

ALTERNATE REPORT¹
CIVIL SOCIETY COALITION FOR HUMAN RIGHTS IN MANIPUR AND THE UN
3 June 2024

THE FOURTH PERIODIC REPORT OF INDIA UNDER THE ARTICLE 40 OF THE CCPR
UNITED NATIONS HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE
141stSESSION: 01 - 23 JULY 2024

General Information

Manipur, a province of India located in the North Eastern Region on the Indo-Myanmar border, is acknowledged by all international communities that a protracted non-international armed conflict is ongoing for several decades since the 50s of the last century. The province is mostly populated by indigenous and tribal peoples, broadly categorized into three ethnics – Meitei, Naga and Zo-Kuki. Effective legal and institutional protection measures as well as constitutional guarantees of fundamental rights and freedoms have been denied to the peoples of Manipur. The peoples have been subjected to abuse of their fundamental rights and freedoms as well as restrictions to their freedom of movement, expression, association and assembly. Members of civil society, journalists as well as human rights defenders have been the victims of false accusations, preventive detention on unfounded charges of sedition and waging war against the government of India under draconian laws that have been imposed in the name of national security and public safety.

The Indian Security Forces, law enforcing agencies, and police enjoy de-jure and de-facto impunity under the notorious Armed Forces (Special) Powers Act of 1958(AFSPA) as well as under the policy of the government. The Security Forces (SFs) have been deployed for decades at many shrines, community grounds, historical sites, natural tourist spots, surrounding of lakes, rivers and mountains, prime agricultural land, even educational institutions, community halls, public playgrounds, etc., in the name of national security and public safety. These deployments of SFs not only effects on basic rights, “Rights to Life and Livelihood” but also adversely destroyed the local economy of the peoples of Manipur. The deliberate institutional incapacitation of the legal system to redress the peoples’ grievances and deliver justice is directly linked to the legal immunity that different types of security forces enjoy in this region.

The provisions of international treaties ratified by India are still not self-executing despite the establishment of the National Human Rights Commission by the enactment of the Protection of Human Rights Act in 1993.

The state report(Reply)

Reply to the para 9 of the Fourth Periodic Report Submitted by India.

The Fourth Report of India has not presented the true picture of practice in the institutional frameworks

¹ The CSCHR in Manipur and the UN had submitted a list of issues to the HRC, hereafter referred to as the Committee, for the 4th periodic review of India, in the absence of a report, on 12 May 2019 for the 126th Session, 1 -26 July 2019. The considerable delay in the submission of the state party’s 4th periodic report is noted with concern. The Committee is requested to recall this report (INT_CCPR_ICSI_Ind_34887_E).

as claimed in thereport. Taking up just one or two glaring instances, out of many, the Protection of Human Rights Act 1993, Article 19 disabled the National Human Rights Commission and related NHRIs to investigate autonomously into human rights violations routinely committed by the members of the Armed Forces. Not a single security personnel had ever been indicted in Manipur on the recommendation of the National Human Rights Commission. Amnesty International in March 1996 (AI Index ASA 20/05/96) also corroborates the increasing use of state forces to the disappearances of people (p. 7), extra judicial executions (p. 8), disappearances at the hands of the army stationed in Manipur for five decades. Moreover, in the State of Manipur, no proper staff, infrastructures, funds and other accessories items are provisioned for the effective function of SHRC Manipur, and various State Commissions for the protection of the rights of Scheduled Tribes, Scheduled Castes, Backward Communities, Minorities, Women and Children. In these junctures all are remaining like toothless tigers in the State.

