



General Assembly

Distr.: General
12 March 2012

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Thirteenth session
Geneva, 21 May - 4 June 2012

Summary prepared by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in accordance with paragraph 5 of the annex to Human Rights Council resolution 16/21

India*

The present report is a summary of 51 stakeholders' submissions¹ to the universal periodic review. It follows the general guidelines adopted by the Human Rights Council in its decision 17/119. It does not contain any opinions, views or suggestions on the part of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), nor any judgement or determination in relation to specific claims. The information included herein has been systematically referenced in endnotes and, to the extent possible, the original texts have not been altered. As provided for in Resolution 16/21 of the Human Rights Council, where appropriate, a separate section is provided for contributions by the national human rights institution of the State under review that is accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles. The full texts of all submissions received are available on the OHCHR website. The report has been prepared taking into consideration the periodicity of the review and developments during that period.

* The present document was not edited before being sent to United Nations translation services.

I. Information provided by the accredited national human rights institution of the State under review in full compliance with the Paris Principles

A. Background and framework

1. The National Human Rights Commission of India (NHRC)² reported its assessment of the Government's response to the eighteen recommendations made in UPR 1.³ According to NHRC, there was no evidence that India intended to ratify CED. Enforced disappearance was not codified as a criminal offence in domestic law, nor was extant provisions of law used to deter the practice.⁴ India had not taken any steps towards signing and ratifying OP-CEDAW.⁵ India's position for not ratifying ILO Conventions No. 138 and 182 was less tenable after the passage of the Right to Education Act, which made it compulsory for children to be at school until the age of fourteen.⁶ India had not reviewed its reservation to article 32 of the CRC.⁷

2. NHRC stated that the "Prevention of Torture Bill, 2010", which was originally weak, was strengthened by a Select Committee of Parliament's Upper House. If the Bill eventually adopted diluted the revisions proposed by the Select Committee, India's commitment to the CAT would be called into question.⁸

3. NHRC stated that there had been no developments to amend the Special Marriage Act and give equal rights to property accumulated during marriage.⁹

4. According to the NHRC, the Government continued to allow the National Commissions function independently but had given them no additional powers or greater resources; the State Human Rights Commissions were mostly moribund; and few human rights courts had been set up.¹⁰

5. NHRC reported that there was still no national action plan for human rights.¹¹ There was little progress in strengthening human rights education and almost none of the States in India had given education priority.¹²

6. NHRC stated that the Human Development Report 2011 of the Planning Commission included some disaggregated data, but not on caste and related discrimination. NHRC believed such data was essential in key areas of: crimes committed against women and children from the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes; violence against women other than rape; bonded labour, child labour and manual scavenging; custodial violence, illegal detention and torture.¹³

7. NHRC was unaware of any programmes of the Government on sharing its experience in promoting and protecting human rights.¹⁴

B. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms

8. Reporting on the implementation of recommendations made to India, NHRC indicated that the Government's issuance of a standing invitation to mandate holders should not make it difficult to act on the request to receive the Special Rapporteur on torture.¹⁵ India's reports were still delayed or it had not reported to treaty bodies.¹⁶

9. NHRC was unaware of a formal follow-up process to the UPR and, thus, the question of the integration of a gender perspective did not arise.¹⁷ Some Ministries consulted civil society in the formulation and implementation of their programmes.¹⁸

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations

10. NHRC stated that the Indian experiment was unique and must be judged by its own benchmarks, which were set by a powerful and activist judiciary, a free media and vigilant civil society, which were guardians of human rights in an open society run by the rule of law.¹⁹

11. With respect to civil and political rights, NHRC stated that the implementation of laws, the weakness of new Bills and the law's delay were areas of concern. Some of which were highlighted by the NHRC.²⁰

12. HRC received 341 complaints of disappearance in 2010, 338 so far in 2011. These numbers underlined the need for the Government to act.²¹

13. 35% of the complaints to the NHRC annually were against the police. In 2006 the Supreme Court issued seven binding directives to start police reform, but little had been done, although the need was urgent.²²

14. Custodial justice remained a problem. Jails were overcrowded and unhygienic, disease rampant and treatment poor. NHRC indicated that 67% of prisoners were pre-trial, unable to raise bail or confined far longer than they should be because of the huge backlog of cases.²³

15. There were inordinate delays in the provision of justice. 56,383 cases were pending in the Supreme Court at the end of October 2011. At the end of 2010, 4.2 million cases were pending in High Courts, and almost 28 million in subordinate courts.²⁴

16. Bonded labour continued and was taking new forms. NHRC had received reports of bonded labour being used to execute defence projects in difficult areas.²⁵

17. The degrading practice of manual scavenging continued. Some States were in denial over this. The Indian Railways were the largest users of manual scavengers.²⁶

