

Refugee Review Tribunal

AUSTRALIA

RRT RESEARCH RESPONSE

Research Response Number: IND30447
Country: India
Date: 25 August 2006

Keywords: India – TADA Act – POTB – Muslims – Detention – Discrimination – Government – RSS – VHP

This response was prepared by the Country Research Section of the Refugee Review Tribunal (RRT) after researching publicly accessible information currently available to the RRT within time constraints. This response is not, and does not purport to be, conclusive as to the merit of any particular claim to refugee status or asylum.

Questions

1. What is the TADA Act?
2. What is the POTB bill 2001?
3. Have perceived Muslim sympathisers been detained and interrogated pursuant to this legislation?
4. Are Muslims with known political opinions open to discrimination/harassment by the Indian government?
5. Is there established discrimination against Muslims by the present Indian government?
6. Who are the RSS?
7. Who are the VHP?
8. Do they or any other political groups, harass/discriminate/commit violence against Muslims?

RESPONSE

1. What is the TADA Act?
2. What is the POTB bill 2001?

A RRT research response dated 3 September 2003 includes information on the *Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act 1987* (TADA) (RRT Country Research 2003, *Research Response IND16020*, 3 September, (Question 5) – Attachment 1). The response refers to an Amnesty International report dated November 1994 that analyses provisions of the TADA Act (Amnesty International 1994, *India: The Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act: The lack of 'scrupulous care'*, ASA 20/39/94, November – Attachment 2).

Another Amnesty International report dated 15 November 2001 provides information on the TADA Act and the *Prevention of Terrorism Bill, 2000* (POTB). According to the report, the TADA Act was enacted in 1987 and “remained in force till May 1995.” In April 2000, the Law Commission of India, pursuant to a government request, produced “draft legislation under the name of *Prevention of Terrorism Bill, 2000* (POTB).” The bill “was never introduced in

parliament” following “stiff opposition from the human right movement, political parties and the NHRC” [National Human Rights Commission]. On 15 October 2001, the government “approved a new ordinance, the Prevention of Terrorism Ordinance (POTO)”. It is stated in the report that:

Successive Indian governments have introduced or attempted to introduce legislation to cover offences linked to “terrorist activities”. In 1987 the Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act (TADA) was enacted. It remained in force till May 1995. During those eight years, thousands of people were arbitrarily arrested, detained and tortured under it. TADA was used to crack down on political opponents and human rights defenders. It was finally allowed to lapse, following widespread allegations of misuse and harsh criticism from national and international human rights organizations, United Nations (UN) human rights mechanisms, the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC), lawyers and even government ministers and officials themselves.

Since then, several attempts have been made by successive governments to introduce new pieces of legislation intended to deal with the “terrorism” threat... In 1999 the Government of India requested the Law Commission of India to “undertake a fresh examination of the issue of a suitable legislation for combatting terrorism and other anti-national activities.” In late 1999 the Law Commission took a stand in favour of new legislation and in April 2000 it produced, as part of its 173rd Report, draft legislation under the name of *Prevention of Terrorism Bill, 2000* (POTB)... This bill faced stiff opposition from the human right movement, political parties and the NHRC and as a result it was never introduced in parliament.

Amnesty International is concerned that the lessons of both the implementation of TADA and the failure of POTB have not been learnt... In the wake of the attacks on Washington and New York and in the context of international calls for a “war against terrorism”, in fact, the Central Government on 15 October 2001 approved a new ordinance, the Prevention of Terrorism Ordinance (POTO), which gives Indian police sweeping powers of arrest and detention and, if enacted, would reinstate a modified version of TADA. The POTO was signed by the President of India on 24 October. From that date the Ordinance is temporarily enforceable. It will be presented in parliament for discussion in the winter session, beginning on 19 November. If approved by the parliament, it would then become an Act enforceable initially for a period of five years (Amnesty International 2001, *India: Briefing on the Prevention of Terrorism Ordinance*, ASA 20/049/2001, 15 November, Introduction – Attachment 3).

The US Department of State report on human rights practices in India for 2003 indicates that the POTO was replaced by the Prevention of Terrorism Act, which was enacted in March 2002. It is stated in the report that:

The Prevention of Terrorism Act (POTA), enacted in March 2002, replaced the Prevention of Terrorism Ordinance (POTO) in 2001. POTA allows for the detention without charge for 3 months, and 3 more months if allowed by a special judge, deems not disclosing information to the authorities about terrorist activities an offense, and provides extensive new powers to ban organizations and seize their assets. The act is similar to TADA in its provisions for detentions, summary trials, and the use of testimony obtained under duress. In addition, POTA provides for special courts to try offenses, places the burden of proof at the bail stage on the accused, allows confessions made to a police officer admissible as evidence, extends the period of remand from 15 to 60 days, and sets mandatory sentences for terrorism-related offenses (US Department of State 2004, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2003 – India*, February, Section 1 (d) – Attachment 4).

