



Flygtningenævnets baggrundsmateriale

Bilagsnr.:	132
Land:	Indien
Kilde:	British Home Office
Titel:	"Opertional Guidance Note India"
Udgivet:	September 2005
Optaget på baggrundsmaterialet:	11. januar 2006



OPERATIONAL GUIDANCE NOTE

INDIA

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1.1 – 1.5
2. Country assessment	2.1 – 2.7
3. Main categories of claims	3.1 – 3.6
Sikhs in fear of state persecution	3.7
Sikhs in fear of non-state agents	3.8
Christians, Muslims and Hindus	3.9
Land disputes	3.10
Members of Akali Dal	3.11
Prison conditions	3.12
Women	3.13
4. Discretionary Leave	4.1
Unaccompanied minors	4.2
Medical treatment	4.3
5. Returns	5.1 – 5.2
6. Additional References	

1. Introduction

1.1 This document summarises the general, political and human rights situation in India and provides information on the nature and handling of claims frequently received from nationals/residents of that country. It must be read in conjunction with the India country report and any CIPU or COI Service Country bulletins.

1.2 This document is intended to provide clear guidance on whether the main types of claim are or are not likely to justify the grant of asylum, Humanitarian Protection or Discretionary Leave. Caseworkers should refer to the following Asylum Policy Instructions for further details of the policy on these areas:

API on Assessing the Claim
 API on Humanitarian Protection
 API on Discretionary Leave
 API on the European Convention on Human Rights.

1.3 Claims should be considered on an individual basis, but taking full account of the information set out below, in particular Part III on main categories of claim.

1.4 India is a country listed in section 94 of the Nationality Immigration and Asylum Act 2002. Asylum and human rights claims must be considered on their individual merits. However if, following consideration, the claim is refused, caseworkers should certify the claim as clearly unfounded unless satisfied that it is not. A claim will be clearly unfounded

if it is so clearly without substance that it is bound to fail. The information set out below contains relevant country information, the most common types of claim and guidance from the courts, including guidance on whether cases are likely to be clearly unfounded.

1.5 Source documents

Where paragraph numbers have been cited, these refer to the India Country Report April 2005. Other source documents are listed at the end of this note.

[Back to top](#)

2. Country assessment

2.1 The Republic of India is a mix of different cultures, ethnic groups, languages and religions. [2.3-2.4] India has a democratic, parliamentary system of government with representatives elected in multi-party elections. [5.13] The Constitution provides citizens with the right to change their government peacefully, and citizens exercise this right in practice through periodic, free, and fair elections held on the basis of universal suffrage. [5.13] India has 28 states with constitutionally defined powers of government. [5.16]

2.2 The President is the Constitutional Head of State, elected for five years by an electoral college comprising elected members of both Houses of Parliament and the State legislatures. [5.15]

2.3 Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee called an early election for April 2004 and voting was held over 4 days starting on 20 April 2004 and ending on 10 May 2004. [4.23] The Congress-led front emerged victorious, securing 217 seats (35.19% of the vote) with its allies. The BJP and allies secured 185 seats (35.31%), and others 136 seats. The surprise result saw the former BJP-led coalition government resign. [4.24] Sonia Gandhi, the leader of the Congress Party, declined the prime ministership. Manmohan Singh, a former finance minister, was sworn in as Prime Minister on 22 May 2004, becoming India's first-ever non-Hindu Prime Minister. He leads a coalition government, called the United Progressive Alliance. [4.26]

2.4 India is a longstanding parliamentary democracy with an independent judiciary. According to the US Department of State report 2004, published in 2005, the Government generally respected the human rights of its citizens; however, numerous serious problems remained. The report noted particularly that police and security forces were sometimes responsible for extrajudicial killings, Government officials often used special antiterrorism legislation to justify the excessive use of force while combating active insurgencies in Jammu and Kashmir and some northern states, security force officials who committed human rights abuses generally enjoyed legal impunity although there were numerous reports of investigations into individual abuse cases and punishment for some perpetrators. Other violations included, torture and rape by police and other government agents, poor prison conditions, lengthy pretrial detention without charge, prolonged detention while undergoing trial; occasional limits on press freedom and freedom of movement; harassment and arrest of human rights monitors; extensive societal violence and legal and societal discrimination against women; forced prostitution; child prostitution and female infanticide; trafficking in women and children; discrimination against persons with disabilities; serious discrimination and violence against indigenous people and scheduled castes and tribes; widespread intercaste and communal violence; religiously motivated violence against Muslims and Christians; and widespread exploitation of indentured, bonded, and child labor.[6.1]

2.5 The main domestic human rights organisation operating in the country is the Government-appointed National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) which acts

independently of the Government, often voicing strong criticism of the Governments institutions and actions. However the NHRC faces numerous institutional and legal weaknesses, which have hampered its effectiveness. It does not have a statutory power to investigate allegations and can only request state governments to submit a report. The NHRC was able to investigate cases against the military, but it could only recommend compensation and its recommendations are not binding. States have their own human rights commissions and the NHRC only has jurisdiction to investigate if the state commission does not.^[6.3] The NHRC has also influenced the legislative process, particularly by issuing recommendations on women's issues, persons with disabilities, and children's rights. ^[6.5] The NHRC was reported to have been active throughout 2004, highlighting human rights abuses throughout the country, and recommending compensation for victims of human rights abuses. State Human Rights Commissions exist in, Assam, Chhattisgarh, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Manipur, Maharashtra, Orissa, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, and West Bengal. ^[6.4]

