶⁰
49. Notwithstanding these obligations, SHero Thailand and FLS have documented numerous instances in which police, prosecutors, and judges used blaming, shaming, or re-traumatizing language during questioning. Survivors are often interviewed multiple times—by police officers, multidisciplinary teams (especially in child cases),⁶¹ prosecutors, judges, and lawyers—causing additional psychological harm. These concerns were also highlighted by the UN Working Group on Discrimination against Women and Girls in its 2025 report following its visit to Thailand.⁶²
50. In practice, essential safeguards for gender-sensitive procedures are frequently lacking. Confidential and private spaces for reporting are often unavailable, particularly in police stations outside Bangkok. Courts also do not consistently ensure that survivors be shielded from alleged perpetrators in the courtroom, nor are GVB victims/survivors provided with accommodations such as video testimony or separate waiting areas, despite obligations under the Supreme Court’s 2020 Guidelines on the Treatment of Victims in Criminal Cases.⁶³
51. The shortage of trained female justice sector personnel, particularly inquiry officers, further exacerbates these challenges. Under Article 133 of the Criminal Procedure Code, female GBV survivors are entitled to be interviewed by a female inquiry officer, unless they consent to being interviewed by a male officer or where the law allows an exception in “necessary situations”, the scope of which is not defined. In practice, however, most survivors are interviewed by male officers, primarily due to the low representation of women in law enforcement. As of early 2025, only 763 of 11,607 inquiry officers nationwide were women (approximately 6.6 per cent) across 1,482 police stations.⁶⁴ This situation was worsened by the 2019 policy of the Royal Police Cadet Academy to admit only men, limiting women’s entry into the police force.⁶⁵ Even where female officers are available, many lack specialized training to handle GBV cases in a survivor-centred and sensitive manner.
52. In contrast, there is currently no legal or institutional mandate requiring the inclusion of female judges or prosecutors in judicial or prosecutorial panels. For example, the Law for the Organization of the Court of Justice Act B.E. 2562 (2019) contains no provision mandating the inclusion of, or quotas for, female judges.

Similarly, the Public Prosecution Institution and Public Prosecutors Act B.E. 2553 (2010) does not require the assignment of female prosecutors to GBV cases.

53. Similar gaps exist in interpretation and legal assistance. There is a shortage of female interpreters and Ministry of Justice-certified interpreters for languages beyond English and Chinese, as well as a lack of GBV-trained lawyers available at police stations to promptly assist survivors.

Lack of adequate essential services and support for GBV survivors

54. Following its third UPR cycle in 2021, Thailand accepted recommendations to strengthen efforts to address GBV, including improving access to sexual and reproductive health services, expanding support services, raising awareness, and increasing investment in coordinated care systems that respect survivors' autonomy.⁶⁶ However, many of these commitments have not yet been achieved, and concerns remain regarding insufficient funding, limited shelter capacity, and inadequate assistance. These concerns were also recently echoed in the CEDAW Committee's 2025 Concluding Observations, which called on Thailand to ensure adequate access to comprehensive support services for all survivors of GBV.⁶⁷
55. Although Thailand has taken some positive steps—such as establishing one-stop crisis centres (OSCCs) in healthcare facilities and a 24/7 Social Assistance Center hotline⁶⁸—many essential services remain unavailable or ineffective. In particular, the absence of legally mandated funding, including under the Domestic Violence Victim Protection Act, for reparations and survivor assistance continues to undermine both prevention and support mechanisms.
56. As a consequence of these gaps, there are currently no dedicated State-run emergency shelters for survivors of sexual or domestic violence.⁶⁹ Existing private shelters have limited capacity. State-run shelters under the Child Protection Act—known as Children and Family Homes and available in every province—are also intended to serve domestic violence survivors,⁷⁰ but access is often restricted due to frontline officials in many provinces lacking clarity on admission protocols, particularly regarding survivors without children, those living with HIV/AIDS or undocumented women and girls, resulting in restricted access to these shelters for many in need. In addition, women are allowed to stay in a shelter only up to three months.⁷¹
57. These structural limitations are compounded by a shortage of long-term psychological and counselling services, which are essential for recovery. Existing services are often limited in scope due to inadequate funding, and there is confusion over institutional responsibilities between the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (MSDHS) and the Ministry of Public Health.
58. In addition, OSCC services within the Ministry of Public Health face operational challenges, including limited funding, inconsistent implementation, and low awareness among hospital staff. In many facilities, these services remain minimal or inactive, further restricting access to care.⁷²