The Protection of Human Rights Act (PHRA), 1993 gives mandate to both National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) and State Human Rights Commissions (SHRCs) to implement both ICCPR and ICESCR.²With regard to compliance with the Paris Principles, NHRC and the SHRCs have made no progress whatsoever over the past three decades. The NHRC is a member of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (GANHRI) with an “A” accreditation status, that is, full compliance with the Paris Principles³. However, the review of this status has been deferred repeatedly since 2016, bringing its credibility into serious doubt. More seriously, lack of compliance has adverse implications for the appointment and functioning of the SHRCs despite the judgement of the Supreme Court of India passed in Dilip K. Basu vs State of West Bengal &Others delivered on 24th July 2025.The amendments enacted in the Protection of Human Rights (Amendment) Act, 2019 fail to answer concerns about the independence, autonomy, pluralism and functioning of the NHRC, in short, compliance with the Paris Principles. The appointment of Chairperson and Members of the NHRC and SHRCs are not transparent. For instance, in regards to the SHRC, Manipur, the chief justice or judge of a High Court has to apply⁴ and there is no provision for an independent, transparent nomination process. Moreover, the Commissioner (Law), Government of Manipur acts as de facto Administrative Secretary despite the amendment of PHRA in 2019⁵ and in this regards, SHRC Manipur has intimated to the Government of Manipur for its consideration to maintain the statutory nature of the State Commission.⁶

Counter-terrorism and security measures and accountability for serious human rights isolations(arts. 6, 7, 9, 4 and 2)para, 79, 80, 81, 82

In 2005, Assam Rifles signed a Suspension of Operation (SoO) agreement with Kuki militant groups,

² Section 2(d) and (f) of the Protection of Human Rights Act, 1993

³The NHRC is an ‘A’ accredited commission with direct access to several international human rights forums and mechanisms such as the Human Rights Council and the UN General Assembly important for the Indian government.This ‘A’ accreditation was in limbo between 2016-2017, until the NHRC assured the Sub-Committee on Accreditation (SCA) of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (GANHRI) in November 2017 that there would be amendments to the PHRA to ensure NHRC’s complete compliance with the Paris Principles. This is an unprecedented exception to GANHRI’s working procedures, gifting the NHRC an ‘A’ accreditation on its 25thanniversary. According to GANHRI’s own record, no commission was granted an ‘A’ accreditation based on commitments and proposals.

⁴<https://hcmimphal.nic.in/Documents/law%20dept2018.pdf>

⁵ Section 21(3) of the Protection of Human Rights Act, 1993 states that “Secretary who shall be the Chief Executive Officer of the State Commission and shall, subject to control of the Chairperson, exercise all administrative and financial powers of the State Commission.

⁶ MHRC Annual Report 2021-2022 at page 47 para 4.

who are not proscribed by the Government of India under UAPA, without informing the Government of Manipur.⁷ In 2008, the Government of Manipur was compelled by the Government of India to join in the agreement.⁸ Many of these Kuki militants are Myanmar based militant organisations including Kuki National Army (KNA) and Zomi Revolutionary Army (ZRA).⁹ This fact is admitted by an Officer of Indian army that “KNA or KNA (B) are the same. On the Myanmar side, they are known as KNA (B) and just a change of nomenclature when they cross the border.”¹⁰ In contrary to the recommendation of the Committee,¹¹ the Government of India through its army and paramilitary are using these Myanmar based militant groups to finish off insurgency movement in Manipur¹² who assert for their political right to self-determination. The Government of Manipur is yet to comply with the recommendations of SHRC, Manipur wherein it is stated that “a concerted effort can be effectively made by constituting a **“Peace and Reconciliation Commission”** It shall involve all the stakeholders as envisioned by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in the case Extra Judicial Executions Victims’ Families Association, Manipur, in order to address and ensure a lasting peace.”¹³

The Human Rights Committee and more than 18 UN Human Rights institutions and independent experts expressed their concerns about special powers under AFSPA and other legislations, such as the Unlawful Activities Prevention Act, the National Investigative Agency (NIA) Act and the National Security Act. The legal construction of AFSPA runs counter to the provisions of ICCPR in areas which are declared to be disturbed. According to the Human Rights Committee’s Concluding Observations in 1997, in particular, articles 6,7, 9 and 14 of the ICCPR are violated by security and armed forces acting under AFSPA as well as by paramilitary organisations employed by pertinent state agencies. The government of India has not accepted any of the recommendations pertaining to these concerns.

The NGOs called “Extrajudicial Execution Victim Families Association Manipur” (EEVFAM) and Human Rights Alert have filed a Public Interest Litigation in the Supreme Court of India in 2012, seeking justice for 1,528 cases of extrajudicial executions that occurred under AFSPA in Manipur from 1979 to 2012. In 2016, the Supreme Court came out with a historic judgement saying that extrajudicial execution cannot be tolerated even in areas where AFSPA is applicable. Since then, the phenomenon of extrajudicial execution has fortunately come to a low while impunity remains for any of the atrocities committed.

