

**JOINT
STAKEHOLDERS'
REPORT**

**CIVIL SOCIETY
COALITION ON
HUMAN RIGHTS
IN MANIPUR
AND THE UN**

India

STATUS OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN MANIPUR

North-Eastern Region

Submitted to the
Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights

2ND CYCLE
UNIVERSAL PERIODIC REVIEW
HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL
United Nations

INDIA

28 November 2011

CONTENTS

- A. Introduction**
- B. International human rights and humanitarian laws obligations**
- C. Human Rights Violations in Manipur**
- D. Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of Indigenous Peoples in Manipur**
- E. Specific Cases of Development Processes in Manipur and Indigenous Peoples**
- F. Recommendations**

A. Introduction

1. This stakeholders' report is the joint submission by the Civil Society Coalition on Human Rights in Manipur and UN, prepared through a collective consultative process, consisting of informal and formal meetings, conducted from September to November 2011. This coalition is the outcome of the collective engagement with the Special Rapporteur on Human Rights Defenders during her visit in January 2011.
2. The report highlights key features of the unacceptable human rights situation prevailing in the frontier State of Manipur in the so-called North-Eastern region of India. It provides vital supplemental information in the examination of India's human rights situation during the second cycle of the Universal Periodic Review conducted by the UN Human Rights Council.
3. The North East region is inhabited by over 220 distinct peoples or communities, classified as tribes, ethnics or backward classes, with as many languages. Over the last two decades, these communities asserted their identities as "indigenous peoples".
4. Manipur is one of the seven Himalayan provinces in the region, which includes Arunachal Pradesh, Nagaland, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Sikkim and Tripura. Manipur, inhabited by more than 30 indigenous communities, is rich in biological diversity and natural resources.

The constituent members of the Civil Society Coalition on Human Rights in Manipur and the UN endorsing this submission are:

Centre for Organisation Research & Education (CORE)

Citizens Concern for Dams and Development (CCDD)

Civil Liberties and Human Rights Organisation (CLAHRO)

Civil Liberties People Forum (CLPF)

Committee on Human Rights, Manipur (COHR)

Extra-judicial Execution Victim Families' Association Manipur (EEVFAM)

Families of the Involuntarily Disappeared's Association Manipur (FIDAM)

Federation of Regional Indigenous Societies (FREINDS)

Forum for Indigenous Perspective and Action (FIPA)

Human Rights Alert (HRA)

Human Rights Law Network Manipur (HRLN-M)

Just Peace Foundation (JPF)

Movement for Peoples' Right to Information Manipur (M-PRIM)

North East Dialogue Forum (NEDF)

Threatened Indigenous Peoples Society (TIPS)

United Peoples Front (UPF)

5. Manipur was a sovereign state¹ until its subjugation by British in 1891. With the lapse of British paramountcy she regained her sovereign status on 14 August 1947. A constitutional monarchy was established under the Manipur Constitution Act, 1947 after electing a Manipur State Assembly and a Council of Ministers, through adult franchise. But the nascent democracy was summarily dissolved with the annexation of Manipur into the Dominion of India in 1949. No referendum or plebiscite of the people of Manipur was solicited thereby denying the right to self-determination of the nation. The forcible annexation and subsequent military occupation was resisted democratically ever since, which consolidated during the 60s and escalated into an open armed conflict by the 1970s.
6. The Government of India (GoI) continues to insist on a military response to the political struggle in Manipur, by enacting emergency legislations and introducing security apparatuses. Massive deployment of armed forces and military actions are undertaken under the Armed Forces (Special Powers) Act, 1958 (AFSPA). Other security 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), (vii) Prevention of Terrorism Act, 2002 (POTA), (viii) Code of Criminal Procedures (Manipur Amendment) Act 1983, and (ix) National Investigation Agency Act 2008 (NIA) were introduced.