59. Moreover, a critical shortage of officers from the MSDHS stationed at Prevention of Domestic Violence Centers, who are responsible for enforcing the provisions of the Domestic Violence Victim Protection Act at the provincial level, further undermines support for GBV victims/survivors. According to SHero Thailand’s experience, in some provinces there is only one officer available, who has limited capacity and resources to effectively fulfill their legal duties. This shortage was formally acknowledged by the government in the Royal Decree of 23 August 2019.⁷³

Lack of adequate support for GBV survivors with disabilities

60. As a State party to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), Thailand is obligated to ensure effective access to justice for persons with disabilities on an equal basis with others.⁷⁴ It must also protect them from all forms of exploitation, violence, and abuse, including GBV, and exercise due diligence in investigating, prosecuting, and punishing perpetrators.⁷⁵ Following its third UPR cycle in 2021, Thailand supported recommendations to strengthen access to justice, particularly for women with disabilities.⁷⁶ However, in practice, support remains limited and inadequate to ensure effective access to justice for persons with disabilities, including GBV survivors, even at the initial stage of reporting—a concern also raised by the CRPD Committee in its 2017 Concluding Observations.⁷⁷

61. Physical inaccessibility remains a major barrier, as persons with disabilities—including GBV survivors—often face difficulties reaching police stations, courts, and other facilities. Communication barriers also persist, with legal documents frequently available only in inaccessible formats, such as paper or image files unreadable by assistive technologies.

62. There is also a shortage of qualified sign language interpreters. Their limited availability makes it difficult for hearing-impaired survivors to navigate the justice system. In addition, some survivors do not use or understand formal sign language, creating further barriers to participation in legal proceedings.

63. Finally, section 95 of Thailand’s Civil Procedure Code presents a significant legal barrier. It requires that a witness be able to understand and respond to questions and have directly perceived the relevant facts. In practice, this may exclude some persons with disabilities from having their testimony accepted, undermining their equal standing before the law.

V. Recommendations

64. In light of the above-mentioned concerns, the ICJ, SHero Thailand and FLS call upon the HRC and the Working Group on the UPR to recommend that the Government of Thailand:

In relation to gender-based discrimination

- Include an explicit provision in the Constitution recognising SOGIE as a protected grounds against discrimination;

- Amend the Gender Equality Act to abolish exceptions allowing discrimination on the grounds of religious rules or national security, and to clearly include SOGIE as a basis for unfair gender discrimination in all its forms in the definition; and
- Adopt a comprehensive Non-Discrimination Act that fully complies with Thailand's international human rights law obligations and standards.