A copy of *The Prevention of Terrorism Act, 2002* is attached (Government of India 2002, *The Prevention of Terrorism Act, 2002*, Act No. 15 of 2002, 28 March <http://www.satp.org/satporgtp/countries/india/document/actandordinances/POTA.htm> – Accessed 12 August 2004 – Attachment 5).

According to the US Department of State report on human rights practices in India for 2005, the government repealed the POTA in September 2004 “and replaced it with the Unlawful Activities Prevention Act (UAPA).” It is stated in the report that:

In September 2004 the government repealed the Prevention of Terrorism Act (POTA) and replaced it with the Unlawful Activities Prevention Act (UAPA). Nonetheless, SAHRDC [The South Asian Human Rights Documentation Center] reported that more than 1,000 persons remained in detention awaiting prosecution under lapsed special terrorism legislation, and that cases opened under POTA and Terrorism and Disruptive Activities Act (TADA) continued through the judicial system.

The report also notes that “POTA contained a sunset feature, which gave the central POTA review committee one year to review all existing POTA cases”, although “at year’s end, numerous cases remained unreviewed. This clause also allowed the government to make new arrests under POTA, despite its repeal, if the arrests were tied to an existing POTA case” (US Department of State 2006, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2005 – India*, March, Section 1 (d) – Attachment 6).

A RRT research response dated 10 August 2006 includes information on the current situation regarding the POTA Act (RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND30381*, 10 August, (Question 1) – Attachment 7).

3. Have perceived Muslim sympathisers been detained and interrogated pursuant to this legislation?

In relation to the TADA, the previously mentioned Amnesty International report dated November 1994 notes that “India’s Minister of State for Internal Security admitted in August in Bombay that TADA “had been misused extensively against Muslims” adding that the government was prepared to repeal the Act “if overzealous arrests and misuse of TADA continues by the states”” (Amnesty International 1994, *India: The Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act: The lack of ‘scrupulous care’*, ASA 20/39/94, November, p 1 – Attachment 2).

The RRT research response dated 3 September 2003 (RRT Country Research 2003, *Research Response IND16020*, 3 September, (Question 5) – Attachment 1), refers to a Human Rights Watch report dated 25 March 2003, which indicates that:

Under TADA, tens of thousands of politically motivated detentions, acts of torture, and other human rights violations were committed against Muslims, Sikhs, Dalits (so-called untouchables), trade union activists, and political opponents in the late 1980s and early 1990s. In the face of mounting opposition to the act, India’s government acknowledged these abuses and consequently let TADA lapse in 1995 (Human Rights Watch 2003, *Country Studies: The human rights impact of counter-terrorism measures – India*, 25 March – Attachment 8).

An earlier Human Rights Watch report dated 20 November 2001 also comments that “The government used TADA as a tool to fight trade unions and to detain Muslims, Sikhs, Dalits,

and political opponents. Over 76,000 people were arrested while TADA was in force from 1987 to 1995. The conviction rate for these arrests was less than one percent” (Human Rights Watch 2001, *Anti-terrorism legislation*, 20 November – Attachment 9).

In relation to the POTA, the RRT research response dated 10 August 2006 includes mention of the treatment of Muslims under the POTA Act (RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND30381*, 10 August, (Question 1) – Attachment 7).

The US Department of State report on religious freedom in India for 2005 indicates that a study by a NGO “in 10 states in July 2004 found that 99.9 percent of those arrested under POTA were Muslims.” It is stated in the report that:

Some laws, such as the repealed Prevention of Terrorism Act (POTA), while not specifically written to target minorities, affected particular ethnic or religious groups. A study carried out by the NGO “People’s Tribunal” in 10 states in July 2004 found that 99.9 percent of those arrested under POTA were Muslims. A 2003 report also showed that 124 of 126 persons arrested for the Godhra train arson, predominantly Muslims, were charged under POTA, while no Hindus arrested in connection with the riots in Gujarat were similarly charged. However, on June 22, the Central POTA Review Committee stated that there was not enough evidence to support the use of POTA against those accused in the Godhra train massacre case and recommended that the charges be dropped. The POTA court has yet to follow through on the recommendation (US Department of State 2005, *International Religious Freedom Report 2005 – India*, November, Section II – Attachment 10).