B. International human rights and humanitarian laws obligations

7. This submission emphasises that the government of India has failed to widely and constructively involve civil society in all stages of follow up and implementation of the recommendations of the first UPR. The recommendations have neither been disseminated across the country nor has the civil society been engaged in its implementation.
8. India played a crucial role in adopting UN General Assembly resolution declaring the right of the peoples to self-determination in 1960 (Resolution 1514 [XV] adopted 14 December 1960). However, by putting reservations to common Article 1 of the two International Covenants, ICCPR and ICESCR, India deliberately denied the inalienable right to self-determination of the people of Manipur. India continues to declare the non-state organisations of Manipur demanding the right to self-determination as “terrorist” under the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act. The UN Human Rights Committee (HRC) has pointed out that the problem is political and that the approach to resolving it must also, essentially, be political in nature. In doing so, the Committee reminded 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 governance².
9. India also continues to disregard recommendations of other human rights treaties monitoring bodies. The HRC specifically requested the Indian Supreme Court to examine the Covenant compatibility while examining the constitutional validity of the Armed Forces (Special Powers)

¹ Reaffirmed, among others, by the Anglo-Manipuri Defence Treaty, 14 September, 1762 A.D and the Anglo-Burmese Yandaboo Treaty of 24 February 1826 A.D

² UN Human Rights Committee (HRC), ICCPR: Concluding Observations, India, 3rd Periodic Report, 1997, Paragraph 18 (CCPR/C/79/add.81of 4 August 1997).

Act 1958 (AFSPA). The request was completely ignored by the judgement pronounced by the apex Court on 27 November 1997. India has ceased to report to the HRC and the 4th Periodic Report under the ICCPR is overdue since 2001.

10. Further, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD)³ has urged the government of India to repeal the discriminatory AFSPA in February 2007, and to report on the steps taken within a year. India has not responded to various reminders from the Committee. Similar recommendations on AFSPA have come from the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR)⁴, Committee on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)⁵ and the Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC)⁶. This issue of non-compliance was raised by the governments of the United Kingdom, Canada and Germany in the first UPR of India.
11. Pertaining to international humanitarian law, India has ratified the four Geneva Conventions of 1949 and enacted the Geneva Conventions Act, 1960. However, the Government is yet to ratify the Additional Protocols of 1977. In the North Eastern region especially in Manipur, India acknowledges the *de facto* existence of armed conflict by undertaking military operations and related activities under different operational code-names, such as, *inter alia*, operations “Blue Bird” (1988), “Sunny Vale” (1993), “Loktak” (2005), “Tornado” (2005), “Dragnet” (2006), “Somtal I” (2006) and “Somtal II” (2008), and “Summer Storm” (2009)⁷, while refuting a *de jure* armed conflict situation, thereby denying 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).
12. The situation of armed conflict reflected in the militarisation scenario vis-à-vis combatants is summarised below:

Table No.1

| State Forces | Non-state organisations who ceased hostility with the State Forces | Non-State Organisations having active hostility with State Forces |
|--|---|---|
| Indian Army Units under 57 Mountain Division | Ethnic based armed organisations in cease-fire arrangement with government of India (2) | Organisations fighting for the restoration of Manipur’s independence, proscribed as unlawful terrorist organisations under UAPA (6) |
| Para-military Forces [Assam Rifles (IGAR | Ethnic based armed organisations in suspension of operations | |

³ UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD), UNCERD : Concluding Observations, India, 5 May 2007, CERD/C/IND/CO/19

⁴ UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR), ICESCR: Concluding Observations, India, 8 August 2008, E/C.12/IND/CO/5, Para. 50

⁵ UN Committee on Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), UNCEDAW: Concluding observations, India, 1 February 2000, para. 72 – “The Committee recommends a review of prevention of terrorism legislation and the Armed Forces Special Powers Act....”

⁶ UN Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC): Concluding Observations, India, CRC/C/15/Add.228, Para 68-69

⁷ Please see, for some references, http://www.satp.org/satporgtp/countries/india/states/manipur/data_sheets/majorincidents.htm

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| South), Border Security Force, Central Reserve Police Force] | arrangement with government of India (18) | |
| Indian Reserve Battalions (8) | | |
| Manipur Rifles Battalions (6) | | |
| Manipur Police Commandos (specially trained in counter-insurgency) in all the 9 districts of Manipur | | |
| Manipur Police (Civil) | | |
| Home Guards | | |
| Village Defence Forces (officially armed vigilante groups) | | |

13. The key recommendations of the first Universal Periodic Review of India in April 2008 have not been implemented. India has not ratified the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (UNCAT) as well as the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance (CED).
14. The standing invitation to UN Special Thematic Procedures extended by India in September 2011 is welcome. There is a very strong apprehension, however, that Thematic Procedures visiting India on mission would be denied entry into Manipur, such as the denial of the request of the Special Rapporteur on Human Rights Defenders in January 2011.