In relation to shortcomings in legal provisions addressing GBV

- Amend sections 1(18) and 276 of the Criminal Code with the aim of adopting a definition of rape centred on the absence of consent, taking into account coercive circumstances and covering all forms of sexual penetration;
- Ensure that the law criminalises conduct in which a person causes a rape offence to be committed by another person, or forces a victim/survivor to engage in conduct constituting a rape offence against the body of another person, including by recognising such conduct as instigation under section 84 of the Criminal Code;
- Amend section 277bis of the Criminal Code with the aim of abolishing the death penalty in all circumstances, including where rape results in death;
- Amend sections 276 and repeal section 281 of the Criminal Code with the aim of removing provisions that classify certain rape offences as compoundable or provide mitigating circumstances in cases of marital rape;
- Ensure that sections 3(19) and 284/1 of the Criminal Code (sexual harassment provisions) be interpreted and applied with sanctions proportionate to the gravity of the offence, including the use of criminal sanctions only where conduct amounts to a violation of a survivor's physical, sexual, or psychological integrity;
- Address the vagueness of terms used in section 3(19) of the Criminal Code, which provides the definition of sexual harassment, including through the development of adequate tools or guidelines for justice sector actors to support implementation, with the aim of ensuring access to justice for GBV victims/survivors;
- Ensure that provisions on the production, possession, and dissemination of "obscene materials," including under sections 284/1 and 287 of the Criminal Code and section 14(4) of the Computer-Related Crime Act, be applied only in respect of non-consensual acts, except in cases involving child sexual abuse material, and clearly define the term "obscene materials" in a human rights-compliant manner;
- Amend sections 3, 4, 6, 7 and 15 of the Domestic Violence Victim Protection Act to align definitions with international standards and comply with a survivor-centred approach, and remove barriers to accountability, including compoundable offence status, short limitation periods, restrictions on *ex officio* investigations, prioritization of reconciliation and family unification over survivor safety, and inadequate penalties; and

- Establish effective perpetrator intervention programmes for intimate partner and domestic violence cases, aimed at behavioural change and prevention of reoffending.

In relation to barriers to access to justice for GBV survivors

- Repeal or substantially amend laws that create an environment facilitating or tolerating GBV, ensuring survivors can report without fear of prosecution, detention, or deportation, including:
 - Decriminalize abortion, including by repealing section 301 of the Criminal Code, and ensure the availability, accessibility, acceptability, and quality of safe and legal abortion services in all public hospitals or through specialized services in every province;
 - Decriminalize sex work, including by repealing the Prevention and Suppression of Prostitution Act B.E. 2539 (1996) and relevant Criminal Code provisions;
 - Amend the Immigration Act, including section 81 and related regulations, to protect GBV victims/survivors from prosecution, detention, or deportation when reporting abuse;
 - Relax travel and employer-change restrictions for documented migrant workers, particularly when reporting GBV;
- Strengthen measures to prevent and address gender stereotyping among justice sector actors by institutionalizing mandatory, continuous training on international human rights law and standards, alongside the development and enforcement of practical guidelines and protocols, as well as accountability and disciplinary mechanisms in cases of misconduct;
- Establish specialized GBV units within the police and increase the number of trained female officers, and strengthen gender-sensitive and survivor-centred practices across the prosecution and judiciary through: (i) the establishment of gender quotas for trained female judges on judicial panels adjudicating GBV cases; (ii) the assignment of trained female prosecutors; (iii) mandatory and continuous training, practical tools and protocols; and (iv) effective supervision, accountability, and disciplinary mechanisms in cases of misconduct;
- Eliminate practices that expose survivors to secondary victimization and ensure survivor-centred and trauma-informed procedures, including through reform of the Criminal Procedure Code;
- Increase the number of trained lawyers at police stations and ensure access to high-quality, gender-sensitive legal aid;
- Expand the availability of interpreters, particularly female interpreters and those proficient in languages spoken by migrants and marginalized communities;

- Establish dedicated and accessible funds for financial redress and survivor assistance, including through amendments to the Domestic Violence Victim Protection Act, and ensure sustained, adequate and gender-responsive financing to strengthen institutional capacity and frontline responses, enabling effective prevention of and response to GBV;
- Ensure the availability of State-run shelters for GBV survivors;
- Provide long-term psychological support and trauma-informed sexual and reproductive healthcare, particularly in rural and remote areas, including through the expansion of services and removal of barriers to access; and
- Ensure full access to justice for GBV survivors with disabilities by guaranteeing physical, informational, and communication accessibility, and repealing laws—such as section 95 of the Civil Procedure Code—that restrict their ability to testify.