18. The focal point set up in the NHRC for the protection of human rights defenders received complaints that several, including those working on minority rights and the rights of the scheduled castes and tribes, faced harassment in several States, including arbitrary detention.²⁷

19. NHRC reported that in the areas controlled by the Naxal movement, human rights have become even more parlous: governance and the rule of law rarely functioned. Villagers were the victims of Naxal violence, and collateral damage in the counter-insurgency operations.²⁸

20. NHRC stated that the Armed Forces Special Powers Act (AFSPA) remained in force in Jammu & Kashmir and the North-Eastern States, conferring impunity that often led to the violation of human rights, despite India reporting in 2011 that it did not face international or non-international armed conflict situations.²⁹

21. NHRC stated that although India had set up ambitious "flagship programmes" to provide economic, social and cultural rights those rights remained precarious.³⁰ The flagship programmes, through which the Government addressed "economic and social inequities," were not well conceived, had been lavishly funded but looted by the corrupt. Intended beneficiaries received a small proportion of their supposed entitlements.³¹ The denial or the abuse of, or the inability to access, their rights hit the most vulnerable the hardest – women, children, the scheduled castes and tribes, and the minorities.³²

22. Over 90% of the workforce was in the unorganized sector, had no access to social security, was particularly vulnerable in the cities, and, therefore, driven into permanent debt, often leading to conditions of bonded labour.³³

23. A massive public distribution system had not assured the right to food because malnutrition was endemic. The National Advisory Council had recommended that legal entitlements to subsidized foodgrains be extended to at least 75% of the population. This was not acceptable to the Government, which set arbitrary ceilings on the numbers who could be declared as being below the poverty line.³⁴

24. Under the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme 55 million were given work, but on average received half the wages guaranteed. The Scheme had not made enough of an impact, very large sums of money had been siphoned off, and it did not provide long-term employment or build permanent assets.³⁵

25. The Indira Awas Yojana, set up to provide rural housing, required that an applicant had a plot of land. Millions of landless were excluded. The scheme did not provide enough to build a house, and there was some evidence that those who took the money ended up in debt.³⁶

26. Public spending on health continued to be abysmally low, at about 1% of GDP, despite Government's commitment to raise it to 2-3%. The public health system was riddled with problems; vast numbers in the villages get little or no medical care. An evaluation and audit had found serious deficiencies in the National Rural Health Mission.³⁷ Referring to the high percentage of underweight children under age five years, NHRC reported that a 2011 evaluation of a huge programme called the Integrated Child Development Services found that 60% of the annual budget for supplementary nutrition was being diverted.³⁸

27. The quality of education, particularly in the villages, was dismal; the infrastructure was appalling, teachers were absent, para-teachers were poorly trained. Learning levels and literacy were very low.³⁹

28. Rapid growth, the development of infrastructure and the expansion of mining industries, had all led to massive displacements of populations, often without their informed consent. NHRC found that usually those displaced were given neither adequate relief, nor the means of rehabilitation.⁴⁰

II. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Background and framework

1. Scope of international obligations

29. Joint Submission 9 (JS9) stated that the Prevention of Torture Bill 2010 (PTB), was yet to be tabled before both Houses of Parliament.⁴¹ JS14 and HAQ: Centre for Child Rights (HAQ) stated that this Bill did not contain any provisions in relation to children.⁴² The Asian Legal Resource Centre (ALRC) stated that the Bill required substantial revision, including in its definition of torture.⁴³ The International Commission of Jurists (ICJ) recommended making provision for criminal liability for public officials and superior and commanding officers; and that India eventually become a party to OP-CAT.⁴⁴ Working Group on Human Rights in India and the UN (WGHR) recommended that India adopt the PTB after addressing its shortcomings and then immediately ratify CAT.⁴⁵ Human Rights Watch (HRW) recommended ratification of CED.⁴⁶ WGHR recommended that India ensure that enforced disappearances and extrajudicial killings are codified as offences under criminal law.⁴⁷

30. Amnesty International (AI) recommended ratification of ICRMW and the optional protocols to ICCPR, and ICESCR.⁴⁸ JS2⁴⁹ and Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative

(CHRI) recommended that India sign and ratify OP-CEDAW;⁵⁰ JS2 and AI recommended the removal of the reservations to CEDAW;⁵¹ and JS14 reconsideration of India's reservation to Article 32 of CRC.⁵²

31. JS16 called on India to ratify and effectively implement the Rome Statute.⁵³ JS13 recommended that India accede to Additional Protocols I and II to the Geneva Conventions and give unconditional access to the International Committee of the Red Cross to the north-eastern region, especially Manipur.⁵⁴

32. JS10 recommended urgent ratification of the ILO C. Nos. 182 and 138;⁵⁵ and JS11 recommended ratification of ILO C. 169.⁵⁶