In July 2007, at the behest of the Supreme Court of India, the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) started investigating in 98 cases on prima facie evidence and 41 incidents of extrajudicial executions have been investigated in detail. In August 2018, the CBI had registered 39 First Information Report (FIR) against security forces. The Supreme Court also appointed in 2013 the Justice Santosh Hegde Commission who found that none of the victims in six cases examined had affiliations with a banned or unlawful organization.

About twelve years now have passed since the families of the 1,528 victims of alleged extrajudicial executions moved to the Supreme Court. Delays in prosecution, and ongoing threats and harassment continue to frustrate their quest for justice. Although the CBI filed chargesheets in 8 cases, and trials have begun in 5 cases in courts in Manipur, the SIT (Special Investigation Team of CBI) observes

⁷<https://www.ifp.co.in/manipur/manipur-integrity-in-soo-agreement-min>

⁸ Ibid

⁹<https://www.ifp.co.in/manipur/manipur-cabinet-resolves-to-withdraw-from-soo>

¹⁰https://ukhrultimes.com/border-villages-at-kamjong-accuse-indian-security-forces-of-involvement-in-the-ongoing-myanmar-war/#google_vignette

¹¹ CCPR/C/79/Add.81 at para 18

¹²<https://thefrontiermanipur.com/the-indian-military-policy-in-manipur-the-kuki-mercenaries/>

¹³ MHRC Annual Report 2021-2022 at page 64

many challenges at the time of investigation, gathering of evidences, interrogation of perpetrators etc. In a Writ Petition of 2018, army personnel have been seeking class impunity from legal action in their conduct of counter insurgency operations. The number of petitioners increased to currently more than 750. The investigation status of the majority of the cases is unknown. SIT submitted 18 charge sheets and nine closed reports to the designated Courts in Manipur since 2023.

On the other hand, government of India fails the prosecution sanction to investigate the Indian Army and Paramilitary forces whose names are listed the charge sheet submitted by CBI and SIT.

Non-Discrimination

Civil and Political Rights Violations

Discrimination, like violence, manifests in many forms and ways, both direct and indirect. Subjecting certain indigenous ethnic minorities to consistent direct and indirect violence is also a form of discrimination. The forcible annexation and resultant military occupation of the sovereign state of Manipur in 1949 has been opposed since the annexation. Various popular democratic opposition groups have been undertaking resistance movements, including armed opposition, against the Indian State ever since.

By the willful denial of the inalienable right to self-determination to the people of Manipur, India has blatantly violated Article 1 of two International Covenants, ICCPR and ICESCR to which India is party, notwithstanding the fact that India has played a crucial role in adopting UN General Assembly resolution¹⁴ on the “*Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples*” in 1960.

The Committee, after consideration of India’s 3rd Periodic Report under ICCPR (1997), had pointed out that the problem is political and that the approach to resolving it must also, essentially, be political in nature¹⁵, but such approaches must be in compliance with the provisions of the Covenant. The Committee informed the Government of India to bear in mind the right to self-determination of peoples, the right to freedom of expression and the right to participation in governance.

The Government of India continues to adopt a military response to the political struggle in Manipur, in blatant contravention of the provisions of the Covenant, by enacting emergency legislations and introducing security apparatuses supported by overwhelming force. Massive deployment of armed forces and military actions are undertaken under the Armed Forces (Special Powers) Act, 1958 (known as AFSPA). The recommendation to ratify the Convention against Torture (CAT) and to end practice of torture remains unheeded (Universal Periodic Review 1 and 2). The ratification of the Convention on the Protection of All Persons against Enforced Disappearances, which was accepted in the UPR 1, was rejected in UPR 2.