2.6 Amnesty International noted in its report on 2004 that members of opposition groups were responsible for the targeted killings of civilians including relatives of state officials and those suspected of working for the government. The use of explosives lead to the indiscriminate killing of civilians.^[9] Torture, including rape and beatings of the civilian population by members of armed opposition groups also continued to be reported throughout 2003 and 2004. Armed opposition groups failed to abide by standards of international humanitarian law and many civilians were killed as a result of indiscriminate violence during attacks on security forces. ^[6.266, 6.267] The Jammu and Kashmir Protection of Human Rights Act 1997 established a State Human Rights Commission and human rights courts. The Commission is empowered to enquire into any complaint of a violation of human rights presented to it by a victim or any person on his/her behalf. It can also intervene in any proceeding involving any allegation or violation of human rights pending before a court with the approval of the court. ^[6.296] More detailed information on the situation in Jammu and Kashmir can be found in the current Country Report on India.

2.7 Although India has signed and ratified the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, and has a number of constitutional safeguards guaranteeing equal rights for women, there is evidence of huge gaps between constitutional guarantees and the daily realities of women's lives. ^[6.301, 6.302, 6.306] In 2004 domestic violence was reported to be a common and serious problem across all religious, class, and caste boundaries. Societal violence against women was also a serious problem in 2004. Although providing or taking a dowry is illegal, dowries continue to be offered and accepted and dowry disputes are a serious problem. It was reported in 2004 that women do not report the majority of rapes. Women victims of rape are reported to be at a severe disadvantage within the criminal justice system. Rape of women in custody was also reported in 2004. ^[6.324, 6.341-346, 6. 349-6.350, 6.354]

[Back to top](#)

3. Main categories of claims

3.1 This Section sets out the main types of asylum or human rights claims made by those entitled to reside in India. It also contains any common claims which may raise issues covered by the API on Discretionary Leave. Where appropriate it provides guidance on whether or not an individual making a claim is likely to face a real risk of persecution, unlawful killing or torture or inhuman or degrading treatment/punishment. It also provides guidance on whether or not sufficiency of protection is available in cases where the threat comes from a non-state actor; and whether or not internal relocation is an option. The law and policies on persecution, Humanitarian Protection, sufficiency of protection and internal

relocation/ flight are set out in the relevant APIs, but how these affect particular categories of claim are set out in the instructions below.

3.2 Each claim should be assessed to determine whether there are reasonable grounds for believing that the claimant would, if returned, face persecution for a Convention reason - i.e. due to their race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion. The approach set out in Karanakaran should be followed when deciding how much weight to be given to the material provided in support of the claim (see the API on Assessing the Claim).

3.3 If the claimant does not qualify for asylum, consideration should be given as to whether a grant of Humanitarian Protection is appropriate. If the claimant qualifies for neither asylum nor Humanitarian Protection, consideration should be given as to whether he/she qualifies for Discretionary Leave, either on the basis of the particular categories detailed in Section 4 or on their individual circumstances.

3.4 This guidance is **not** designed to cover issues of credibility. Caseworkers will need to consider credibility issues based on all the information available to them. (For guidance on credibility see para 11 of the API on Assessing the Claim). Where consideration is being given to the certification of the claim under the case by case certification power in section 94(2) of the Nationality Immigration and Asylum Act 2002, refer for guidance on how to approach credibility to the current APU instructions entitled "Certification under section 94 of the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002".

3.5 Also, this guidance does not generally provide information on whether or not a person should be excluded from the Refugee Convention or from Humanitarian Protection or Discretionary Leave. (See API on Humanitarian Protection and API on Exclusion under Article 1F or 33(2) and API on DL).

3.6 All APIs can be accessed via the IND website at:
http://www.ind.homeoffice.gov.uk/ind/en/home/laws_policy/policy_instructions/apis.html

[Back to top](#)

3.7. Sikhs in fear of State Persecution

3.7.1 The majority of asylum claims made by Indian nationals in the United Kingdom are from young male Sikhs from Punjab.

- Some claim a fear of persecution by the Indian authorities because of their membership of groups such as Shiromani Akali Dal (SAD) or All India Sikh Students Federation (AISSF).
- Some claim a fear of persecution by the Indian authorities because the individual has, or is perceived to have, harboured or assisted, terrorists, or otherwise been associated with terrorists (in particular Khalistan separatist groups).
- Some claim they have been victims of harassment, and fear further harassment, by the Indian authorities because they are Sikh.