2. Constitutional and legislative framework

33. Edmund Rice International (India) (ERI)⁵⁷ and JS3 observed that various legal instruments defined children by different ages.⁵⁸ JS14⁵⁹ and JS3 encouraged India to have a uniform definition.⁶⁰

34. Institute for Human Rights and Business (IHRB) recommended amending the Human Rights Protection Act 1993⁶¹ to enable the NHRC to address business-related human rights grievances.⁶²

3. Institutional and human rights infrastructure and policy measures

35. JS20 stated that all the National Human Rights Institutions did not comply with the Paris Principles, for reasons which included their lack of financial autonomy and their dependence on seconded staff from government departments.⁶³ JS12 recommended reforms to the NHRC, including ending the use of serving or retired police officers on investigative teams.⁶⁴

36. JS20 reported that the NHRC cannot investigate human rights violations by the armed forces under section 19 of the Human Rights Protection Act.⁶⁵ JS16 stated that in 1997 the NHRC was empowered by the Supreme Court to examine the role of state actors in the perpetration of human rights violations in Amritsar,⁶⁶ and to provide redress to victims.⁶⁷ After fifteen years of proceedings, NHRC had little to show.⁶⁸ JS16 made recommendations to ensure accountability of the NHRC.⁶⁹

37. JS18 recommended strengthening the State Human Rights Commission in the seven states where they were operational and establishing commissions in the remaining states.⁷⁰ Child Rights and You (CRY) recommended that the National and State Commissions for the protection of child rights be set up as constitutional bodies accountable to the legislature.⁷¹

38. AI recommended that India produce an action plan for human rights.⁷²

39. HAQ stated that the National Plan of Action for Children was in need of revision as most goals projected to be accomplished by 2010, remained unaccomplished.⁷³

40. . WGHR stated that there was no public information available of a developed national action plan for human rights education⁷⁴ and JS18 recommended its development.⁷⁵ JS9 recommended that India formulate a coherent plan to provide training on the prevention of discrimination to, inter alia, law enforcement and judicial personnel.⁷⁶

41. JS9 stated that in the 2011 nationwide census there was no disaggregation of data by caste, gender, religion, status and region.⁷⁷

B. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms

42. ICJ recommended that India present a national plan of action for the implementation of, inter alia, accepted recommendations to the Plenary of the Human Rights Council at the adoption of the report on its upcoming review; and two years thereafter present a mid-term progress report on the status of implementation.⁷⁸

1. Cooperation with treaty bodies

43. Christian Solidarity Worldwide (CSW) recommended that India ensure that it met its reporting responsibilities in a timely fashion.⁷⁹ Implementation of treaty body recommendations on caste-based discrimination was recommended by JS9⁸⁰ and on maternal health by JS2.⁸¹

2. Cooperation with special procedures

44. CSW recommended that India ensure that recommendations made by special procedures mandate holders were implemented.⁸²

45. CHRI suggested that the Government clear the backlog and invite all Special Procedures with pending visit requests to visit India before the next UPR.⁸³ International Forum for Justice/Human Rights Forum J&K (IFJ/HRFJK) called on India to extend an invitation to the Special Rapporteur on violence against women.⁸⁴

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

1. Equality and non-discrimination

46. Equal Rights Trust stated that India must amend or repeal discriminatory laws and introduce comprehensive anti-discrimination legislation to meet its international obligations.⁸⁵ JS9 recommended the development of a national action plan to eliminate all forms of discrimination.⁸⁶

47. JS20 stated that patriarchy remained the root cause of discrimination against women.⁸⁷ Peoples' Vigilance Committee on Human Rights (PVCHR) stated that human rights initiatives in India lacked a gender perspective.⁸⁸ WGHR reported that violence against women was pervasive.⁸⁹ WGHR recommended that the Government reform religion-based family laws and address witch-hunting through a national law.⁹⁰ JS3 urged India to undertake and enforce effective measures to ensure equal treatment and opportunities between men and women in the employment market.⁹¹ ERI recommended that the Government quickly pass the much awaited 33% Women's Reservation Bill.⁹²

48. JS9⁹³ and JS20⁹⁴ reported on violations against Scheduled castes (SC), including 1349 rape cases, 570 murder cases, 511 abduction cases and 150 arson cases in 2010. ALRC stated that India should be encouraged to take affirmative actions, beyond legislation, such as the mandatory acceptance of complaints.⁹⁵ JS3 urged India to take steps to abolish the discriminatory practice of "untouchability" and prevent caste motivated abuse.⁹⁶