Other security related legislation including, *inter alia*, (i) Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967 (UAPA), (ii) Prevention of Seditious Meetings Act, 1911, (iii) Official Secrets Act, 1923, (iv) Maintenance of Public Order Act, 1947, (v) Punjab Security of the State Act, 1953, (vi) National Security Act, 1980 (NSA), (viii) Code of Criminal Procedures (Manipur Amendment) Act, 1983, and (ix) National Investigation Agency Act, 2008 (NIA) were introduced.

iii. Gross Violations under de facto State of Emergency

¹⁴<http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/declaration.shtml> Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: Adopted by General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960

¹⁵<https://www.hrw.org/reports/1999/india/India994-21.htm> Para 18, Concluding observations of the Human Rights Committee: India

1. Manipur has become one of the most militarized areas of the world. In the prevailing armed conflict situation of Manipur, not less than 1, 00,000 Indian soldiers in addition to several thousands of police, mercenaries, intelligence agencies, etc., in a population of below 3 million are deployed. With the enactment of AFSPA, massive deployment of armed forces in Manipur continued; the armed forces are occupying sacred cultural sites, schools, health centers, local government offices and prime agricultural land.
2. Many education institutions like Manipur University continue to be occupied by the Assam Rifles. Mass graves are discovered from schools formerly occupied by the Indian security forces, such as the Tombisana High School in the heart of Imphal City, the State's capital. The Government of India has failed to conduct any impartial investigation into the case of discovery of mass graves in Tombisana High School in Imphal, Manipur. Despite of the plea of the Families of the Involuntary Disappeared Association Manipur (FIDAM) to scientifically conduct exhumation of the site, the government has continued excavation and construction of a shopping complex by destroying the vital evidence. The government has not responded to the repeated queries of the UN Working Group on Enforced and Involuntary Disappearances.
3. While India refutes the existence of a *de jure* armed conflict situation in Manipur, it tacitly acknowledges the *de facto* existence of armed conflict, a fact proven by the numerous military operations and related activities undertaken under different operational code-names, such as, inter alia, operations (Annex see table). The refutation denies the civilian population and the combatants from the protection of international humanitarian law and the services of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC).
4. The AFSPA, couched in the colonial Armed Forces (Special Powers) Ordinance promulgated by the colonial British government on August 15, 1942 to suppress "Quit India Movement" was imposed despite the stern opposition of representatives of Manipur to the Indian Parliament. Manipur's Member of Indian Parliament (MP), *Mr. Paonam Achou* strongly opposed the Bill to enact the AFSPA, 1958 in the parliamentary debate on 18th August 1958.
5. The invocation of AFSPA for half a century in Manipur has blatantly violated non-derogable rights, primarily the "right to life" provided by Article 4 of the ICCPR. Under Section 3 of AFSPA, Manipur has been declared as a "disturbed area". Under section 4(a) of AFSPA, a non-commissioned officer of the Indian army can shoot to kill in mere suspicion of crimes defined by the Government.
6. The invocation of AFSPA in Manipur and India's NE region has violated Article 4 (a) of ICCPR on declaration of "States of Emergency" since *de facto* emergency has been imposed without formal promulgation of any form of public emergency.
7. Section 6 of the AFSPA specifies that, "[N]o prosecution, suit or other legal proceeding shall be instituted, except with the previous sanction of the Government, against any person in respect of anything done or purported to be done in exercise of the powers conferred by this Act".
8. Recommendations of the UPR 1 and 2 regarding AFSPA, 1958 are not accepted by India. AFSPA was further extended for one more year in Manipur on December 2015. The AFSPA, 1958 continues to be enforced and there are no processes for repeal or review. The AFSPA, 1958 is also freshly introduced in 12 Districts of Arunachal Pradesh, bordering Assam, despite wide objections.
9. The typical response of the Government to cases of rampant human rights violation both by the armed forces and the law enforcing agencies in Manipur is, under immense public pressure, the institution of judicial and magisterial inquiries from time to time. A basic problem of setting up such inquiries is the lack of transparency, concealing of inquiry reports without any action being taken up against the perpetrators.

