



Reference: jyo3x5t5

Date: Thursday, August 27, 2026

Type: Human rights violation

Original: English

Consent: The nature of the allegation is such that consent cannot be obtained, e.g. the victim(s) is/are dead or has/have been subject to an enforced disappearance

Related mandates

- arbitrary Detention
- freedom of opinion and expression
- human rights defenders
- migrants

Victims

Name: Chí Thành Lê

Type: Individual

Sex: Male

Date of birth: 20/07/1983

Victim is a child (under 18 years of age)? No

Nationality: Viet Nam

Address:
Suan Phlu Immigration Detention Centre
120/5 Soi Suan Phlu
Thung Maha Mek, Sathon District
Bangkok 10120
Thailand

Ethnic, religious, social or other background: Kinh (majority ethnic group), no known religious affiliation. Former police officer turned whistleblower.

Occupation: Former police officer; anticorruption whistleblower; online commentator exposing police abuses.

Other status: Migrant, Refugee / asylum seeker

Affiliation or activity: Other
Anti-corruption activism; whistleblowing; human rights-related activity; public reporting on police misconduct; freedom-of-expression work.

Identity document Vietnamese Passport

Issued by Government of Vietnam – Ministry of Public Security

Issued on Unknown (passport later revoked by Vietnamese authorities)

Identity document number Unknown (passport confiscated and revoked)

Submitted by

Name: Quyen Nguyen

Type: Individual

Email: [REDACTED]

Telephone: [REDACTED]

Address:

[REDACTED]
Belgium

Disclosure

Does the alleged victim(s) or group/community agree to have their name(s) disclosed in a letter that may be sent to the Government, or others, such as intergovernmental organisations including United Nations entities, businesses, military or security companies?

No - The victim is detained in Suan Phlu Immigration Detention Centre and cannot be contacted. He is unable to provide consent for disclosure due to incommunicado detention and lack of access to communication.

Does the alleged victim(s) agree to have their name(s) appear in a public report to the Human Rights Council?

No - The victim is detained in Suan Phlu Immigration Detention Centre and cannot be contacted. He is unable to provide consent for public disclosure due to incommunicado detention and lack of access to communication. Public disclosure may increase the risk of retaliation or deportation.

Please confirm that the victim, or the victim's family, or the victim's legal representative is in agreement that the case can be dealt with through the regular procedure of the Working Group

No

The identity and the details of the victim's case can be communicated to the Government concerned

No

The identity of the victim can be published in the communications report to the UN Human Rights Council

No

Case details

Country where the incident allegedly occurred/is occurring/might occur: Thailand

District: Suan Phlu Immigration Detention Centre, Thung Maha Mek, Sathon District, Bangkok

If relevant to your submission, please indicate whether there are additional country/ies where the incident allegedly occurred/is occurring/might occur, or otherwise related to the case submitted Viet Nam

Please provide a short chronological summary of the incident: what happened; when (date/time); who was involved?

On 6 March 2026, Vietnamese national and former police officer Lê Chí Thành was arrested by Thai immigration authorities in Bangkok after the Vietnamese Government revoked his passport while he was legally residing and working in Thailand. The revocation rendered him “undocumented,” leading to his immediate detention under Thai immigration law. He was transferred to Suan Phlu Immigration Detention Centre (IDC), where he remains in custody.

Prior to arriving in Thailand, Lê Chí Thành was imprisoned in Viet Nam for exposing corruption and misconduct within the police force. He reported abuses, unlawful confiscations, and internal wrongdoing through online platforms. For these activities, he was arrested in 2021, tortured during detention, and sentenced to prison on politically motivated charges. After release, he fled to Thailand seeking safety.

Since his detention in Suan Phlu IDC, he has been held incommunicado. He has no access to a telephone, email, legal counsel, or UNHCR. No family members or NGOs have been permitted to contact him. Thai authorities have not provided information on his legal status, duration of detention, or any protection assessment.

There is a credible and immediate risk that Thai authorities may deport him to Viet Nam. If returned, he faces a high likelihood of torture, illtreatment, and renewed imprisonment due to his past whistleblowing, political expression, and humanrightsrelated activities. Viet Nam has a documented pattern of reprisals against former police whistleblowers and political dissidents.

The incident involves: Thai Immigration Bureau officers (arrest and detention), Suan Phlu IDC officials (continued detention and denial of communication), and Vietnamese authorities (passport revocation and prior persecution). The situation is ongoing, and the victim remains at risk of refoulement and further harm.