3.7.2 Treatment The 2001 Census of India notes that out of a population of 1028 million 19 million or 1.9% follow the Sikh religion.^[10] Sikhs are a majority in the state of Punjab. ^[6.98] ^[6.38] During the 1980's tensions between Sikhs and the central government in New Delhi

heightened. Over the years that followed the Punjab was faced with escalating confrontations and increased terrorist incidents.[6.102] Serious human rights abuses were committed during a period of counter insurgency lasting from 1984 to 1994.[6.133] However, the Sikh militant movement is no longer active in Punjab. The hard core militants have either been arrested or killed by security forces. [6.115-6.116, 6.148] This change in the situation for Sikhs who no longer constitute a persecuted group is confirmed in reports as long ago as 1997 and 1998. [6.115-6.116, 6.124]

3.7.3 A 2000 Danish Immigration Service Fact Finding Mission reported that there were now no security problems in Punjab and co-operation between the State Government and central Government was good. Cases concerning human rights abuse were different from before in that now the abuse was individual and had specific reasons. Sikhs were not subjected to torture just because they were Sikhs or because of the general political situation. It was also reported that the situation was not perfect but that Sikhs in general were not being persecuted. The problems were of a different nature than before, and were often due to problems in local society, e.g. disputes over land, etc. [6.151] During the same mission to the Punjab in March and April 2000, the Danish Immigration Service were informed by the non-governmental Committee for Co-ordination on Disappearances in Punjab (CCDP) that, in their view, the Punjab was now peaceful and that there were no problems with militant groups and no political problems either. [6.150] Amnesty International in a report issued in January 2003 (reporting specifically on the situation in Punjab) confirmed that the targets of torture have changed since the period of Sikh militancy when the most frequent victims of police abuse were members of the Sikh community, in particular youths and supporters of Sikh political parties and armed opposition groups. Now, the majority of victims are detainees held in connection with criminal investigations, and include members of all religious communities and social groups. [3, p1] The US Department of State in its most recent report issued in February 2005 also confirms that in Punjab the pattern of disappearances prevalent in the early 1990s has ended. [6.148]

3.7.4 Amendments in 1984 to the National Security Act 1980 and the subsequent Terrorist Affected Areas Act and Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act (in force from 1985 to 1995) provided the police in Punjab with sweeping powers of arrest and detention. These laws left the heaviest legacies of the militancy period on policing methods in the state and the rest of the country. [6.121] It is reported that the Punjab police may be serious about pursuing Sikhs anywhere in India whom they view as hard-core militants, however in practice only a handful of militants are likely to be targeted for such long-arm law enforcement. [6.128]

3.7.5 The Punjab State Human Rights Commission was set up in July 1997. It has intervened in a number of cases of police excesses, torture and custodial death, and the Punjab Government has been forced to pay compensation. [6.139] The Commission is reported to receive 200 to 300 complaints per day but is limited by statute to examining cases which fall within a one-year statute of limitations.[6.140]

3.7.6 The Shiromani Akali Dal (SAD) is now a recognised and legal political party in India which has taken part in elections and supported the last government's BJP party. [Annex B and C] The All India Sikh Students Federation was banned in 1984 but this ban was lifted in 1985. It has since split into various factions and is believed to be active in various universities in Punjab. It currently operates under the name of Sikh Students Federation.(SSF).[15] There are no reports that members of either of these organisations are specifically targeted or discriminated against as a result of their membership.

3.7.7 Sufficiency of Protection As this category of claimant's fear is of ill treatment/persecution by the state authorities they cannot apply to the authorities for protection.

3.7.8 Internal Relocation For claimant in this category fearing ill treatment/persecution by the state authorities relocation to a different area of the country to escape this threat is not feasible, however where the fear is of local police and the individual is not of interest to the central authorities internal relocation is feasible and not unduly harsh.

3.7.9 Caselaw

IAT Determination: [2003] UKIAT 00098 S (India). The Tribunal found that a Sikh ex-army Sergeant, who was frequently arrested by local police and mistreated (and released after payment of a bribe on each occasion) would be able to relocate to an area where he would face neither persecution nor a breach of his Article 3 rights. The IAT held that his problems with the police were localised and he was not of interest to the central authorities if he did not volunteer his past associations and that whilst he might face difficulties in another area accessing employment and accommodation because of language differences and lack of family ties this was not sufficient to make relocation unduly harsh.

IAT Determination: Surinder Pal(2001)(01TH01238) The Tribunal commented that although some concerns remained, the general human rights situation in Punjab had much improved as the conflict there had died down. It was held that the adjudicator had rightly concluded that a Sikh supporter of the Khalistan movement (AISSF) was not at risk if returned to Punjab.

IAT Determination: [2002] UKIAT 07599 Joginder KAUR The tribunal found that the sister of a high profile Khalistani radical Mukhtiar Singh, would be at real risk of Article 3 ECHR mistreatment, through family connections.

3.7.10 Conclusion A distinction should be drawn between low and high level activists:

3.7.11 Low-level activists It is most unlikely that anyone claiming involvement in low-level activities would be able to demonstrate a well-founded fear of persecution within the terms of the 1951 Convention or would qualify for Humanitarian Protection, on the basis of their activities alone. Claims from low level activists are likely to be clearly unfounded.

3.7.12 High-level activists High profile activists, or family members of high profile activists, may be able to establish a well-founded fear of persecution, or torture or degrading or inhuman treatment, amounting to a breach of Article 3 ECHR, and in exceptional circumstances a grant of asylum or Humanitarian Protection may be appropriate. If refused, claims from high profile activists known to the authorities are unlikely to be clearly unfounded.

[Back to top](#)

3.8 Sikhs in fear of non-State agents

3.8.1 Claimants fear persecution by non state agents because they have refused to join a terrorist group, or may claim to fear the Akali Dal because of their involvement with the Congress party.