49. According to JS9, Dalit Christians formed around 75-80% of the Indian Christian population.⁹⁷ Lutheran World Federation (LWF) stated if members of SC and scheduled tribes (ST) converted to some religions they lost their rights under the "reservation system" as well as their protection under the Prevention of Atrocities Act. LWF made recommendations, including amending the laws to ensure that members of the SC and ST have access to the same rights and protections, irrespective of their religion.⁹⁸

50. According to JS12, Muslims were often segregated in India⁹⁹ and housing discrimination had become a problem, particularly since the Mumbai bombings.¹⁰⁰ Although Muslims made up nearly 14 percent of India's population, they held fewer than five percent of government posts.¹⁰¹

51. JS20 stated that many of the Particularly Vulnerable Tribal Groups were on the verge of extinction while others were stigmatized under the 'Habitual Offenders Act'.¹⁰²

2. Right to life, liberty and security of the person

52. JS1 stated that Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 prescribed the death penalty for drug related crimes.¹⁰³ Child Rights Information Network made recommendations, including the enactment of legislation prohibiting capital punishment and life imprisonment for child offenders in Jammu and Kashmir.¹⁰⁴ ICJ recommended that India establish a moratorium on executions with a view to abolishing the death penalty and take immediate steps towards abolition of the death penalty.¹⁰⁵

53. AI stated that the AFSPA granted security forces, in specified areas of armed insurgency, powers to shoot to kill in situations where they were not necessarily at imminent risk.¹⁰⁶ WGHR stated that enforced disappearances and extrajudicial killings remained entrenched in conflict areas, reinforced by extraordinary powers of arrest, detention and immunity available to the security forces. In Manipur, 789 extra-judicial executions were documented between 2007 and 2010. A People's Tribunal established the presence of 2,700 mass unmarked graves, confirmed by the J&K State Human Rights Commission in 2011. In West-Bengal, the Border Security Force (BSF) had been responsible for extra-judicial killings at the Indo-Bangladesh border.¹⁰⁷

54. WGHR indicated that a study concluded that 1.8 million people were victims of police torture and ill-treatment in India every year.¹⁰⁸ ALRC stated that the practice of torture was widespread;¹⁰⁹ perpetrated in all forms of custody;¹¹⁰ condoned in conflict areas;¹¹¹ and was a common technique for criminal investigations.¹¹² Successful prosecution for torture was extremely low.¹¹³

55. WGHR alleged that a new law sought to widen the scope of deployment of BSF for counter-insurgency and "anti-Naxal" operations.¹¹⁴ The police was being increasingly militarized in conflict areas and given charges of counter-insurgency operations. Paramilitary forces were being intensely trained by the army for operations in Central India.¹¹⁵ JS19 indicated that, in 2010, in Jammu and Kashmir, the police and paramilitary used excessive force against anti-government protestors.¹¹⁶ It made recommendations, including the issuing of non-lethal weapons to security forces for crowd control purposes.¹¹⁷

56. JS18 reported on religious violence and intolerance among religious groups and organized communal attacks against religious minorities and their properties.¹¹⁸ CSW commended India for its attempt to pass legislation on communal violence; and encouraged India to see this process through. Such a law could provide a useful model to other countries in the region confronting similar problems.¹¹⁹

57. WGHR noted a worrying trend in the targeting of activists seeking implementation of progressive laws/schemes.¹²⁰ Urgent concerns about the environment in which activists and human rights defenders operated and the threats they faced, especially where they exposed official nepotism and corruption, were reported by JS19. JS19 made recommendations.¹²¹

58. AI stated that in Jammu and Kashmir the State authorities continued to use the Public Safety Act, 1978, to detain individuals for long periods of time.¹²² WGHR reported that a large number of *adivasis* had been arbitrarily arrested in Central India and languished

in jail.¹²³ JS12 made recommendations, including that India ensure that apprehension, arrest, detention, custody and imprisonment were in accordance with international standards.¹²⁴

59. Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children recommended that India introduce legislation, as a matter of urgency, to prohibit corporal punishment of children in the home and in all settings, including as a sentence under traditional forms of justice.¹²⁵

60. PVCHR stated that discriminatory attitudes and lack of sensitization on the dynamics of crimes involving sexual and domestic violence left victims without critical police aid or redress to which they were entitled.¹²⁶ HRW recommended that India enact a comprehensive law prohibiting all forms of sexual assault against women and children.¹²⁷

61. JS11 stated that India was a source, destination, and transit country for trafficked human beings, mostly for forced labour, bonded labour,¹²⁸ and commercial sexual exploitation.¹²⁹ Allegedly, victims were mostly women and children belonging to the lower castes and tribes and living in disadvantaged regions.¹³⁰ JS4 reported on violations faced by “sex workers” due to the criminalization of “sex work” and the stigma associated with it.¹³¹