ENDNOTES

¹ ICJ, 'Baseline Study on Access to Justice for Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV) in Thailand', 21 November 2025, available at: <https://www.icj.org/thailand-swift-action-is-needed-to-ensure-access-to-justice-for-survivors-of-sexual-and-gender-based-violence/>

² Human Rights Council, 'Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Thailand,' A/HRC/49/17, 21 December 2021 ('2021 UPR Report'), paras 51.135 -51.136 and 51.148.

³ The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW Committee) and the Human Rights Committee raised concerns in their 2025 and 2017 Concluding Observations on Thailand, emphasizing that such exceptions weaken the protection against gender discrimination. See: Human Rights Committee, 'Concluding observations on the second periodic report of Thailand,' UN Doc CCPR/C/THA/CO/2, 25 April 2017, paras 11-12; CEDAW Committee, 'Concluding observations on the eighth periodic report of Thailand,' UN Doc CEDAW/C/THA/CO/8, 10 July 2025, paras 11-12.

⁴ 2021 UPR Report, paras 51.45-51.50.

⁵ Section 3 of the Gender Equality Act.

⁶ In at least one Thai court decision, the court has recognized the expression of one's gender identity as protected under the Gender Equality Act. This was reflected in a recent ruling by the Central Administrative Court (Red Case No. 1868/2566), in 2023, concerning the official uniform of Bar Council members. The Court held that the Regulation of the Bar Council, which prescribes specific dress codes for male and female members without accommodating gender-diverse persons, constitutes unfair gender discrimination and an infringement of the rights of those whose gender or gender identity differs from their sex at birth. The Court found that the right to express one's gender identity is guaranteed under Sections 27 and 34 of the Thai Constitution (which guarantee gender equality and freedom of expression), as well as Section 3 of the Gender Equality Act.

⁷ 2021 UPR Report, paras. 51.139-51.144 and 51.146, 51.149- 51.150.

⁸ Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences, Dubravka Šimonović, 'Rape as a grave, systematic and widespread human rights violation, a crime and a

manifestation of gender-based violence against women and girls, and its prevention', UN Doc. A/HRC/47/26, 19 April 2021, para. 9.

⁹ Committee Against Torture, General Comment No.2, Implementation of Article 2 by States Parties, CAT/C/GC/2, 24 January 2008 para. 18. ('CAT General Comment No. 2'); Human Rights Committee, 'General comment No. 28: Article 3 (The Equality of Rights Between Men and Women)', UN Doc. CCPR/C/21/Rev.1/Add.10, 29 March 2000.

¹⁰ Section 276 defines rape as involving "threats by any means, use of violence or force, circumstances where the survivor cannot resist, or a misunderstanding that the perpetrator is another person."

¹¹ CEDAW Committee, 'General recommendation No. 35 on gender-based violence against women, updating general recommendation No. 19 (1992)', UN Doc. CEDAW/C/GC/35, 2017 ('CEDAW General Recommendation No. 35'), para. 29(e); CEDAW Committee, 'Committee Communication No. 34/2011, *R. P. B. v. the Philippines*', UN Doc. CEDAW/C/57/D/34/2011, para. 8.10; CEDAW Committee, 'Committee Communication No. 18/2008, *Vertido v. the Philippines*', UN Doc. CEDAW/C/46/D/18/2008, para. 8.7.

¹² ICJ, 'Women's Access to Justice for Gender-Based Violence: ICJ Practitioners' Guide n° 12 launched,' 2016, at 199-202, available at: <https://www.icj.org/resource/womens-access-to-justice-for-gender-based-violence-icj-practitioners-guide-n-12-launched/> ('ICJ Practitioners' Guide No. 12'). For example, Rule 70 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence of the International Criminal Court recognizes that a main point of inquiry for the Court in rape trials is not only whether a perpetrator used "force, threat of force, [or] coercion," but also whether the perpetrator was "taking advantage of a coercive environment." In addition, in the presence of such force, threat of force or coercion, or taking advantage of a coercive environment, consent cannot be inferred by reason of any words or conduct of a victim. Neither can consent be inferred from silence or lack of resistance of a victim.