10. There is a deliberate or inordinate delay in executing speedy trial of all Human rights cases pending in various courts of the country. There is need for speedy trial of all human rights related cases by instituting special court for the purpose.
11. Justice Jeevan Reddy Review Committee on AFSPA, 2005, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD)¹⁶, the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR), 2007¹⁷, and the Committee on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)¹⁸ and the UN Special Rapporteur on human rights defenders, violence against women and extrajudicial executions during their visits in Manipur and in North East India in 2011, 2012 and 2013 have recommended the repeal of the AFSPA, 1958, However, these recommendation have remained unheeded by India.
12. The Manipur Human Rights Commission (MHRC) has remained defunct since 2010 as no new members has been appointed by the Government despite of an order of the Gauhati High Court.

iv. *Impact of Militarization*

13. **Extra-judicial, summary and arbitrary executions** in Manipur, mostly of young men, resulted in the proliferation of young widows and orphans. The widows face the burden of being a young widow in Manipur. The families of the victims of extra-judicial executions formed an association in 2009 called 'Extra-judicial Executions' Victim Families Association, Manipur' (EEVFAM). Their requests to register under the Societies Registration Act 1989 were denied by the Government of Manipur, thereby also denying their right to freedom of association. Members of the society continue to be denied welfare and rehabilitation benefits from the State.
14. EEVFAM moved the Supreme Court of India seeking justice and reparation for 1528 victims of extra-judicial executions. In this case, EEVFAM vs. Union of India, writ petition (criminal No. 129 of 2012), the Supreme Court appointed a commission to inquiry into six randomly chosen cases. The commission found none of the cases to be genuine as claimed by the security forces and none of the victims have any established criminal records as claimed by the security force. In its interim judgment the court asserted that all the cases of excesses and retaliatory killings should be probed. But it is still not clear what would be the nature of the probe.
15. The law enforcement agencies in Manipur are also responsible for a wide range of human rights violations, often committed in close coordination with the Indian armed forces. The Manipur police commandos are also primarily responsible for committing a series of extra-judicial executions in the pretext of encounter killings in Manipur. The case of the extra-judicial execution of *Chungkham Sanjit* and *Thokchom Rebina* on July 23, 2009 by Manipur police commandoes, in the middle of Imphal in full public view, remains an infamous case and stark evidence of how the law enforcing agencies perpetrate human rights violations with impunity in Manipur. *Thounaojam Herojit*, the head constable who actually pulled the trigger confessed publically of this deed, but he also admitted that he did so following orders from his superiors. *Thounaojam Herojit* is facing trial but not his superiors who turned him into a killing machine.
16. The practice of torture continues with impunity. In Manipur, almost every person who is arrested or detained is tortured; and the common methods include verbal abuse, psychological torture, blind-folding, hooding, beating, electric shocks to the genitalia, water-boarding, etc. Only a few

¹⁶<http://docstore.ohchr.org/SelfServices/FilesHandler.ashx?enc=6QkG1d%2fPPRiCAqhKb7yhsgU0zkGW3DaEaEZzdG AfeNjaQkporzAddUxC4lWuaHQI%2fa2rFrSfdTfIXZNxVfPK2In4pk6yEaETwOuqs2KqTD4UBHoaYzs5VDvOKrUoq bzE;Para 12:Concluding observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination: India>

¹⁷<https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G08/436/08/PDF/G0843608.pdf?OpenElement>; Para 50:Concluding Observations of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights: India

¹⁸CEDAW/C/IND/CO/4-5; Para 13: Concluding observations on the combined fourth and fifth periodic reports of India

survivors of torture dare to make formal complaints to the authorities; however, the institutional response of the judiciary as well the State and National Human Rights Commissions is to retraumatize the complainant, discourage and demoralize them.

17. ***Enforced Disappearances:*** Notwithstanding Government of India's commitment to ratify CED, no concrete positive steps have been taken by the Government of India to ratify the CED. On the other hand, the phenomenon of enforced disappearances continues in Manipur. The practice of secret detention and elimination persists.
18. ***Discovery of Mass Grave in Tombisana High School:*** At least eight human skeletal remains were found on December 25, 2014 at the campus of Tombisana High School in the heart of Imphal Town in Manipur in India's Northeast by laborer engaged in construction work for a new market complex. The school was formerly occupied for almost three decades by the Central Reserve Police Force, the Border Security Forces Manipur Police Commandoes and very close area of Joint Interrogation Cell.