62. JS10 proposed amendment of the Immoral Traffic Prevention Act, 1956 and the Indian Penal Code, 1860 to, inter alia, clearly define child prostitution and criminalize related acts;¹³² and define trafficking in children.¹³³ Odisha Goti Mukti Andolan reported on the practice of bonded labour.¹³⁴ JS11 recommended the adoption of victim-centred legislation and the regulation of registration of placement agencies for migrant workers.¹³⁵

63. According to JS3, children who abandoned school became domestic workers with low wages, street children or railway dwellers.¹³⁶ Ambedkar Center for Justice and Peace recommended the release and rehabilitation of all children subjected to child labour.¹³⁷

3. Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law

64. CHRI stated that there was a shortage of judges¹³⁸ and nearly 16 million people were awaiting trials for crimes.¹³⁹ In 2010, there were more than 32 million pending cases, an increase of more than 830 thousand from the previous year.¹⁴⁰ ICJ recommended increasing the number of courts and judges by immediately filling all vacancies.¹⁴¹

65. CHRI recommended that the Government undertake police reforms in the spirit of the Supreme Court’s orders in the 2006 judgement and along the lines of recommendations made by the National Police Commission.¹⁴² WGHR recommended the creation of an independent directorate of prosecution.¹⁴³ ALRC encouraged India to consider reform of justice institutions as the Government’s priority.¹⁴⁴

66. HRW recommended that India vigorously investigate and prosecute officials who order, commit, or tolerate human rights violations, including torture, custodial killings, faked armed encounter killings, and enforced disappearances.¹⁴⁵ United NGOs Mission-Manipur (UNM-M) recommended effective investigation and prosecution of human rights violations committed by the security forces in the context of AFSPA; and the provision of effective access to justice and remedy for the victims of these violations.¹⁴⁶

67. IFJ/HRFJK recommended that India allow DNA profiling of the bodies from mass and unmarked graves in Jammu and Kashmir and allow for international investigation in this regard.¹⁴⁷ A related recommendation was made by JS22.¹⁴⁸

68. CHRI stated that India’s pre-trial prison population was one of the highest in the world.¹⁴⁹ JS20 reported that custodial deaths were rampant.¹⁵⁰ CHRI called for ensuring more release on bail and parole and that the Government strengthen statutory prison oversight mechanisms.¹⁵¹

69. ICJ made recommendations for ensuring the availability of legal aid to a larger segment of the population.¹⁵²

70. HAQ indicated that the Special Juvenile Police Units (SJPU) in every district with at least one police officer designated as juvenile welfare officer, as provided in law, did not exist.¹⁵³ JS14 made recommendations, including the expeditious establishment of fast-track, child-friendly courts.¹⁵⁴

71. WGHR stated that India lacked a law or scheme for witness protection. The Supreme Court had developed principles, none of which encompassed all aspects of witness protection.¹⁵⁵

72. PVCHR stated that the culture of impunity was the biggest threat to the rule of law.¹⁵⁶ HRW recommended the repeal of all legal provisions providing immunity to government officials, including article 197 of the Criminal Code of Procedure and of AFSPA.¹⁵⁷ WGHR noted that sections of the Government were calling for re-examining the AFSPA, which was opposed by the army.¹⁵⁸ Kashmir Institute of International Relations called for the repeal of the Public Safety Act, Jammu and Kashmir Disturbed Area Act and National Security Act which provide impunity to Indian army and other security agencies.¹⁵⁹

4. Right to privacy, marriage and family life

73. WGHR stated that in 2009, homosexuality was de-criminalized by the Delhi High Court. The judgement was under appeal. The State has abdicated its role of defending the judgment, relegating defence of human rights of the LGBT persons to civil society.¹⁶⁰

74. JS6 recommended mandatory registration of all deaths, births and marriages.¹⁶¹

5. Freedom of religion or belief, expression and association

75. JS21 stated that “Freedom of Religion” Acts, which regulate religious conversions,¹⁶² had been enacted in the states of Orissa, Madhya Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat and Himachal Pradesh.¹⁶³ JS21 alleged that attacks against religious minorities, including the Christian community, appeared to be more pronounced in the states that have adopted such acts.¹⁶⁴ JS5 recommended the repealing of the Freedom of Religion Act in the states in which they existed.¹⁶⁵ JS5 alleged that the “Adivasis” had been a major target of forced religious conversion by the “Hindu religious right wing”.¹⁶⁶ Pax Christi International called for measures to address incidents of hate speech and violence against religious minorities.¹⁶⁷ JS18 made recommendations for the prevention of religious intolerance and religion-based strife.¹⁶⁸

76. WGHR reported that the stringent provisions under the Foreign Contribution Regulation Act 2010 could threaten the functioning of human rights organizations, especially those critical of the Government.¹⁶⁹ Concerns about the Act were also raised by the European Association of Jehovah’s Witnesses.¹⁷⁰

