protection of freedom of the people toward public reliability under Thailand's office of the Attorney General.

The qualitative research was used so that the availability of existing management of Thailand's office of the Attorney General could be described significantly. The Key Informant, Documentary Research and Focus Group were used as tools from fieldwork of collection data. The findings were found that:

1.Even the administration strategy of the office has been implicitly established, the unsuccessful management from the executive head of individuality was observed by uncompromising, irrelevant and even situational manners against it. In consequence, the inconstant, irresponsive and inactive natures of management resulted regarding irresponsibility and lacks of authentic evaluations.

2. The authoritative office concerns accountability on legality against offences and others while the protection of freedom of the people has been regarded as inactive and unjust manipulation toward the litigants as clients. The office has been criticized on discrimination and a known "double-standard", of which it has been serving for high profiles and society of the individual including the rich for long.

3. Apart from its authority by laws, the public services which has not been constantly improved to serve for the trends in administration has confronted poor access of people who require its services. The office seemingly separated from the people should have rather made public interest than individual interest when innate nature of services with public affairs and spirit should be recognized.

4. Being nearly authority of its own territory and making it in the trap like other justice offices, the cooperation and networks among the administrative offices have been deprived of in full operation but conflicts instead.

5. The lack on improvement of administrative structure with functional authority, systematic procedure and integrated operation in services of public interest has remained when the divisions of the office have not operated in compliance with their authority concerning with utilization. As the result, the complexity and procedure occurred by operational services of individual authority would often be a reward of unresponsiveness upon the required clients and the office would never have been verified thoroughly.

6. Having been monitored by code of conducts and regulations of time frames under the legal system, the daily-basis individual authority has been