¹³ The Royal Thai Police's 2021 Police Investigation Manual, which provides guidance for inquiry officers handling rape cases, reflects this flawed approach. While the manual acknowledges that consent should be taken into account, many of the recommended questions focus on physical resistance, such as "Was force used, or did the survivor fight back?" and "Did the survivor shout for help, and did anyone come to assist?", but omit questions on whether a "coercive environment" existed such that genuine consent was not possible. See: Royal Thai Police, 'Police Investigation Manual,' 2021, at 108-109, available at: <https://thungsonghong.metro.police.go.th/images/PDF/o8.4.1.pdf>

¹⁴ In 2014, the UN Committee against Torture in its Concluding Observations to Thailand expressed concerns on the "discriminatory rules of evidence in legal procedures of rape cases, which result ... lack of prosecution for the perpetrator." See: Committee against Torture, 'Concluding observations on the initial report of Thailand', UN Doc CAT/C/THA/CO/1, 20 June 2014, para. 16(c).

¹⁵ Dubravka Simonovic, 'A framework for legislation on rape (Model Rape Law): report of the Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women, Its Causes and Consequences,' A/HRC/47/26/Add.1, 15 June 2021, states that "a person (the perpetrator) commits rape when they: (a) engage in non-consensual vaginal, anal or oral penetration of a sexual nature, however slight, of the body of another person (the victim) by any bodily part or object; or (b) cause non-consensual vaginal, anal or oral penetration of a sexual nature, however slight, of the body of another person (the victim) by a third person; or (c) cause the victim to engage in the non-consensual vaginal, anal or oral penetration of a sexual nature, however slight, of the body of the perpetrator or another person.."

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ See also: Human Rights Committee, 'General comment No. 36 on article 6: right to life', UN Doc. CCPR/C/GC/36, 3 September 2019, paras 5, 10, 35.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, para. 34. The organizations further note that the UN General Assembly, by overwhelming majorities, has repeatedly called on all States that retain the death penalty to declare a moratorium on its use with a view to abolition, most recently on 17 December 2024 (UN Doc. A/RES/79/179).

¹⁹ Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences, Dubravka Šimonović, 'Rape as a grave, systematic and widespread human rights violation, a crime and a manifestation of gender-based violence against women and girls, and its prevention', UN Doc. A/HRC/47/26, 19 April 2021, para. 88.

²⁰ Šimonović, UN Doc. A/HRC/47/26/Add.1, 2021, Article 8, para. 23(a)(i)

²¹ This applies, in particular, to marital rape cases where the offence does not take place in a public setting or does not result in serious harm or death.

²² CAT General Comment No. 2, para. 18; Committee Against Torture, General comment No. 3, Implementation of article 14 by States parties CAT/C/GC/3, 13 December 2012 ('CAT General Comment No. 3'), para. 23; CEDAW General Recommendation No. 35, paras 24 and 29.

²³ Section 96 of the Criminal Code

²⁴ According to CAT General Comment No. 3, para. 40, the Committee states that, for many victims, the passage of time does not attenuate the harm; in some cases, the harm may increase due to post-traumatic stress, which requires medical, psychological, and social support that is often inaccessible to those who have not received redress.

²⁵ CEDAW General Recommendation No. 35, para. 29(a); ICJ, 'Thailand: New sexual harassment law a step in the right direction, albeit concerns remain', 7 January 2026, available at: <https://www.icj.org/thailand-new-sexual-harassment-law-a-step-in-the-right-direction-albeit-concerns-remain/>.