77. JS15 commended the Government on internet initiatives and progress, including in the areas of education, health and e-governance.¹⁷¹ JS15 recommended uniform implementation of the Right to Information Act 2000 across India, which will bring transparency, ensure accountability and minimise corruption.¹⁷²

78. CRY recommended the establishment of a broadcasting regulatory authority that, inter alia, would address the exploitative and degrading portrayal of children including in the media.¹⁷³

6. Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work

79. WGHR stated that India's economic policies were steadily eroding rights, working conditions and living standards for the majority of the labour force, 92 percent of who belonged to the informal sector.¹⁷⁴ JS9 recommended, inter alia, the adoption of the "Unorganised Workers Social Security Bill".¹⁷⁵

7. Right to social security and to an adequate standard of living

80. JS11 reported that SC and ST accounted for 80% of the rural poor.¹⁷⁶ ALRC stated that widespread corruption denied the rural poor the benefits of development and government welfare schemes. India should be urged to bring functioning, transparent mechanisms to prevent this corruption.¹⁷⁷

81. WGHR stated that almost fifty percent of the world's hungry lived in India. India had the world's highest number of malnourished and hungry children.¹⁷⁸ JS11 stated that India's National Food Security Bill (NFSB) overlooked the Interim Orders of the Supreme Court on the right to food.¹⁷⁹ WGHR noted that the NFSB failed to universalise the *Public Distribution System* (PDS) the world's largest food subsidy programme. A successful system of quasi-universal PDS had been introduced by Tamil Nadu, which should be emulated across the country.¹⁸⁰

82. WGHR stated that India faced an acute housing shortage¹⁸¹ and recommended the development of a rights-based national housing policy or law with a focus on social housing.¹⁸²

83. WGHR reported that the provision of water and sanitation, although claimed to be a priority, was dismal. 665 million people defecated in the open.¹⁸³

8. Right to health

84. JS8, World Vision (WV) and WGHR made recommendations on increasing the budget allocation on health.¹⁸⁴ JS8 made recommendations, including that India address human resource constraints; prioritize the funds, infrastructure and capacity to manage drugs and supplies; and address socio-economic inequalities in public health care services planning.¹⁸⁵

85. WGHR stated that India had the world's highest child mortality.¹⁸⁶ According to JS2, India was the country leading all others in the absolute number of maternal deaths.¹⁸⁷ WV reported that States with poor health indicators like Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh and Orissa, accounted for almost half of the country's ST population and 37% of SC population.¹⁸⁸ JS2 stated that the persistence of maternal mortality, including due to child marriage and unsafe abortion, reflected the low status of women in India and the lack of prioritization of gender equality (MDG 3).¹⁸⁹ HRW recommended that India ensure that maternal health programmes did not discriminate against women with more than two children or mothers under the age of 18.¹⁹⁰

86. JS17 highlighted the serious concerns regarding the very limited availability of palliative care services.¹⁹¹ HRW recommended that India take immediate steps to ensure that all regional cancer centres offered palliative care and all states and territories implement simplified morphine regulations.¹⁹²

87. WGHR recommended that India review regulations to prevent unethical medical trials.¹⁹³

9. Right to education

88. JS6 was concerned about inadequate funding to implement the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act (RTE) and involvement of the private sector.¹⁹⁴ While acknowledging the RTE, JS15 referred to widespread internet use and indicated that the internet could be a medium to access information and knowledge at low cost.¹⁹⁵

89. JS3 noted that discrimination against ST and SC children affected children in the educational system.¹⁹⁶ JS9 stated that a disproportionate number of SC students, in higher education, had committed suicide.¹⁹⁷ ERI recommended zero tolerance for any form of discrimination based, inter alia, on religion, caste, or disability, in schools.¹⁹⁸

90. HRW reported on Maoist attacks on schools and on the government occupation of schools for their anti-insurgency operations.¹⁹⁹ Related concerns were raised by JS20,²⁰⁰ UNM-M²⁰¹ and JS13.²⁰² ERI recommended that the army or police should not occupy schools during conflict situations.²⁰³

10. Persons with disabilities

91. ERI recommended that children with disabilities should be educated in mainstream schools.²⁰⁴

92. National Disability Network (NDN) stated that there was a lack of protection for people with disabilities from neglect, abuse, and harassment in families and communities, and lack of support for them. There were many instances of abuse of people who were mentally impaired in state-run institutions, including through the use of electro-convulsive therapy.²⁰⁵ NDN made recommendations.²⁰⁶

11. Minorities and indigenous peoples

93. Zo Indigenous Forum reported that India had the largest number of indigenous people of any country and must recognize them as indigenous people.²⁰⁷

94. Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC) stated that in north-east India, ethnic tensions between indigenous people (e.g. Bodos) and those they regarded as “outsiders” (e.g. Muslims or Adivasis) had led to violence and displacement.²⁰⁸