Are there witnesses to the incident? Don't know

Is there evidence or substantiating information concerning the incident? Don't know

Does the alleged victim believe she/he was targeted due to her/his Engagement in human rights, trade union, political, religious activities or other types of activities

Has the incident been reported to the relevant authorities? No

Has the Government taken action to prevent or investigate the incident, punish the perpetrators, or ensure compensation to the alleged victim(s)? No

Is this case under consideration by any other international or regional body? Don't know

arbitrary Detention

Date of arrest

06/03/2026

Approximate date?

No

Place of arrest

Bangkok, Thailand – by Thai Immigration Bureau officers

Not known

No

What reasons were given for the arrest?

Thai Immigration stated he was “undocumented” after the Vietnamese Government revoked his passport.

Not known?

No

What was the legal basis for the arrest?

Thai Immigration Act (detention for lack of valid documentation following passport revocation).

Not known

No

Date of detention arrest

06/03/2026

Approximate date

No

Duration of the detention

Ongoing since 6 March 2026.

Not known / approximate

No

Place(s) of detention (indicate any transfer and the current place of detention)

Suan Phlu Immigration Detention Centre, Thung Maha Mek, Sathon District, Bangkok (current and only place of detention).

Not known

No

Reasons given for the detention

Immigration detention due to passport revocation by Vietnam, rendering him “undocumented.”

Not known

No

Legal basis for the detention

Thai Immigration Act – detention for lack of valid travel documents.

Not known

No

What are the reasons why you believe the deprivation of liberty is arbitrary?

The detention is arbitrary because the victim’s passport was revoked by the Vietnamese Government as an act of political retaliation for his whistleblowing and human-rights-related activities. The revocation created an artificial immigration violation, leading to his arrest in Thailand despite previously residing legally. He is held without access to legal counsel, UNHCR, or communication, and no individualized assessment of protection needs has been conducted. His detention is prolonged, indefinite, and lacks judicial review. There is a credible and immediate risk of refoulement to Viet Nam, where he previously suffered torture and imprisonment for exposing police corruption. The detention therefore lacks legal basis, is disproportionate, and serves the political interests of another State, constituting arbitrary deprivation of liberty under international human rights standards.

Are the reasons for the deprivation of liberty authorized by the law?

No

If yes, please elaborate

The detention is based solely on an immigration violation created artificially by the Vietnamese Government’s political revocation of his passport. Although Thailand cites its Immigration Act, the underlying cause is not legitimate, and the detention lacks judicial review, proportionality, and due process. Therefore, the deprivation of liberty cannot be considered lawful under international human rights standards.

Are the reasons for the deprivation of liberty linked to the exercise by the victim of her/his human rights or fundamental freedoms?

Yes

If yes, please elaborate

Yes. The victim’s deprivation of liberty is directly linked to his exercise of fundamental freedoms, including freedom of expression, whistleblowing, and reporting on police corruption in Viet Nam. His passport was revoked as retaliation for these activities, which led to his arrest and detention in Thailand. His current detention is therefore a consequence of his human-rights-related actions and political expression.

If applicable, do you know if the right to a fair trial has been respected? (for example : the right to defend yourself and the right to legal assistance; the right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty according to law; the right to a fair and public hearing by a competent, independent and impartial tribunal established by law; the right when charged with a criminal offence to be informed of the nature and cause of criminal charges brought against them; etc.)

No

If yes please elaborate

No. The victim has not been informed of any charges, has not been given access to legal assistance, and has not been provided any opportunity to defend himself. Immigration detention in Suan Phlu IDC does not include judicial hearings, public hearings, or any independent review. He is held without due process and without being presumed innocent or given any legal rights normally associated with criminal proceedings.

In the case of an asylum seeker, migrant or refugee who has been subjected to prolonged administrative detention, was she/he was guaranteed the possibility of administrative or judicial review of the detention, or remedy?

No

If yes please elaborate

No. Immigration detention in Thailand is indefinite and without automatic judicial review. The victim has not been given access to any administrative or judicial mechanism to challenge his detention. He cannot file appeals, cannot meet UNHCR, and cannot access legal counsel. There is no remedy or review available to him.

Can you indicate if complaints were made to the administrative or judicial authorities, or remedies sought with respect to this

particular case ?

No

Do you know what were their results?

No

If yes please elaborate

No complaints could be made because the victim is held incommunicado and has no access to legal representation, NGOs, or UNHCR. Therefore, no remedies were available and no results exist.

freedom of opinion and expression**Please indicate any views, affiliations, past or present participation in political, social, ethnic or labour group/activity.**

The victim publicly exposed corruption involving Vietnamese police officers and local authorities. He shared information online about extortion, abuse of power, and misconduct by State agents. He is not affiliated with any political party or organization, but his whistleblowing activities were political in nature because they challenged State authority and exposed wrongdoing. His online posts and communications were peaceful expressions protected under international human rights law.