²⁶ Subject to Principle 1 of the 8 March Principles for a Human Rights-Based Approach to Criminal Law Proscribing Conduct Associated with Sex, Reproduction, Drug Use, HIV, Homelessness and Poverty—published by the ICJ—"the principle of legality ... requires that the law be publicly and sufficiently accessible, and that criminal liability be foreseeable and capable of being clearly understood in its application and consequences. Thus, crimes must be classified and described in precise and unambiguous language that narrowly defines the punishable offence, with a clear definition of the criminalized conduct, establishing its elements and the factors that distinguish it from conduct that is not criminally proscribed.

Criminal law must not proscribe any act or omission in terms that are vague, imprecise, arbitrary, or overly broad. Criminal law must not be construed broadly to an accused person's disadvantage. In cases of ambiguity, the definition of a particular offence should be interpreted in favour of the accused."

²⁷ Committee against Torture, 'Concluding observations on the 2nd periodic report of Thailand,' UN Doc CAT/C/THA/CO/2, 2024, paras 36-37. The Committee expressed concern, inter alia, about provisions that require survivors to lodge complaints in order to initiate prosecutions, that privilege amicable settlements over survivors' well-being and safety, and that require survivors to file a complaint within three months. It recommended that Thailand ensure that all acts of gender-based and domestic violence are thoroughly investigated, including through the initiation of ex officio investigations; that alleged perpetrators are prosecuted and, if convicted, punished appropriately; and that survivors or their families receive redress, including adequate compensation and rehabilitation.

²⁸ CEDAW Committee, 'Concluding observations on the eighth periodic report of Thailand,' UN Doc. CEDAW/C/THA/CO/8, 10 July 2025 (' '), paras 25-26. The Committee expressed concern about the absence of effective investigation, enforcement, and survivor protection mechanisms in the Domestic Violence Victim Protection Act; the reliance on family reconciliation procedures; and insufficient legal support, as well as language and accessibility barriers.

²⁹ ICJ, 'Thailand: Draft Domestic Violence Act should be revised in line with international standards', 4 March 2026, available at: <https://www.icj.org/thailand-draft-domestic-violence-act-should-be-revised-in-line-with-international-standards/>.

³⁰ CEDAW Committee, 'X. and Y. v. Georgia,' Communication No. 024/2009, UN Doc. CEDAW/C/61/D/24/2009, 13 July 2015; and CEDAW Committee, 'Kell v. Canada,' Communication No. 19/2008, UN Doc. CEDAW/C/51/D/19/2008, 26 April 2012. Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence defined "domestic violence" as "all acts of physical, sexual, psychological or economic violence that occur within the

family or domestic unit or between former or current spouses or partners, whether or not the perpetrator shares or has shared the same residence with the victim.”

³¹ In the case of *J. I. v. Finland, X. v. Timor Leste, S. L. v. Bulgaria*, see: CEDAW Committee, ‘Concept and scope of protection against domestic violence as GBV under the CEDAW Convention, GR 35 and CEDAW Optional Protocol, and in the practice of the UN SR VAW - Main issues identified, recommendations and guidance to SPs, good practices,’ available at: <https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/2023-08/domestic-violence-as-gender-based-violence-under-cedaw.doc>.

³² Section 3 of the Act defined “persons in the family” to include spouse, a former spouse, a person cohabiting or having cohabited with another husband and wife without civil marriage, a child, an adopted child, a member of a household, as well as any person counting on and living in a family.

³³ The grounds set out in section 297 of the Criminal Code include, *inter alia*, infirmity; an illness causing intense bodily pain for more than 20 days; loss of sight or hearing; cutting of the tongue; loss of the sense of smell; loss of an organ; permanent disfigurement of the face; abortion; permanent insanity; or a chronic illness lasting throughout life.

³⁴ Section 6 of the Act stipulates that if a survivor wishes to pursue legal action, they must file a complaint unless they “do not have the ability or opportunity to file the complaint by themselves.” In such cases, the competent official is authorized to file the complaint on their behalf.