The Human Rights Watch 2005 world report on India indicates that the POTA “was often used against marginalized communities such as Dalits, indigenous groups, Muslims, and the political opposition.” According to the report:

The government’s repeal of the controversial Prevention of Terrorism Act (POTA) was a major step forward for civil liberties in India. POTA empowered security forces to hold individuals for up to 180 days without filing charges, broadening the scope of the death penalty, dispensing with the presumption of innocence by placing the burden of proof on suspects, and admitting confessions into evidence despite the frequent use of torture. The law was often used against marginalized communities such as Dalits, indigenous groups, Muslims, and the political opposition (Human Rights Watch 2005, *World Report 2005 – India*, January – Attachment 11).

4. Are Muslims with known political opinions open to discrimination/harassment by the Indian government?

5. Is there established discrimination against Muslims by the present Indian government?

The RRT Country Research resource guide *The Republic & States of India at a Glance*, updated August 2006 includes information regarding the current United Progressive Alliance (UPA) government in India. The UPA formed a minority government following the 2004 election (RRT Country Research 2006, *The Republic & States of India at a Glance*, August, p 7 – Attachment 12).

A recent RRT research response dated 10 August 2006, which looks at whether Muslims in India are subjected to discrimination/harassment by Hindu extremists, includes information on the attitude of the current UPA government towards religious minorities (RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND30445*, 10 August – Attachment 13).

The US Department of State report on religious freedom in India for 2005 indicates that “The status of religious freedom improved in a number of ways during the period covered by this report, yet problems remained in some areas.” According to the report, the UPA had pledged to “respect the rights of religious minorities.” It is stated in the report that:

The United Progressive Alliance (UPA) espoused an inclusive and secular platform, pledging to respect the country’s traditions of secular government and religious tolerance, and respect the rights of religious minorities. The UPA coalition government also took steps to address the failures of the government of Gujarat to halt expeditiously Hindu-Muslim riots there in 2002. Minority rights activists reported that instances of communal violence decreased during the reporting period as a result. The Government repealed the controversial Prevention of Terrorist Act (POTA), often criticized by Muslim groups as a tool used to target them, and replaced it with a law considered by numerous nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) to be fairer to minorities. The Government also withdrew controversial school textbooks that had been condemned for espousing a Hindu nationalist agenda and replaced them with more moderate versions, although problems linger in some states controlled by the opposition. The National Human Rights Commission also intervened in the ongoing legal battles surrounding the 2002 Gujarat riots, resulting in the reopening of 2000 cases.

The report also notes that:

However, the Government sometimes in the recent past did not act swiftly enough to counter societal attacks against religious minorities and attempts by some leaders of state and local governments to limit religious freedom. This resulted in part from legal constraints on central government action inherent in the country’s federal structure, and from shortcomings in the law enforcement and justice systems, although courts regularly uphold the constitutional provision of religious freedom. Despite the Government’s efforts to foster communal harmony, some extremists continued to view ineffective investigation and prosecution of attacks on religious minorities as a signal that they could commit such violence with impunity, although numerous cases are currently in the courts.

The report indicates that “Muslim and Christian activists reported that communal concerns have diminished since the UPA government came to power, bringing about a greater sense of security amongst minorities.” It is also stated in the report that “While the Central Government has not been implicated in abuses of religious freedom, human rights activists have criticized it for alleged indifference and inaction in the face of abuses committed by state and local authorities and private citizens” (US Department of State 2005, *International Religious Freedom Report 2005 – India*, November, Introduction & Section II – Attachment 10).

The Human Rights Watch 2005 world report on India indicates that “The government’s repeal of the controversial Prevention of Terrorism Act (POTA) was a major step forward for civil liberties in India”, and that the POTA “was often used against marginalized communities such as Dalits, indigenous groups, Muslims, and the political opposition” (Human Rights Watch 2005, *World Report 2005 – India*, January – Attachment 11).