3.8.2 Treatment Reports in 1997 and 1998 note that the Sikh militant movement is no longer active in Punjab having been virtually eliminated. The hard core militants have either been physically wiped out or are no longer in India, with militant organisations being shut down or reduced in size. Key leaders had been arrested, gone underground, or had abandoned the movement with remaining supporters struggling to maintain funds and morale.[6.115-116] A 2002 report noted that the state of Punjab remains largely free from terrorist violence, for the ninth successive year after the terrorist-secessionist movement for Khalistan was comprehensively defeated in 1993. There does remain a handful of terrorist groups mainly sponsored by Pakistan and by some non-resident Indian Sikh groups based in the West who continue to propagate the ideology of Khalistan (a separate Sikh state). [6.152] In the

year 2002, till 30 May 2002 five people were killed and 39 others injured in terrorism-related violence in the state. During this period a total of four terrorists were arrested and another surrendered. [6.118] In a 2003 report Amnesty International(AI) noted that the majority of the armed opposition groups are inactive in Punjab today and AI has received no reports of acts of torture perpetrated by their members after the end of the militancy period. [6.148] Although some claimants claim to fear persecution by terrorists or other non-state agents there is no evidence that, following the end of the counter-insurgency period, such persecution takes place in Punjab.

3.8.3 Sufficiency of Protection Police are a civil authority controlled by the Union Ministry of Home Affairs and subordinate to the Executive, represented in the Union Government by the Prime Minister and in the States by the Chief Minister, and their respective Councils of Ministers. The 25 state governments have primary responsibility for maintaining law and order. Each State has its own force headed by a Director-General of Police (DGP) and a number of Additional Directors-General or Inspectors-General of Police (IGP) who look after various portfolios.[5.56] A wide variety of domestic and international human rights groups generally operate without government restriction in India. [6.426] Those experiencing persecution from militant groups can reasonably seek protection from the Indian authorities and there is no evidence to suggest that such protection is not provided.

3.8.4 Internal Relocation The Indian Constitution guarantees Indian citizens the right to move freely throughout the territory of India, and to settle and reside in any part of the country. Indian citizens enjoy freedom of movement within the country except in certain border areas where, for security reasons, special permits are required. Punjabi Sikhs are able to relocate to another part of India, and there are Sikh communities all over India. [6.157-158, 6.200]

3.8.5 There are no checks on a newcomer to any part of India arriving from another part of India, including if the person is a Punjabi Sikh. Local police forces have neither the resources nor the language abilities to perform background checks on people arriving from other parts of India. There is no system of registration of citizens, and often people have no identity cards, which in any event can be easily forged. [6.159]

3.8.6 Taking these factors into account as a general rule, Sikhs from the Punjab are able to move freely within India and internal relocation to escape the attentions of individuals in their home area would not be unduly harsh. For single women who do not relocate as part of a family unit relocation may be difficult and unduly harsh.

3.8.7 Caselaw

IAT Determination: Balvir Kaur [2002] UKIAT03387 The Tribunal found that it would be unduly harsh to expect a woman from a rural background to relocate to another part of India because in reality she would be destitute, without accommodation, without housing and with no one to turn to.

3.8.8 Conclusion Following the end of the counter-insurgency period there is no evidence of persecution of Sikhs by non state agents and therefore claimants would be unlikely to demonstrate a well-founded fear of persecution, or torture or degrading or inhuman treatment, amounting to a breach of Article 3 ECHR. In addition there exists the option for those who encounter difficulties to seek national protection or to relocate internally and therefore it is unlikely that any such claim would result in a grant of asylum or Humanitarian Protection and such claims are likely to be clearly unfounded.

[Back to top](#)

3.9 Christians, Muslims and Hindus

3.9.1 Claimants fear persecution from non-state agents as a consequence of their Christian, Muslim or Hindu religious faith.

3.9.2 *Treatment-General* Christians constitute 2.3% of the population of India, Muslims 12% (of which just over 90% are Sunni and the remainder Shi'a), Sikhs 2.0%. Hindus, the major religion in India, constitute 82% of the population. [6.39] Muslims and Christians are therefore respectively the first and second largest minority religious groups in India.[6.83]

3.9.3 The Constitution provides for secular government and the protection of religious freedom. However it is reported that whilst the central Government generally respected these provisions in practice; it sometimes did not act effectively to counter societal attacks against religious minorities and attempts by state and local governments to limit religious freedom. This failure resulted in part from the legal constraints inherent in the country's federal structure, and in part from shortcomings in the law enforcement and justice systems. Ineffective investigation and prosecution of attacks on religious minorities were seen by some extremists as a signal that such violence may be committed with impunity.[1]

3.9.4 It has been reported that the status of religious freedom improved during 2004 however tensions between Muslims and Hindus, and between Hindus and Christians, continued during the year. Attacks on religious minorities decreased overall but occurred in several states, which brought into question the Government's ability to prevent sectarian and religious violence or prosecute those responsible for it. On the positive side no new anti-conversion laws were enacted during 2004 and the anti-conversion law in Tamil Nadu was repealed. Hindutya, the politicised inculcation of Hindu religious and cultural norms to the exclusion of others remained a subject of national debate and influenced some governmental policies.[6.49-6.50]

3.9.5 *Treatment-Muslims* The Indian authorities do not restrict the religious activities of Muslims, who have freedom of religious practice and freedom to organise their services according to their codes, religious teachings and customs. Muslims in India have their own educational establishments including madrasa religious schools responsible for disseminating the teachings of Islam. They also have a large number of places of worship in India. Muslims are reported to be under-represented in the civil service, the military and institutions of higher education.[6.52-6.53] However the current President of India Dr APJ Abdul Kalam is a Muslim.[1]