³⁵ CEDAW General Recommendation No. 35, para. 32(a).

³⁶ Under section 7, the three-month period begins when the person subjected to domestic violence is in a position—taking into account their circumstances and mental condition—to notify or file a complaint. While this provision, to some extent, recognizes factors that may hinder survivors’ ability to report violence to competent services or authorities, a three-month limitation period will often be insufficient for many survivors.

³⁷ CEDAW General Recommendation No. 35, para. 32(b).

³⁸ CEDAW General Recommendation No. 35, para. 29.

³⁹ OHCHR, ‘Abortion,’ 2020, available at: https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Issues/Women/WRGS/SexualHealth/INFO_Abortion_WEB.pdf.

⁴⁰ Section 301 provides that any woman who is more than 12 weeks pregnant and causes herself to have an abortion, or allows another person to procure an abortion for her, shall be imprisoned for no more than six months, fined no more than ten thousand Baht (approx. 295 USD), or both.

⁴¹ Ministry of Public Health, ‘Announcement on Examining and Counseling on Pregnancy Termination Options under Section 305(5) of the Criminal Code,’ 26 September 2022, available at: https://www.ratchakitcha.soc.go.th/DATA/PDF/2565/E/228/T_0001.PDF

⁴² 2025 CEDAW Concluding Observations on Thailand, paras 41(a) and 42(a).

⁴³ See also: Report of the Working Group on discrimination against women and Girls, ‘Visit to Thailand’, UN Doc. A/HRC/59/45/Add.2, 19 May 2025, para. 46 (‘2025 WGDAWG’s Report on Thailand’); and Thanyaporn Buathong, ‘Abortion: Legalization of abortion for women 12-20 weeks pregnant and why safe abortion is still difficult to access,’ BBC Thai, 27 September 2022, available at: <https://www.bbc.com/thai/articles/cv2ej8yl7yjo>.

⁴⁴ Human Rights Council, ‘Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, Anand Grover’, UN Doc. A/HRC/14/20, 27 April 2010, paras 42-43; and Working Group on discrimination against women and girls, ‘Women’s human rights in the changing world of work’, UN Doc. A/HRC/44/51, 2020, para. 43; and Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, Tlaleng Mofokeng, ‘Violence and its impact on the right to health,’ UN Doc. A/HRC/50/28, 14 April 2022, para. 71.

⁴⁵ Working Group on discrimination against women and girls, ‘Eliminating discrimination against sex workers and securing their human rights,’ UN Doc. A/HRC/WG.11/39/1, 7 December 2023, para. 23, available at: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/documents/tools-and-resources/guidance-document-working-group-discrimination-against-women-and>.