6. Who are the RSS?

According to a Human Rights Watch report dated July 2003:

The Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (National Volunteer Corps, RSS) was founded in the city of Nagpur in 1925 by Keshav Baliram Hedgewar with the mission of creating a Hindu state. Since its founding, it has propagated a militant form of Hindu nationalism, which it promotes as the sole basis for national identity in India. According to the RSS, the leaders of India's nationalist movement and of post-independence India failed to create a nation based on Hindu culture. Western thought and civilization are perceived as enemies of Hindu culture. Religions such as Islam and Christianity are depicted as alien to India; they are seen as the religions of foreign invaders—the Mughals and the British. The RSS wanted “the entire gamut of social life” to be designed “on the rock bed of Hindu nationalism,” a goal that inspired the creation of RSS political, social, and educational wings, a family of organizations that, as noted above, is now referred to collectively as the *sangh parivar*...

... The Jana Sangh Party was formed in 1951 as the political wing of the RSS, and later replaced by the BJP [Bharatiya Janata Party] in 1980 (Human Rights Watch 2003, *Compounding Injustice: The Government's Failure to Redress Massacres in Gujarat*, Vol. 15, No. 4 (C), July, pp 12-13 – Attachment 14).

An article dated 4 August 2005 in *The Economist* indicates that “The RSS is a huge, amorphous organisation, claiming 7m-8m activists. About 4m attend daily shakhas—early morning gatherings where, in khaki uniforms, they engage in physical jerks, sports and “ideological discourse”. It runs 22,000 schools, has 45,000 units working in slums and is active in 11,000 of the villages where India's tribal minorities live” (“The struggle for the Hindu soul” 2005, *The Economist*, 4 August – Attachment 15).

The RRT Country Research resource guide *The Republic & States of India at a Glance*, updated August 2006 provides information on the RSS and a link to the organisation's website (RRT Country Research 2006, *The Republic & States of India at a Glance*, August, p 29 – Attachment 12).

A number of RRT research responses provide information on the RSS. These include the following attached responses: (RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND17817*, 1 March, (Questions 1 & 3) – Attachment 16), (RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND17783*, 6 February, (Question 2) – Attachment 17), (RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND17769*, 2 February, (Question 6) – Attachment 18), (RRT Country Research 2004, *Research Response IND16826*, 23 June – Attachment 19), (RRT Country Research 2003, *Research Response IND16026*, 2 September, (Question 8) – Attachment 20), (RRT Country Research 2003, *Research Response IND16074*, 19 August – Attachment 21), and (RRT Country Research 2001, *Research Response IND14866*, 12 November, (Questions 1 & 3) – Attachment 22).

7. Who are the VHP?

The UK Home Office report on India dated April 2006 indicates that the “Vishwa Hindu Parishad (VHP) (World Council of Hindus)” is a “Right-wing ally of the BJP, concerned explicitly with religious matters, founded in August 1964. The VHP was banned between December 1992 and June 1995 for its role in the destruction of the Babri mosque in Ayodhya. A wealthy organisation, the VHP is partly funded by donations from Hindu communities abroad, especially the USA. The VHP's militant women's wing is known as Durga Vahini” (UK Home Office 2006, *Country of Origin Information Report – India*, April, Annex C – Attachment 23).

The previously mentioned article dated 4 August 2005 in *The Economist* mentions that “The VHP’s Giriraj Kishore quite unabashedly defines its aim as establishing “a Hindu state and Hindu glory”” (“The struggle for the Hindu soul’ 2005, *The Economist*, 4 August – Attachment 15).

The previously mentioned Human Rights Watch report dated July 2003 indicates that:

The VHP was formed in 1964 to cover the social aspects of RSS activities. The VHP organizes and communicates the RSS message to Hindus living outside India and holds conferences for Hindu religious leaders from all over the country. The most publicized of the VHP’s activities was its Ram temple campaign in Ayodhya... The VHP has also organized programs to reconvert those who have converted from Hinduism to other faiths. The Bajrang Dal is the militant youth wing of the VHP. It was formed in 1984 during the Babri Masjid conflict, in order to mobilize youth for the Ram temple campaign.

The report indicates that the VHP, the Bajrang Dal and the RSS collectively formed “the *sangh parivar* (or “family” of Hindu nationalist groups).” The BJP was “the political wing of the *sangh parivar*” (Human Rights Watch 2003, *Compounding Injustice: The Government’s Failure to Redress Massacres in Gujarat*, Vol. 15, No. 4 (C), July, pp 4 & 13 – Attachment 14).

The following attached RRT research responses include information on the VHP: (RRT Country Research 2004, *Research Response IND16826*, 23 June – Attachment 19) and (RRT Country Research 2003, *Research Response IND16026*, 2 September, (Question 9) – Attachment 20).

8. Do they or any other political groups, harass/discriminate/commit violence against Muslims?

A previously mentioned RRT research response dated 10 August 2006 looks at whether Muslims in India are subjected to discrimination/harassment by Hindu extremists (RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND30445*, 10 August – Attachment 13).