3.9.6 A campaign of sectarian violence was triggered in February 2002 following an attack on a train carrying Hindu activists. As a result of a fire on the train 59 Hindus were killed and the event provoked deadly religious riots in which at least 1,000 people died, most of them Muslim.[6.65-6.68] The Supreme Court made a scathing attack on the government of Gujarat over its handling of a particular incident during these riots(the Best Bakery Case) in which 12 Muslims were killed. Following this criticism Gujarat's State Government agreed to seek a re-trial of the 21 Hindus who had been acquitted of involvement in the attack. In April 2004, in what was described as an indictment of Modi's Gujarat government, the Supreme Court overturned the acquittal of the 21 accused in the bakery store case and ordered a new trial of those indicted. India's highest court ordered a transfer of the trial to neighbouring Maharashtra state and directed both state governments to provide protection to witnesses and victims, appoint a new public prosecutor, and institute new police investigations into the case. [6.71] The re-trial of those involved commenced before the Special Court in Mumbhain in July 2005 continuing into August 2005.[11] Human Rights Watch noted in its 2005 Annual Report that the Gujarat government's failure to bring to justice those responsible for the riots in which thousands of Muslims were killed and left homeless continues to be a source of tension throughout the country, but noted that the Supreme Court and the National Human

Rights Commission have taken several positive steps to secure justice for the victims of the riots.[6.77]

3.9.7 Treatment-Christians It is reported that the Indian authorities do not interfere with the internal religious activities of Christians, that their activities are conducted freely and that they are well integrated into Indian society. Minorities including Christians can establish their own schools offering religious instruction as well as a general education, in addition religious instruction can be provided at seminaries.[6.83-6.84]

3.9.8 However individual acts of violence and harassment have been reported over the years sometimes leading to the injury or death of individuals. In some cases Christians involved in missionary work have been the target particularly where their actions have involved or have been perceived to involve religious conversions. Perpetrators of some of these acts of violence have been traced and prosecuted. [6.89 to 6.95, 6.97] The United Nations noted in their Human Development Report, 2004, "In South Asia organised violent attacks on Christian Churches and missions have increased. India, despite its long secular tradition, has experienced considerable communal violence, with rising intensity." A separate report also notes an increase in the number of attacks on Christians over the last 10 years. [6.96]

3.9.9 Treatment-Hindus As noted above Hindus are the major religion in India accounting for some 82% of the population. Skirmishes between Hindus and Muslims do occasionally occur for example there were minor Hindu-Muslim skirmishes in Gujarat in Vadodara (September 2003 and February 2004), Viramgam (November 2003), Ahmedabad (November 2003 and January 2004), and Godhra (September 2003 and February 2004) as a result of which seven people, three Hindus and four Muslims, were killed.[14] Hindu nationalists have long agitated to build a temple on a disputed site in Ayodhya and in February 2002 it was reported that a mob of Muslims attacked a train carrying Hindu volunteers returning from Ayodhya to the state of Gujarat, and 57 were burnt alive. Over 900 people were killed and 100,000 left homeless in the resulting anti-Muslim riots throughout the state. This led to accusations that the state government had not done enough to contain the riots, or arrest and prosecute the rioters.[4.20] More recent reports have suggested that the fire may not have been as a result of an attack by Muslims but may have been accidental.[6.68]

3.9.10 Sufficiency of Protection The Penal Code prohibits and punishes any violation of tolerance and non-discrimination based on religion or belief. [6.36] However in May 2004, the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom reported the government's response to violence against religious minorities in Gujarat and elsewhere continues to be inadequate. [6.39]

3.9.11 The US State Department Report on Religious Freedoms 2004 report records that the National Commission for Minorities (NCM) and the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) have appointed members and these organisations are tasked respectively with protecting the rights of minorities and protecting human rights. These governmental bodies investigate allegations of discrimination and bias and can make recommendations to the relevant local or central government authorities. These recommendations are generally followed, although they do not have the force of law. [6.32]

3.9.12 In a 1999 case involving the death of missionary Graham Staines and his two sons, in September 2003 the ringleader received the death sentence and twelve others received life imprisonment. The death sentence is used rarely in India and is reserved for the most serious crimes, defendants have the right to appeal all the way to the Supreme Court and can then ask for a presidential pardon. [6.93] Additionally following a bombing incident in 2000 which injured 30 Christians, the former BJP Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee spoke out strongly about these incidents. He called on State Governments to "firmly and impartially investigate

all incidents of violence against Christians in India", and commenting on the spate of attacks he called them an "aberration and an exception to the general texture of peaceful and cordial relations between the various communities". [4]

3.9.13 As noted above the Gujarat government has been criticised for its failure to bring to justice those responsible for the riots in 2002. A National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) report held the Gujarat government responsible for the riots accusing it of complicity. However the Supreme Court and the National Human Rights Commission have taken steps to secure justice for the victims of the riot. In August 2004 the Supreme Court ordered the Gujarati police to review and re-open 2,000 closed cases relating to the events in 2002. [6.67, 6.76-6.77]

3.9.14 Those experiencing religious intolerance can reasonably seek protection from the Indian authorities and there is no evidence to suggest that such protection is not provided. As evidenced by the NHRC findings in respect of the extreme violence in February 2002 in Gujarat, there is monitoring, investigation and redress for those who are victim to religious violence even in the most extreme circumstances. As detailed, perpetrators of religious violence against Christians, Muslims and Hindus have been prosecuted for their actions.