The discovery of skeletal remains and skulls has raised suspicions, especially among the families of those disappeared in the hands of Indian Army paramilitary units that the skeletal remains were those of their missing and loved ones whose bodies were never recovered. Various cases of enforced disappearances (1980-2000) were recorded in which the main perpetrators were Central Reserve Police Force, the Assam Rifles, J&K light infantry, Madras Regiment, Sikh infantry, etc. After intense public pressure, the Government of Manipur on December 29, 2014 decided to hand over the investigation on skulls recovery to the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI), which never took place. (Annex - Also See Memorandum of the Committee on Mass Grave at Tombisana High School, submitted to the Chief Minister of Manipur, dated January 25, 2015).

The constitution of India is silent on the legal and legitimate process to deal with the democratic aspiration of the peoples and nations to part from the Union. The law that attracts the activities of these groups with such aspiration is the Unlawful Activities Prevention Act (UAPA). Under this law, "secession" is included in the definition of "terrorist". Section 2 (1) states "secession of a part of the territory of India from the Union "includes the assertion of any claim to determine whether such part will remain a part of the territory of India".

However, such criminalization of the political discourses cannot deter the democratic aspirations of the people of Manipur. As a matter of fact, Manipur with just 0.2 per cent of the population of India constitute a whooping 65 pc of the total detentions under the UAPA across the country. How does one explain this paradox? The answer perhaps can be seen from the history. Manipur, which stood an independent kingdom in the western frontier of south East Asia for at least two millennia, was forcibly annexed into the dominion of India on 15 October 1949. In doing so, India under the minded the democratically elected popular Assembly and Council of Ministers already functioning then under the Manipur Constitution act 1947. No plebiscite/ referendum of the people of Manipur was ever conducted thereby violating the Right to Self-determination of the Manipur nation.

Elaborating on this issue of the right to self-determination of Manipur, the Committee on Human Rights (COHR), Manipur had already submitted an alternative report during the third periodic review of India for consideration of the Human Rights Committee in February 1997.

When the UN Special Rapporteur on the situation of Human Rights Defenders, Margaret Sekaggaya visited India in 2011 and met a group of HRD from Manipur in Guwahati she wrote the following in her report submitted to the General assembly and Human Rights Council:

At the time of her visit, Manipur was reportedly the state worst affected by militarization with more

than half a dozen human rights groups having been banned as terrorist due to their self-determination advocacy.

Proposal for a UN monitored Plebiscite by the proscribed United Liberation Front (UNLF) of Manipur to resolve ‘the politico-military conflict in Manipur ‘has no takers in the corridors of power in New Delhi. Instead, the Chairman of UNLF Mr. RK Meghen was arrested and charged with waging war against the state by the NIA.

The proscribed Revolutionary People’s front submitted a memorandum to the Secretary General of the UN and Chairman of the Decolonization Committee “for decolonization of the Manipur from Indian colonialism and alien racist regime, enlisting Manipur in the list of the non-self- governing territories of the UN and, restoration of independence and sovereignty of Manipur”.

Scope of International obligations

India is state party to a number of core UN human rights standards, among others the ICCPR, ratified in April 1979 but with reservations declared to articles 1 (right to self-determination), 9, 13.

India has-till date- not ratified the following core conventions: CAT, CED, CMW and neither ILO Convention 169. India is not a party to any of the Optional Protocols (individual complaint and abolition the death penalty mechanisms) to the UN core conventions. India did not accede to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.

HR Committee during India’s third periodic review stress the need to address the issues of ‘armed insurgency” by political means.

Recommendations:

- CSCHR would like to request the Human Rights Committee to urge the government of India to drop its reservation on Article 1 of the Covenant and to let the people of Manipur freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic and social development.
- Ratify CAT, CED, CMW, ILO Convention 169 and the Rome Statute.
- Ratify all optional protocols to the UN core standards
- Respect and implement recommendations made by UN treaties bodies, Special Rapporteurs and UN High Commissioners of Human Rights with regard to repeal AFSPA as a matter of urgency.
- Urge to Government of India to issue the Prosecution sanction to investigate the India Army and Paramilitary forces for committing extrajudicial execution.

Request to the Committee:

CSCHR requests the Committee to address the issue of self-determination in Manipur and seek information from the Indian government on measures to resolve political conflicts through democratic means.



(Phulindro Konsam)
Convenor
CSCHR
Imphal
Manipur (India)