An article by Human Rights Watch dated 4 May 2006 indicates that “avenging Hindu mobs, often led by members of the fundamentalist Hindu groups Vishwa Hindu Parishad (VHP) and the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS), surrounded and threatened Muslim neighborhoods” in Gujarat following riots in early May 2006. It is stated in the article that:

In Gujarat, violence in Vadodara began with the demolition on May 1 of an ancient Muslim shrine by municipal authorities. Riots broke out as Muslims protested the demolition. At least five people died, including a Muslim and a Hindu, who were killed by police who shot at rioters. Tension built up over the following day and, during the night of May 2, avenging Hindu mobs, often led by members of the fundamentalist Hindu groups Vishwa Hindu Parishad (VHP) and the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS), surrounded and threatened Muslim neighborhoods. One Muslim man was burnt alive in his car. In other areas of the city, there were incidents of arson. The situation is still tense and Muslim residents are terrified, fearing a repeat of the 2002 state-backed riots. The army has been called in to prevent an escalation of violence.

The article also notes that “In cases where witnesses and their lawyers have pursued justice” in relation to communal violence between Hindus and Muslims in Gujarat in 2002, “they

have received anonymous threats from supporters of the VHP, RSS, and the Bajrang Dal, and have been persecuted by the state administration.” According to the article:

The violence follows the 2002 communal violence which swept Gujarat after 59 Hindus died in Godhra when their train carriage caught fire. Blaming their deaths on Muslims, Hindu mobs slaughtered hundreds of Muslims. Tens of thousands were displaced and their property destroyed. The police stood by, refusing to act against a mob which had the protection of the state government. There are allegations that the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) state government under Chief Minister Narendra Modi was involved in planning and carrying out the attacks.

Human Rights Watch has repeatedly noted the failure of the authorities to identify and prosecute those who planned and executed the attacks. In cases where witnesses and their lawyers have pursued justice, they have received anonymous threats from supporters of the VHP, RSS, and the Bajrang Dal, and have been persecuted by the state administration. Four years later, many Muslims still live in fear because the attackers remain free and continue to make threats, particularly against those involved in prosecutions. Instead of pursuing the perpetrators of violence, the state government has nurtured a climate of fear (Human Rights Watch 2006, *India: End Communal Violence in Gujarat, Kashmir*, 4 May

http://hrw.org/english/docs/2006/05/03/india13305_txt.htm – Accessed 24 August 2006 – Attachment 24).

The previously mentioned Human Rights Watch report dated July 2003 provides further information in relation to the involvement of the RSS and VHP in anti-Muslim violence in Gujarat in 2002 (Human Rights Watch 2003, *Compounding Injustice: The Government's Failure to Redress Massacres in Gujarat*, Vol. 15, No. 4 (C), July – Attachment 14).

The RRT research response dated 1 March 2006 includes information regarding the attitude of the RSS towards Muslims (RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND17817*, 1 March, (Question 3) – Attachment 16).

The US Department of State report on human rights practices in India for 2005 indicates that “Human rights groups and others suggested that political links between the BJP and hard-line Hindu groups such as the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) influenced some state BJP governments’ inadequate responses to acts of violence against religious minorities” (US Department of State 2006, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2005 – India*, March, Section 2(c) – Attachment 6).

The US Department of State report on religious freedom in India for 2005 notes that:

The BJP, which led two national coalition governments from 1998 until May 2004, is one of a number of offshoots of the RSS. Most BJP leaders, including former Prime Minister A.B. Vajpayee and former Deputy Prime Minister L.K. Advani, also are RSS members. Some Members of the BJP, the RSS, and other affiliated organizations (collectively known as the Sangh Parivar) have been implicated in incidents of violence and discrimination against Christians and Muslims.

The BJP and RSS claim to respect and tolerate other religions; however, the RSS in particular opposes conversions from Hinduism and believes that all citizens regardless of their religious affiliation should adhere to Hindu cultural values. The BJP officially states that the caste system should be eradicated, but many of its members strongly adhere to it. The BJP political platform calls for the construction of a Hindu temple on the site of a mosque in Ayodhya destroyed by a Hindu mob in 1992; for the repeal of Article 370 of the Constitution, which

grants special rights to the state of Jammu and Kashmir, the country's only Muslim majority state; and for the enactment of a Uniform Civil Code that would apply to members of all religions.