3.9.15 In the cases of high profile religious leaders whose actions have made them a particular target the Indian State may not be able to provide a sufficiency of protection.

3.9.16 *Internal Relocation* The Indian Constitution guarantees Indian citizens the right to move freely throughout the territory of India, and to settle and reside in any part of the country. Indian citizens enjoy freedom of movement within the country except in certain border areas where, for security reasons, special permits are required. [6.157, 6.200] Therefore, as a general rule, an internal relocation option exists from one Indian State to another. However, internal relocation for females who need to relocate may not be an option. For single women who do not relocate as part of a family unit, relocation may be difficult and unduly harsh.

3.9.17 *Caselaw*

IAT Determinations: Winston Farrer (2002)UKIAT04874. The Tribunal agreed with the Adjudicator that this Christian appellant was personally at risk of persecution in Gujarat on account of his religious beliefs. However, it was held that it would not be unduly harsh for the appellant to relocate to another area of India where sentiment against Christians was not so strong and therefore internal relocation was a viable option.

3.9.18 *Conclusion* The Indian constitution guarantees the rights of religious minorities and there are avenues open for individuals to seek protection from the authorities where they experience ill-treatment. Furthermore there exists the option for those who encounter such difficulties to relocate internally. Therefore it is unlikely that claimants in this category would qualify for asylum or Humanitarian Protection and such claims are likely to be clearly unfounded. An exception to this may be high-profile religious leaders in very specific and individual circumstances for whom there may not be a sufficiency of protection as detailed above, however such cases are likely to be extremely rare. Such cases, may result in a grant of asylum or Humanitarian Protection but if refused are unlikely to be clearly unfounded.

[Back to top](#)

3.10 Land disputes

3.10.1 Typically a claimant states that he is in dispute with either an uncle or another family member over a piece of land. The protagonist violently abuses the claimant, and is

influential so either the claimant does not report the problems to the police or has not had an investigation by the police. The violence escalates and the claimant flees the country.

3.10.2 Treatment In a country where nearly two thirds of the population relies on agriculture for their livelihoods^[3.1] the ownership and acquisition of land is clearly an important issue. Land records are vital documents for farmers and the government, used to prove ownership and for administrative functions as well.^[2] The computerisation of land records in India was advocated in 1985 and a centrally sponsored scheme was started in 1988. The scheme continued to develop and by 1999 was being implemented in 544 districts of the country, leaving only those where there were no land records.^[5] It is reported that computerised land ownership records in India are now providing millions of farmers with a measure of security and peace of mind they did not previously have.^[2] However another report notes that current land ownership records provide only “presumptive title” rather than “guaranteed title” suggesting that the absence of guaranteed title has far-reaching implications in the country.^[7] Land disputes in India can occasionally end in violence as noted in a 2001 report in The Tribune newspaper, when four people were hurt in a firing incident over a land dispute. The report notes that the police were deployed in the tense situation in the village, three people were arrested, and the gun used seized.^[8]

3.10.3 Sufficiency of Protection India has an independent judiciary, but this is reported to be underfunded and overburdened generally. In general it is reported that the judiciary enforces the right to a fair trial, although there is a backlog of cases and the system is understaffed. NGO’s allege that corruption influenced some court decisions.^[5.23, 5.31, 6.1] A wide variety of domestic and international human rights groups operate freely without government restriction, investigating abuses and publishing their findings on human rights cases. The National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) was set up under the Protection of Human Rights Act 1993, which defines Human Rights as rights relating to life, liberty, equality and dignity of individuals guaranteed by the Constitution or embedded in the International Covenants and enforceable by Courts in India. ^[6.426] ^[6 para 7.49, 7.50] While the NHRC is conducting enquiries, it has the powers of a civil court, including summoning attendance of witnesses, compelling the provision of information and referring cases of contempt to a magistrate. ^[6.13] The 1993 Protection of Human Rights Act recommended the establishment of State Human Rights Commissions and these have been established in 14 out of 25 states. ^[6. 17]^[6 para 7.74] There are institutions in place in India to protect those in land disputes and there are some organisations both Governmental and non-governmental to whom individuals can turn for help and assistance.

3.10.4 Internal Relocation Notwithstanding the avenues of protection available to claimants in this category, it would not be unduly harsh to expect a person who has a localised problem to relocate. The Indian Constitution guarantees Indian citizens the right to move freely throughout the territory of India, and to settle and reside in any part of the country. ^[6.157] Indian citizens enjoy freedom of movement within the country except in certain border areas where, for security reasons, special permits are required. ^[6.200] Therefore, as a general rule, an claimant who fears retribution as a result of a land dispute could move from one State to another. However, internal relocation for females who need to relocate may not be an option. For single women who do not relocate as part of a family unit, relocation may be difficult and unduly harsh.

3.10.5 Conclusion Sufficient protection is available in all parts of India and claimants can seek assistance from the national or local human rights commissions if required. Those who are unable or, owing to fear unwilling to avail themselves of the protection of the authorities, can relocate to another part of India. As generally there is a sufficiency of

protection and internal relocation is possible, grants of asylum or Humanitarian Protection will not be appropriate and such claims will be clearly unfounded.

[Back to top](#)

3.11 Members of Akali Dal

3.11.1 Members of the Akali Dal political party may claim that they fear ill-treatment amounting to persecution from members of the opposing Congress Party.