-
- ⁴⁶ CEDAW General Recommendation No. 35, para. 29(c)(i).
- ⁴⁷ 2025 CEDAW Concluding Observations on Thailand, paras 29(a) and 30(a).
- ⁴⁸ CEDAW, 'General recommendation No. 33 on women's access to justice', UN Doc. CEDAW/C/GC/33, 3 August 2015, paras 9 and 10.
- ⁴⁹ Sections 6-7 of the Prevention and Suppression of Prostitution Act B.E. 2539.
- ⁵⁰ Section 282 of the Criminal Code.
- ⁵¹ Section 286 of the Criminal Code.
- ⁵² iLaw, 'Decriminalize sex work: Civil Society Proposes Repealing Laws Suppressing Prostitution,' 8 April 2021, available at: https://www.ilaw.or.th/articles/4598?fbclid=IwY2xjawFWFh5leHRuA2FlbQIxMQABHZgRqh9tlfzDZAe5TDKQqpCbNeWMLqBehr_JTJWPZ2IWKKEqrLhVgU51A_aem_iWTAhrJDqYc0a0Sy9MDM2g&fbclid=IwY2xjawFWFh5leHRuA2FlbQIxMQABHZgRqh9tlfzDZAe5TDKQqpCbNeWMLqBehr_JTJWPZ2IWKKEqrLhVgU51A_aem_iWTAhrJDqYc0a0Sy9MDM2g&fbclid=IwY2xjawFWFh5leHRuA2FlbQIxMQABHZgRqh9tlfzDZAe5TDKQqpCbNeWMLqBehr_JTJWPZ2IWKKEqrLhVgU51A_aem_iWTAhrJDqYc0a0Sy9MDM2g.
- ⁵³ Section 287 of the Criminal Code.
- ⁵⁴ Section 14(4) of the Computer-related Crime Act B.E. 2550 (2007).
- ⁵⁵ 2025 WGDAGW's Report on Thailand, para. 63.
- ⁵⁶ CEDAW General Recommendation No. 35, para. 29(c)(iii)
- ⁵⁷ Certain permits will not allow migrants from neighbouring countries to leave the 'specific areas,' which usually encompass several districts in the border zones.
- ⁵⁸ An exception to the prohibition on changing employers specifies that if an employer resorts to torture or bodily assault, fails to comply with labour protection laws, or places employees in dangerous working environments, among other violations, migrants will not lose their legal status or face arrest and deportation, provided they find a new employer within 15 days. See also: Emergency Decree on Managing the Work of Aliens B.E. 2560 (2017) (amended in 2018).
- ⁵⁹ CEDAW General Recommendation No. 33, para. 51(g)
- ⁶⁰ CAT General Comment No. 3, para. 33.
- ⁶¹ Section 133 bis of the Criminal Code.
- ⁶² 2025 WGDAGW's Report on Thailand, paras 62-64.
- ⁶³ Available at: <https://opsc.coj.go.th/th/content/category/detail/id/8/cid/1145/iid/218017>.
- ⁶⁴ See also: Move Forward Party, 'Female police officers and the justice system in sexual harassment cases', 10 July 2022, available at: <https://think.moveforwardparty.org/article/urban-development/2783/>.
- ⁶⁵ Attending the four-year program at the cadet academy as a Matthayom 6 high-school graduate is one of the principal ways to become a policewoman. Two other options are to enter different pre-cadet training programs and to take another test, or obtain a bachelor's degree and then a six-month training program by the Royal Thai Police. See: Khaosod English, 'women Banned From Police Academy Starting 2019,' 3 September 2018, available at: <https://www.khaosodenglish.com/news/2018/09/03/women-banned-from-police-academy-starting-2019/>.
- ⁶⁶ 2021 UPR Report, paras 51.124 and 51.145-147.
- ⁶⁷ 2025 CEDAW Concluding Observations on Thailand, paras 25 (e) and 26 (e).
- ⁶⁸ 2025 WGDAGW's Report on Thailand, para 57.
- ⁶⁹ CAT General Comment No. 3, para. 18.

⁷⁰ MSDHS's Department of Children and Youth, 'Management of Children and Family Shelters,' accessed on 15 May 2025, available at: https://www.dcy.go.th/public/mainWeb/file_download/1646580636011-740931321.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com

⁷¹ 2025 WGDWAWG's Report on Thailand, para 60.

⁷² 2025 WGDWAWG's Report on Thailand, paras 58-59.

⁷³ The Royal Decree is available at: https://www.ratchakitcha.soc.go.th/DATA/PDF/2562/A/092/T_0001.PDF.

⁷⁴ Section 13 of the CRPD.

⁷⁵ CRPD Committee, 'General Comment No. 3: Article 6: Women and girls with disabilities,' UN Doc. CRPD/C/GC/3, 2 September 2016, para. 26 ('CRPD General Comment No. 3').

⁷⁶ 2021 UPR Report, paras 52,72.

⁷⁷ CRPD Committee, 'Concluding observations on the initial report of Thailand,' CRPD/C/THA/CO/1, 2016, paras 27-28.