The report also indicates that the RSS had "claimed that Muslims and Christians born in the country should not call themselves minorities, as their forefathers were Hindu. RSS General Secretary Mohan Rao Bhagawat stated that during the colonial period, the British introduced the "minority-majority" concept as part of a plan to divide the country and that the only genuine minorities are Jews and Parsees." There is also reference to an attack on a mosque by RSS activists in Kerala in which one Muslim man was killed and the imam and another man injured, although the date of the incident is not specified.

The report notes that "Extremist Hindu groups such as the VHP and Bajrang Dal maintain that they intend to build a Hindu temple in Ayodhya on the site of the 500-year-old Babri Mosque demolished by a Hindu mob in 1992, with or without the Government's approval." It is also stated in the report that:

In the second week of September, the VHP led an unsuccessful attempt to demolish the tomb of a 17th century Muslim warrior in Pratapgarh in Mahabaleshwar district. During the agitation, several Muslim families left their homes, fearing violence, but later returned. In the above mentioned incidents, the state police moved swiftly to control damage and there were no allegations of anti-Muslim bias by the police in handling of the incidents.

Muslims continued to experience intimidation and often reported that they could not work, reside, or send their children to schools in Hindu-dominated areas. In some areas, primarily in Gujarat, Hindutva groups displayed signs stating "Hindus only" and "Muslim free area." Prohibitions on the Muslim call to prayer were also reported (US Department of State 2005, *International Religious Freedom Report 2005 – India*, November, Sections II & III – Attachment 10).

The previously mentioned RRT research response dated 19 August 2003 includes information regarding the involvement of the RSS in anti-Muslim violence prior to December 1992 (RRT Country Research 2003, *Research Response IND16074*, 19 August, (Question 2) – Attachment 21).

List of Sources Consulted

Internet Sources:

Copernic search engine

Amnesty International website www.amnesty.org

Human Rights Watch website www.hrw.org

UNHCR

REFWORLD

UNHCR Refugee Information Online

Databases:

Public

FACTIVA

Reuters Business Briefing

DIMA

BACIS

Country Information

REFINFO

IRBDC Research Responses (Canada)

RRT

ISYS

RRT Country Research database, including

Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch,

US Department of State *Country Reports on Human*

List of Attachments

1. RRT Country Research 2003, *Research Response IND16020*, 3 September.
2. Amnesty International 1994, *India: The Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act: The lack of 'scrupulous care'*, ASA 20/39/94, November. (MRT-RRT Library)
3. Amnesty International 2001, *India: Briefing on the Prevention of Terrorism Ordinance*, ASA 20/049/2001, 15 November.
4. US Department of State 2004, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2003 – India*, February.
5. Government of India 2002, *The Prevention of Terrorism Act, 2002*, Act No. 15 of 2002, 28 March <http://www.satp.org/satporgtp/countries/india/document/actandordinances/POTA.htm> – Accessed 12 August 2004.
6. US Department of State 2006, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2005 – India*, March.
7. RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND30381*, 10 August.
8. Human Rights Watch 2003, *Country Studies: The human rights impact of counter-terrorism measures – India*, 25 March. (CISNET India CX78475)
9. Human Rights Watch 2001, *Anti-terrorism legislation*, 20 November. (CISNET India CX78473)
10. US Department of State 2005, *International Religious Freedom Report 2005 – India*, November.
11. Human Rights Watch 2005, *World Report 2005 – India*, January.
12. RRT Country Research 2006, *The Republic & States of India at a Glance*, August.
13. RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND30445*, 10 August.
14. Human Rights Watch 2003, *Compounding Injustice: The Government's Failure to Redress Massacres in Gujarat*, Vol. 15, No. 4 (C), July.
15. 'The struggle for the Hindu soul' 2005, *The Economist*, 4 August. (CISNET India CX131483)
16. RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND17817*, 1 March.
17. RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND17783*, 6 February.

18. RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND17769*, 2 February.
19. RRT Country Research 2004, *Research Response IND16826*, 23 June.
20. RRT Country Research 2003, *Research Response IND16026*, 2 September.
21. RRT Country Research 2003, *Research Response IND16074*, 19 August.
22. RRT Country Research 2001, *Research Response IND14866*, 12 November.
23. UK Home Office 2006, *Country of Origin Information Report – India*, April.
24. Human Rights Watch 2006, *India: End Communal Violence in Gujarat, Kashmir*, 4 May http://hrw.org/english/docs/2006/05/03/india13305_txt.htm – Accessed 24 August 2006.