3.11.2 *Treatment* Akali Dal also called Shiromani Akali Dal(SAD) is a Sikh party originally formed in 1920 to demand an independent Sikh state. The party has a number of factions but as of 2003 the Shiromani Akali Dal under Prakash Singh Badal became the largest faction and the one recognised by the Election Commission as the SAD.^[12] In recent times the SAD has been in alliance with the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) and together with the BJP won 10 out of the 13 seats in Punjab in the 2004 elections.^[Annex B] The SAD is a legal party which has participated in state and national elections in India.^[Annex B] The Congress Party or National Congress as it has been known since the early to mid 1990s was originally known as the All India Congress Committee.^[13 page 2086 to 2087] It was the party of Indian independence and has ruled for some 50 years since independence. It lost the 1998 elections to an alliance under the Bharatiya Janata Party(BJP) but came to power again in 2004 as the leading member of the United Progressive Alliance.^[Annex B, 4.26]

3.11.3 *Sufficiency of Protection* Police are a civil authority controlled by the Union Ministry of Home Affairs and subordinate to the Executive, represented in the Union Government by the Prime Minister and in the States by the Chief Minister, and their respective Councils of Ministers. The 25 state governments have primary responsibility for maintaining law and order. Each State has its own force headed by a Director-General of Police (DGP) and a number of Additional Directors-General or Inspectors-General of Police (IGP) who look after various portfolios.^[5.56] A wide variety of domestic and international human rights groups generally operate without government restriction in India.^[6.426] Those experiencing persecution or ill-treatment from members of opposing political parties or alliances can reasonably seek protection from the Indian authorities and there is no evidence to suggest that such protection is not provided.

3.11.4 *Internal Relocation* Notwithstanding the avenues of protection available to claimants in this category it would not be unduly harsh to expect those facing a localised threat to relocate internally. The Indian Constitution guarantees Indian citizens the right to move freely throughout the territory of India, and to settle and reside in any part of the country. Indian citizens enjoy freedom of movement within the country except in certain border areas where, for security reasons, special permits are required. ^[6.157, 6.200] Therefore, as a general rule, an internal relocation option exists from one Indian State to another. However, internal relocation for females who need to relocate may not be an option. For single women who do not relocate as part of a family unit, relocation may be difficult and unduly harsh.

3.11.5 *Conclusion* The Akali Dal and Congress are both legal political parties within India who campaign and participate in State and National elections. There is no evidence to suggest that members of one party fearing ill-treatment or persecution by individual members of the other party could not seek protection from the authorities or relocate internally to escape a local threat, as a result claims in this category will not generally warrant a grant of asylum and will be clearly unfounded.

[Back to top](#)

3.12 Prison Conditions

3.12.1 Claimants may claim that they cannot return to India due to the fact that there is a serious risk that they will be imprisoned on return and that prison conditions in India are so poor as to amount to torture or inhuman treatment or punishment.

3.12.2 Prisons in India are governed under the auspices of the Prisons Act 1894 and the Prisoners Act 1900. State governments and Union Territories are responsible for prison administration. As at mid 2003 it was reported that there were 1,119 prisons including juvenile camps, with a total prison population of 313,635. The official capacity was 229,713 resulting in an occupancy level of 136.5%.^[5.65] It is reported that prison conditions are harsh and life threatening. Prisons are severely overcrowded, and the provision of food and medical care frequently is inadequate. ^[5.67] As a result of the severely overloaded court system thousands of people await trial for periods longer than they would receive if they had been convicted. Some prisoners are held for months or even years before obtaining a trial date. In July (2004) the Ministry of Law and Justice reported over 29,500 cases pending before the Supreme Court and over 3,000 before the state High Courts. The NHRC reported that 75% of prison inmates were prisoners awaiting trial.^[5.25]

3.12.3 Women are housed separately from men, and by law juveniles must be detained in rehabilitative facilities, however, they are at times detained in prison, especially in rural areas. Pre-trial detainees are not separated from the general prison population. ^[5.73]

3.11.4 One NHRC report notes that a large proportion of deaths in judicial custody were from natural causes, in some cases aggravated by poor prison conditions. The NHRC Special Rapporteur and the Chief Co-ordinator of Custodial Justice have been charged with helping to implement a directive to state prison authorities to perform medical check-ups on all inmates, however by the end of 2004 medical checks were available to only a few inmates.^[5.68] According to a Home Ministry report nationwide deaths in custody rose from 1,340 in 2002 to 1,462 in 2003.^[5.69]

3.12.5 NGOs are allowed to work in prisons within specific government guidelines but as a result of agreements with the Government their findings remained largely confidential. A Home Ministry report noted that the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) visited 55 detention centers and over 7,000 detainees in 2004 including all acknowledged detention centres in Jammu and Kashmir and all other facilities where Kashmiris were held. However ICRC were not authorised to visit interrogation or transit centres, and did not have access to detention centres in the northeastern states.^[5.75]

3.12.5 Conclusion Whilst prison conditions in India are poor, with overcrowding and the inadequate provision of health care being particular problems, conditions are unlikely to reach the Article 3 threshold. Therefore even where claimants can demonstrate a real risk of imprisonment on return to India a grant of Humanitarian Protection will not generally be appropriate. However, the individual factors of each case should be considered to determine whether detention will cause a particular individual in his particular circumstances to suffer treatment contrary to Article 3, relevant factors being the likely length of detention the likely type of detention facility and the individual's age and state of health.