C. Human Rights Violations in Manipur

15. The promulgation of AFSPA for the last 53 years in Manipur, which grants the Indian armed forces special powers to kill on mere suspicion, search without warrant, destroy property institutionalises impunity, blatantly violating the non-derogable rights to life, right against torture, right against arbitrary detention and right to fair trial as provided by the ICCPR.
16. During the first UPR India submitted that the Supreme Court has upheld the constitutionality of AFSPA. However, India has failed to inform the international bodies the recommendations of the officially constituted Committee to Review AFSPA (2005), headed by Justice Jeevan Reddy, which stated that *“It is true that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has upheld its constitutional validity but that circumstance is not an endorsement of the desirability or advisability of the Act. When the constitutional validity of an enactment is challenged in a Court, the Court examines (i) whether the Act is within the legislative competence of the Legislature which enacted it and (ii) whether the enactment violates any of the provisions of the Constitution. The Court does not - it is not supposed to - pronounce upon the wisdom or the necessity of such an enactment. It must be remembered that even while upholding its constitutional validity, the Hon'ble Court has found it fit and necessary not merely to approve the "Dos and Don'ts" in the instructions issued by the Army Headquarters from time to time but has also added certain riders of its own viz., those contained in clauses 8, 9 and 14 to 21 in para 74 of its judgment (at pages 156 and 157 of the judgment in Naga Peoples' Movement Of Human Rights v Union Of India - (1998) 2 SCC 109).*

The Committee is of the opinion that legislative shape must be given to many of these riders. We must also mention the impression gathered by it during the course of its work viz., the Act, for whatever reason, has become a symbol of oppression, an object of hate and an instrument of discrimination and highhandedness. It is highly desirable and advisable to repeal this Act altogether...” (emphasis added)

17. The view of this Committee has been concurred by other official bodies of India, such as the Second Administrative Reform Commission, 2007 as well as the Prime Minister’s Working Group on Confidence Building Measures in Jammu & Kashmir, 2007.
18. AFSPA violates 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. Under Section 3 of AFSPA, the entire State of Manipur has been declared as a “disturbed area” since 1980.⁸ Section 6 of AFSPA specifies that, “No 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”. This impunity provision is found to be incompatible with the obligations of the Government under Article 2 (3) of the ICCPR to ensure the provision of an effective remedy in cases involving violations of human rights.
19. *Extrajudicial Executions*: In the continuing pattern of extra-judicial executions since the last UPR review till December 2010, the government of India has extra-judicially executed more than 668 persons.

Table No. 2

| Year | Killed in officially claimed “encounter” | Refutation by family members as killed after arrest/abduction | Deceased’s family deny any link with armed organisation |
|------|--|---|---|
| 2010 | 73 | 11 | 1 |
| 2009 | 298 | 43 | 34 |
| 2008 | 297 | 50 | 51 |
| 2007 | 121 | 15 | 12 |

Based on documentation of *Human Rights Alert* (2011)

20. 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 a series of extra-judicial executions in the pretext of encounter killings in Manipur. The case of the extra-judicial execution of Chungkham Shanjit and Thockchom Rebina on 23 July 2009 by Manipur police commandoes, in the middle

⁸ Except 7 (seven) Assembly Constituencies in the Imphal Municipality Area, which were de-notified in 2004 under the pressure of unprecedented people’s protests against the custodial murder and rape of Miss Thangjam Manorama by personnel of the 17th Bn. of Assam Rifles.

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.