Please indicate the nature of the medium affected (newspaper, independent radio, etc.), including circulation and frequency of publication or broadcasting, public performances, etc, as well as the political orientation of the medium, if relevant.

The victim used social media and online communication platforms to share information about corruption. His posts were informal, personal disclosures rather than part of a formal news outlet. After publishing these statements, Vietnamese authorities retaliated by revoking his passport, effectively silencing his ability to communicate and restricting his freedom of expression. The "medium" affected was his personal online voice, which was targeted through administrative punishment rather than direct censorship of a publication.

If the incident involves restrictions on a medium (e.g. censorship, closure of a news organ, banning of a book, etc.); please indicate the identity of the authority involved (individual and/or ministry and/or department), the legal statute invoked, and steps taken to seek domestic remedy.

The restriction took the form of passport revocation by the Vietnamese Ministry of Public Security. This administrative action functioned as indirect censorship, preventing him from traveling, working, or safely continuing his online disclosures. The legal statute invoked was not transparently communicated to him. No domestic remedy was available because the revocation was politically motivated, and Vietnamese authorities do not provide independent review for such cases.

If the incident involves arrest of an individual or individuals, the identity of the authority involved (individual and/or ministry and/or department), the legal statute invoked, location of detention if known, information on provision of access to legal counsel and family members, steps taken to seek domestic remedy or clarification of person's situation and status.

The victim was arrested by Thai Immigration Bureau officers after his passport was revoked by Vietnamese authorities. He was detained at Suan Phlu Immigration Detention Centre in Bangkok. The legal basis cited was an immigration violation, but the underlying cause was political retaliation by Viet Nam. He has no access to legal counsel, no access to family, and no ability to communicate with the outside world. No domestic remedy or judicial review exists for his detention.

human rights defenders**Please indicate the status of the alleged victim(s) as a human rights defender: in what human rights activity is the alleged victim (person(s) / organization) engaged?**

The victim qualifies as a human rights defender because he exposed corruption involving Vietnamese police officers and local authorities. His disclosures were aimed at protecting the public from abuse of power, extortion, and misconduct by State agents. Although he is not part of any formal organization, his whistleblowing activities constitute human rights work under the UN Declaration on Human Rights Defenders. His peaceful online statements challenged official wrongdoing and sought accountability, placing him at risk of retaliation by authorities.

migrants**Status of the alleged victim(s) in the country of the incident: undocumented / transit / tourist / student / work permit / resident / refugee / asylum seeker / temporary protection.**

Undocumented (due to passport revocation by Vietnamese authorities).

Was any consular official contacted by the alleged victim(s) or the authorities? Please specify.

No. The victim could not contact any consular official. Vietnamese authorities revoked his passport as retaliation for exposing corruption, and he fears further persecution if he contacts them. Thai authorities did not facilitate consular contact.

Was the alleged victim(s) aware of her/his right to contact a consular official of her/his country of origin?

No. The victim was not informed of this right by Thai authorities, and he has no access to legal counsel or communication while detained.

Perpetrators**Please specify the number of alleged perpetrators: 3****Is the identity/occupation of the alleged perpetrator(s) known? Yes**

Yes.

Thai Immigration Bureau officers;
Suan Phlu Immigration Detention Centre officials;
Vietnamese Ministry of Public Security officials.

Were the alleged perpetrators State agents or believed to be State agents? Yes

Yes. All involved actors are State agents:
Thai Immigration Bureau officers and IDC officials are Thai State agents;
Vietnamese Ministry of Public Security officials are Vietnamese State agents.

If the alleged perpetrators were State agents, were they acting in their official capacity? Yes

Yes. All alleged perpetrators acted in their official capacity as State agents. Thai Immigration Bureau officers and Suan Phlu IDC officials exercised State authority in arresting and detaining the victim. Vietnamese Ministry of Public Security officials acted in their official roles when revoking his passport as political retaliation.

Additional information

The victim is currently detained at Suan Phlu Immigration Detention Centre in Bangkok after his passport was revoked by Vietnamese authorities as retaliation for exposing corruption. He is held incommunicado, without access to legal counsel, family, or consular assistance. His situation is urgent because he faces the risk of refoulement to Viet Nam, where he would be at serious risk of persecution for his whistleblowing activities. I respectfully request the intervention of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention and relevant Special Procedures to clarify his status, prevent refoulement, and ensure his safety.