95. According to IDMC, in Central India, the causes of conflict were linked to discrimination against the indigenous population (or Adivasis) living in areas with large mineral deposits that were being exploited by mining companies, threatening their ancestral lands and traditional ways of life.²⁰⁹

96. JS7,²¹⁰ JS13,²¹¹ IHRB²¹² and ALRC²¹³ referred to alleged instances of violations of indigenous peoples’ land rights with JS11²¹⁴ reporting that the dams and hydro-power projects in Brahmaputra River Basin posed threats to the environment and the livelihood of indigenous peoples. International Institute of Peace Justice and Human Rights reported on alleged excessive use of force against groups protesting forced evictions and land expropriation.²¹⁵ AI recommended that legislation be amended to guarantee free, prior and informed consent (FPIC)²¹⁶ and that India ensure that proposals in the Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Bill 2011 explicitly prohibit forced evictions.²¹⁷

97. JS11 stated that in north-east India, the indigenous languages (Sema, Lotha, Ao, Aimol, Chiru, Kharam) were not included in the school curricula and there were no official commitments to preserve these languages and cultures.²¹⁸

12. Migrants, refugees and asylum-seekers

98. WGHR reported that the status of refugees, simply treated as foreigners, remained arbitrary, decided by the administrative authorities. WGHR called for the adoption of the Refugee and Asylum Seekers (Protection) Bill, 2006.²¹⁹

13. Internally displaced persons

99. IDMC recommended the development of national legislation and policy on internal displacement.²²⁰

14. Right to development and environmental issues

100. WGHR stated that India's free trade agreements threatened the rights to food, health, work and development.²²¹ WGHR recommended that trade and investment agreements meet India's constitutional and international commitments to human rights and environmental standards.²²²

15. Human rights and counter-terrorism

101. JS12 stated that India promulgated amendments to the Unlawful Activities Prevention Act of 1967 which reintroduced elements of earlier anti-terrorism legislation that had been broadly condemned.²²³ It made recommendations, including revising the definition of terrorism to be consistent with international law;²²⁴ ensuring that police training in counterterrorism operations included respect for due process, non-discrimination, and humane treatment.²²⁵

Notes:

¹ The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org. (One asterisk denotes a national human rights institution with "A" status)

National Human Rights Institution

NHRC National Human Rights Commission, New Delhi, India;*

Civil society

ACJP Ambedkar Center for Justice and Peace, Kingston, Pennsylvania, United States of America (USA);

AI Amnesty International, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (UK);

ALRC Asian Legal Resource Centre, Hong Kong, China;

CHRI Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, New Delhi, India;

CRIN Child Rights Information Network, UK;

CRY Child's Rights and You, New Delhi, India;

CSW Christian Solidarity Worldwide, UK;

ERI Edmond Rice International, Geneva, Switzerland;

ERT The Equal Rights Trust, London, UK;

GIEACPC Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, London, UK;

HAQ HAQ:Centre for Child Rights, New Delhi, India;

HRW Human Rights Watch, Geneva, Switzerland;

ICJ International Commission of Jurists, Geneva, Switzerland;

IDMC Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre of the Norwegian Refugee Council, Geneva, Switzerland;

IFJ/HRFJK International Forum for Justice / Human Rights Forum J&K, India;

IHRB Institute for Human Rights and Business, Nairobi, Kenya;

IIPJHR International Institute for Peace, Justice and Human Rights, Geneva, Switzerland;