21. The National Human Rights Commission has written a letter (refer No. 22/14/2004-2005-DB-II/FC dated 28 January 2010) to the Chief Secretary of Manipur asking why the Government of Manipur has not submitted reports of 111 cases of police encounter killings. Inquiries regarding extra-judicial executions are conducted by an Executive Magistrate rather than a Judicial Magistrate, violating Section 176 of the Criminal Procedures Code (Amended 2005). Executive Magistrates have limited knowledge of law and are not mandated to make judicial opinions. The prevailing climate of impunity coupled with the lack of witness protection discourages witnesses to cooperate in the inquiries. The ignorance of the families on legal matters and imposed time limitation, under the Protection of Human Rights Act 1992, of making complaints render most extra-judicial executions unregistered. All inquiries completed are never made public, and action taken reports are not placed in the public domain. The former Special Rapporteur on Extra-Judicial Executions, Prof. Philip G. Alston, reported to the UN Human Rights Council in 2007 that despite the Government of Manipur ordering numerous inquiries into alleged extra-judicial executions, none of them ultimately reached any meaningful conclusions⁹.
22. Extra-judicial executions in Manipur, mostly of young men, resulted in the proliferation of young widows and orphans. The widows face the double burden of being a young widow in a traditional patriarchal society as well as the stigma of being branded as families of terrorists. 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 are denied welfare benefits from the State.
23. *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.

Table No. 3

| No. | Name of the victim | Sex | Year of Submission to WGEID | Alleged Agency Involved | Present Status |
|-----|-----------------------------|------|-----------------------------|---|---------------------|
| 1 | Gurumayum Jeeteshwor Sharma | Male | 2011 | Assam Rifle an Indian Para-military Force | Still 'Disappeared' |
| 2 | Longjam Suresh Singh | Male | 2011 | 12 Maratha Light Infantry of Indian Army stationed at Mayang Imphal | Still 'Disappeared' |

⁹ Report of UN Special Rapporteur on Extrajudicial Execution to the UN Human Rights Council A/HRC/4/20/Add.1.

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|------|------|---|--|
| 3 | Leimakhujam Kokulo Singh | Male | 2010 | 12 Maratha Light Infantry of Indian Army stationed at Patsoi Police Station | Acknowledged detention |
| 4 | Raj Kumar Sanayaima | Male | 2010 | Intelligence Agencies of the Governments of India and Bangladesh | Extraordinary rendering from Bangladesh to India after secret detention of 61 days |

Based on documentation of *Human Rights Alert* (2011)

24. 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 survivors of torture dare to make formal complaints to the authorities; however, the institutional response of the lower judiciary as well the State and National Human Rights Commissions is to re-traumatise the complainant, discourage and demoralise them.
25. *Human Rights Defenders*: Human rights defenders are targeted for promoting and defending indigenous peoples' rights. Human rights defenders are labelled as terrorists, and charged under criminal laws. Human rights defenders are also arbitrarily arrested, detained and subjected to severe torture. Human Rights defenders and their organizations are subjected to close monitoring and surveillance including phone and email tapping, email and postal intercepting, hacking, post restrictions and postal theft, restrictions to movement, etc. Right to Information activists have been subjected to systematic targeting by the incorrigibly corrupt and abusive state bureaucracy through threats, arbitrary detention and torture.
26. *Torture and arbitrary detention of Miss Irom Sharmila*: The continued solitary confinement and detention of Miss Irom Sharmila who has been on a hunger strike demanding the repeal of AFSPA since November 2000 constitutes severe mental and physical torture. Miss Sharmila has been charged for attempt to commit suicide under Section 309 of the Indian Penal Code and kept in detention for the past 11 years. An executive order issued by the Home Department, Government of Manipur dated 8 October 2004 stipulating "not to allow anybody" to meet her without "clear permission of the Home Department"¹⁰ severely curtails her basic human rights and fundamental freedoms including her right to communicate with her family, friends and supporters.
27. The Manipur Human Rights Commission (MHRC) and Manipur State Women's Commission were established, but the MHRC has remained defunct since 2010 as no new members has been appointed by the Government despite an order of the Gauhati High Court.¹¹ The MHRC also

¹⁰ State Home Department vide Order No. 5/6(2)/88H(J)(Pt-I) dated 8 October 2004

¹¹ Order dated 19 October 2011 following PIL (Writ Petition) No. 15 of 2011 (<http://kanglaonline.com/2011/10/hc-directives-to-appoint-mhrc-chairman-within-four-weeks/>)

receives most inadequate financial and personnel support from the government, despite repeated appeals by the members of the Commission.