[Back to top](#)

3.13 Women

For information on women in India and guidance on asylum claims please refer to the India Fact Finding Mission Report, and the India Policy Bulletin.

4. Discretionary Leave

4.1 Where an application for asylum and Humanitarian Protection falls to be refused there may be compelling reasons for granting Discretionary Leave (DL) to the individual concerned. (See API on Discretionary Leave)

4.2 With particular reference to India the types of claim which may raise the issue of whether or not it will be appropriate to grant DL are likely to fall within the following categories. Each case must be considered on its individual merits and membership of one of these groups should **not** imply an automatic grant of DL. There may be other specific circumstances not covered by the categories below which warrant a grant of DL-see the API on Discretionary Leave.

4.3 Unaccompanied minors

4.3.1 The policy on unaccompanied minors is set out in the API on Children. Unaccompanied minors who have not been granted asylum or HP can only be returned where they have family to return to or where there are adequate reception arrangements. At the moment we do not have sufficient information to be satisfied that there are adequate reception arrangements in place.

4.3.2 Unaccompanied minors without a family to return to, or where there are not adequate reception arrangements, should if they do not qualify for leave on any more favourable grounds be granted Discretionary Leave for a period of three years or until their 18th birthday, whichever is the shorter period.

[Back to top](#)

4.4 Medical Treatment in India

4.4.1 Claimants may claim that they cannot return to India due to a lack of specific medical treatment. See the IDI on Medical Treatment which sets out in detail the requirements for Article 3 or 8 to be engaged.

4.4.2 Medical care in India is free to all citizens, but most care is provided in the private sector. Private health care costs are less than in the UK, [5.86] and there is a good availability of medications, many cheaper than in the UK. [5.91] In the larger cities, particularly the State capitals, there are hospitals offering care in a wide range of medical specialities. [5.85] Several reports note that better care is available in cities than in rural areas where treatment may be limited or unavailable. However most districts are served by referral hospitals.[5.85, 5.87]The Article 3 threshold will not be reached in the great majority of medical cases and a grant of Discretionary Leave will usually not be appropriate.

4.4.3 Where a caseworker considers that the circumstances of the individual claimant and the situation in the country reach the threshold detailed in the IDI on Medical Treatment making removal contrary to Article 3 or 8 a grant of Discretionary Leave to remain will be appropriate. Such cases should always be referred to a Senior Caseworker for consideration prior to a grant of Discretionary Leave.

[Back to top](#)

5. Returns

5.1 Factors that affect the practicality of return such as the difficulty or otherwise of obtaining a travel document should not be taken into account when considering the merits of an asylum or human rights claim.

5.2 Indian nationals may return voluntarily to India at any time by way of the Voluntary Assisted Return and Reintegration Programme run by the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) and co-funded by the European Refugee Fund. IOM will provide advice and help with obtaining travel documents and booking flights, as well as organising reintegration assistance in India. The programme was established in 2001, and is open to those awaiting an asylum decision or the outcome of an appeal, as well as failed asylum seekers. Indian nationals wishing to avail themselves of this opportunity for assisted return to India should be put in contact with the IOM offices in London on 020 7233 0001 or www.iomlondon.org

6. Additional References

[1] US State Department report on Human Rights Practices – 2004 published February 2005 <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2004/41740.htm>

[2] The World Bank Group News India Land Records Online Updated May 2004, accessed 14 July 2005
<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/NEWS/0,,contentMDK:20511729~menuPK:141311~pagePK:34370~piPK:34424~theSitePK:4607,00.html>

[3] India: Break the cycle of impunity and torture in Punjab - Amnesty International 19 January 2003 <http://web.amnesty.org/library/Index/ENGASA200022003?open&of=ENG-IND>

[4] India condemns attacks on Christians, BBC news - 24 June 2000 date accessed 18 October 2002 http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/804210.stm

[5] GIS Development Computerisation of Land Records in India, accessed 14 July 2005
<http://www.gisdevelopment.net/application/lis/overview/lisrp0015a.htm>

[6] Report of the fact finding mission to India, published on 21 December 2004

[7] India Together 24 February 2005 A credible low income housing policy, accessed 14 July 2005 <http://www.indiatogether.org/2005/feb/opi-housepol.htm>

[8] The Tribune On Line Edition April 19 2001 Land dispute: 4 hurt in firing, accessed 14 July 2005 <http://www.tribuneindia.com/2001/20010419/nation.htm>

[9] Amnesty International Report 2005 covering events from January to December 2004
<http://web.amnesty.org/report2005/ind-summary-eng>

[10] Census of India 2001 Brief Analysis of Religious Data
<http://www.censusindia.net/religiondata/index.html>

[11] Outlook India.com Court records statement of accused in Best Bakery case 8 August 2005 accessed 16 August 2005 http://www.outlookindia.com/pti_news.asp?id=315757

[12] Wikipedia the free encyclopaedia Shiromani Akali Dal accessed 17 August 2005
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shiromani_Akali_Dal

[13] Europa World Year Book 2004 India Directory

[14] United States Department of State International Religious Freedom Report 2004
<http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/irf/2004/35516.htm>

[15] Email from FCO on AISSF dated 18 August 2005

**Asylum and Appeals Policy Directorate
September 2005**