28. The State and National Human Rights Commissions are not in compliance with the Paris Principles. Section 19 of the PHRA 1993 specifically barred the armed forces of the Union from the jurisdiction of the Commission.

D. Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of Indigenous Peoples in Manipur

29. *Development in Context of Denial of Right to Self Determination of Indigenous Peoples:* A serious challenge with the initiation of developmental projects in Manipur is the non-recognition of indigenous peoples' rights to control and manage their own land and resources, define their development priorities and their rights to be consulted and seek free and prior informed consent (FPIC) before such projects are implemented. Indigenous peoples' right to self-determination, as enunciated in Article 3 of UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) has not been recognized. India also practices the doctrine of *eminent domain* in her policies and legislation regarding land, natural resources and acquisition.
30. The government of India continues to perpetuate a policy of assimilation of indigenous peoples in developmental decision making process and implementation, as in the obsolete ILO Convention 107, rather than the progressive partnership model enunciated in ILO Convention 169. India has not ratified ILO Convention 169 though it has supported the adoption of UNDRIP.
31. The government of India continues to adhere to an insidious policy of gradual demographic profile changes by allowing a steady influx and settling of non-indigenous alien communities on indigenous lands and territories, such as Nepalese, Bengali and people from Myanmar, thereby progressively rendering the indigenous populations into a minority.¹² Over the years, the indigenous population of Tripura State in the region has been reduced to an absolute minority. In the States of Manipur, Tripura, Nagaland and Arunachal Pradesh, indigenous lands have been lost at a massive scale through alienation. The issue was discussed at the Manipur State Assembly (August 2011), and the government assured to urge the central government to re-introduce the Inner Line Permit (ILP) system or Inner Line (IL) Regulation in the State. However, no steps have been taken.
32. *The rights of the indigenous child:* The rights of indigenous children are a major concern in Manipur for several decades. Violations of indigenous children's rights in Manipur constitute a wide range of rights. Despite a number of national laws to protect children in vulnerable situations and from exploitation, such as those involved in armed conflicts or in conflict with law,

¹² According to the *Federation of Regional Indigenous Societies* (FREINDS) of Manipur (August 2011), after the Inner Line Permit (ILP) system in Manipur was lifted on 18 November 1950 there has been an unregulated flood of migrants from Bangladesh, Nepal and Myanmar. The total population of Manipur is 2.3 million (based on 2001 Census), the number of immigrants has grown to 0.7 million i.e. one third of the total population of the state, even surpassing the combined population of officially recognised tribal peoples. (<http://www.manipur-talks.com/index.php?threads/is-it-time-to-implement-ilp-in-manipur.1737/>). The report of the *United Committee Manipur* (UCM) "[Influx of Migrants into Manipur](#)" (August 2011) states that the number of migrants (7,04,488) outnumbered the State's indigenous tribal population (6,70,782), while the majority indigenous Meetei was just 9,18,626 (2001 census).

the government of India has failed to protect indigenous children. Trafficking of indigenous children from Manipur continues unhindered. More than two hundred trafficked children have been rescued from across the country, and returned to Manipur according to the Social Welfare Department of the government of Manipur. However, children who have been rescued have been returned to their home districts without appropriate measures to rehabilitate them.

33. The Indian Supreme Court has passed an order that armed forces, particularly paramilitary forces, are to vacate educational institutions in the North Eastern region on 1 September 2010. The Supreme Court's order sought an urgent report on matters related to the occupation of educational areas or their adjoining spaces by army and military forces. The Ministry of Human Resource Development was directed to submit a list of schools and hostels, in the North Eastern states that have been occupied by armed/security forces. This order has not been fully complied with till date.¹³
34. The UNDRIP was supported by India. However, India stated during the first Universal Periodic Review that, at independence, after the departure of the colonizers, its entire people, including the tribal people, were considered as indigenous.¹⁴ The Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples, Prof. James Anaya strongly commented on India's position reiterating the objectives and human rights principles underlying the UNDRIP and the practice of the multiple United Nations and regional mechanisms and programmes addressing indigenous issues.¹⁵
35. This position of India, effectively and deliberately, denies all the rights of India's indigenous peoples as elaborated in the UNDRIP, while trivialising its constructive engagement in the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII), the Expert Mechanism on Indigenous Peoples (EMRIP) and other UN bodies or programmes.

E. Specific Cases of Development Projects and impacts on Indigenous Peoples

36. The Government of India introduces destructive, unsustainable development projects in Manipur such as the construction of *Loktak Multipurpose Hydroelectric Project (HEP)*, *Mapithel Dam*¹⁶ and the proposed *Tipaimukh Dam* without the free, prior and informed consent of the people of Manipur. The commission of the 105 MW Loktak HEP in 1984 by the National Hydro-Electric Power Corporation (NHPC), has led to submergence of an estimated 83,450 hectares of agricultural land. At least 30,000 indigenous persons were affected. The government has failed to resettle and rehabilitate them. Likewise, the construction of Mapithel Dam has undermined the survival of the people dependent on the river, agricultural land and the forest along the Thoubal River.¹⁷ Military and security cover for large-scale infrastructure construction has become the norm in the region. The proposed 1500 MW Tipaimukh HEP in Manipur has been accorded

¹³ <http://indianmilitarynews.wordpress.com/tag/ministry-of-home-affairs/>

¹⁴ Human Rights Council's Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, in its report of 23rd May 2008; A/HRC/8/26, Para

¹⁵ See Report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples (Addendum, Cases examined by the Special Rapporteur, 2009-2010; A/HRC/15/37/Add.1; Para 201- 239)

¹⁶ *ibid.*

¹⁷ Report by the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms of indigenous people, James Anaya, Addendum, Cases examined by the Special Rapporteur (June 2009 – July 2010), A/HRC/15/37/Add.1

statutory clearances despite consistent stiff objections by the indigenous peoples in the States of Manipur, Assam and Mizoram in India's North Eastern region. A large number of Zeliangrong and Hmar people will be displaced permanently, and the environmental destruction envisaged is of international concern. The CERD stated that India does not fully implement the right of ownership, individual or collective, of members of indigenous communities over the lands traditionally occupied by them.

37. *Oil Exploration in Manipur and Violations*: The Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, Government of India granted license to Jubilant Oil and Gas Private Limited, a multinational oil company in 2009 for exploration and drilling works without the free, prior and informed consent of people of Manipur¹⁸. The total area granted for oil exploration in Manipur is 3850 Sq. Km. or 20% of the area of the State. The contract and licensing to the companies is on the premise that all hydrocarbons deposits in India belongs to the Union¹⁹, contradicting UNDRIP provisions.²⁰

F. RECOMMENDATIONS

38. Government of India should recognize the rights of people of Manipur to their inalienable right to Self-Determination under Article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights by dropping the reservations
39. Government of India should recognise distinct indigenous peoples in India, integrate the provisions of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples into state policy, legislation, programmes and schemes; and ratify ILO Convention No 169 concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent countries
40. Government of India should immediately repeal the Armed Forces (Special Powers) Act, 1958
41. Government of India should ratify the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (UNCAT) as well as the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance (CED)
42. Government of India should submit its fourth Periodic report under ICCPR, which had been due by 2001 year end, to the UN Human Rights Committee
43. Government of India should accede to Additional Protocols I and II, 1977 of the Geneva Conventions, and give unconditional access to the International Committee on the Red Cross (ICRC) to the North Eastern region, especially Manipur
44. Government of India should stop rights violations of human rights defenders in Manipur and implement the UN Declaration on the Rights of Human Rights Defenders, 1999

¹⁸ Signing of PSC for AA-ONN-2009/2 Under NELP-VIII, Source: <http://www.dghindia.org/nelpviiiiblock.aspx>

¹⁹ The Oil Fields (Regulation and Development) Act, 1948, The *Oil Industry (Development) Act, 1974*; Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land), Act, 1962; and Petroleum & Natural Gas Rules, 1959,

²⁰ Circular of the Director, Commerce and Industry Department, Government of Manipur, dated 31 March 2011, Memo No. D (5)-15(1)/IND/2010/IH7