- JS1 Harm Reduction International, London, UK, Indian Harm Reduction Network, New Delhi, India, and Asian Network of People who Use Drugs, Bangkok, Thailand (Joint Submission 1);
- JS2 Center for Reproductive Rights, New York, USA, and Human Rights Law Network, New Delhi, India (Joint Submission 2);
- JS3 Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice and International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education, Development, San Paulo, Brazil (Joint Submission 3);
- JS4 Creating Resources for Empowerment and Action, New Delhi, India, and The Sexual Rights Initiative (comprising of Action Canada for Population and Development, Canada, Creating Resources for Empowerment and Action, India, Federation for Women and Family Planning, Poland, Egyptian Initiative for Personal Rights, Egypt, Akahata, Argentina), Durbar Mahila Samanwaya Committee, India, Veshya Anyay Mukti Parishad, India, Talking About Reproductive and Sexual Health Issues, New Delhi, India, Centre for Penology, Criminal Justice and Police Studies, and Jindal Global Law School, India (Joint Submission 4);
- JS5 Pax Romana, Geneva, Switzerland, Orissa Forum for Social Action, India, National Dalit Movement for Justice, New Delhi, India, Dominicans for Justice and Peace, Geneva, Switzerland, World Council of Churches, Geneva, Switzerland, and National Solidarity Forum, India (Joint Submission 5);
- JS6 World Vision India, India, National Coalition for Education, India (Joint Submission 6);
- JS7 Odisha Review Development: a coalition of 33 civil society organizations, Odisha, India (Joint Submission 7);
- JS8 Save the Children, Washington, DC, USA, World Vision, Geneva, Switzerland (Joint Submission 8);
- JS9 National Coalition for Strengthening PoA Act, New Delhi, India, comprising of National Campaign on Dalit Human Rights, New Delhi, India, National Dalit Movement for Justice, New Delhi, India (Joint Submission 9);
- JS10 Equitable Tourism Options, India, End Child Prostitution, Child Pornography and Trafficking of Children for Sexual Purposes, India, (Joint Submission 10);
- JS11 Franciscan International, Geneva, Switzerland, and Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd Justice Peace and Solidarity, Canada (Joint Submission 11);
- JS12 The Advocates for Human Rights, Minneapolis, USA, Indian American Muslim Council, Washington, D. C., USA, Jamia Teacher Solidarity Association, New Delhi, India (Joint Submission 12);
- JS13 Centre for Organisation Research & Education, Manipur, India, Citizens Corn for Dams and Development, Civil Liberties and Human Rights Organisation, Civil Liberties People Forum, (Joint Submission 13);
- JS14 India Alliance for Child Rights, New Dehli, India (Joint Submission 14)
- JS15 Digital Empowerment Foundation, New Delhi, India, India, and Association for Progressive Communication, California, USA (Joint Submission 15);
- JS16 REDRESS, London, UK, and Ensaaf, India, (Joint Submission 16);
- JS17 Pallium India, India, Worldwide Palliative Care Alliance, London, UK, International Association for Hospice & Palliative Care, Houston, USA, and Human Rights Watch, Geneva, Switzerland (Joint Submission 17);
- JS18 International Association for Religious Freedom, Geneva, Switzerland, Rama Krishna Mission, Mahabodhi International Meditation Centre, Unitarian Universalist of India, Forum for Harmony, Caussanal Inter -Religious Movement, Bahai's Spiritual Center, World Zoroastrian Culture Federation, Thenkasi Harmony, Bala Vikas Foundation, Vishaka Patnam, Sadhrana Brama Samaj, and Interfaith Fellowship for Peace and Progress (Joint Submission 18);
- JS19 CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Johannesburg, South Africa and Common Wealth Human Rights Initiative, New Delhi, India (Joint Submission 19);
- JS20 Asian Centre for Human Rights, New Delhi, India, Asian Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Network, New Delhi, India, Adivasi Development Council, India, Banglar

- Manab Adhikar Suraksha Mancha, West Bengal, India, Mising Bane Kebang, Assam, India, Karbi Human Rights Watch, Assam, India, Integrated Rural Women Development Service Organization, Manipur, India, Zomi Human Rights Foundation, India, Rural Women Upliftment Society, Manipur, India, Mizoram Bru Displaced Peoples' Forum, India, Young Chakma Association, Marpara Zone, Mizoram, India, Kheruk Majdoor Chetna Sangat Alirajpur, Madhya Pradesh, India, Samaj Chetna Adhikar Manch, Madhya Pradesh, India, Dialogue on Indigenous Culture and Environment Foundation, India, National Campaign for Survival and Dignity, Sundargarh, India, Indigenous Tribal Peoples Development Centre, Tripura, All Bodo Students' Union, Assam, India, All Rabha students' Union, Assam, India, Dimasa students' Union, Assam, India, and Barak Valley Chakma Students' Association, Assam, India (Joint Submission 20);
- JS21 World Evangelical Alliance, New York, USA, and Evangelical Fellowship of India, India (Joint Submission 21);
- JS22 International Human Rights Association of American Minorities (IHRAAM), Nainamo, Canada; Indian Council of South America (CISA), La Paz, Bolivia; Indigenous Peoples and Nations Coalition (IPNC), Anchorage, Alaska; International Council for Human Rights (ICHR), Brussels, Belgium; International Educational Development, Los Angeles, USA; Association of Humanitarian Lawyers, San Francisco, USA; International Association of Schools of Social Work (IASSW), Hong Kong, China (Joint Submission 22);
- JW The European Association of Jehovah's Christian Witness, Belgium;
- KIIR Kashmir Institute of International Relations, Islamabad, Pakistan;
- LWF Lutheran World Federation, Geneva, Switzerland;
- NDN National Disability Network, New Delhi, India;
- OFMI Organization for Minorities of India, Lathorp, California, United States of America;
- OGMA Odisha Goti Mukti Andolan, India;
- PCI Pax Christi International, Brussels, Belgium;
- UNMM United NGOs Mission-Manipur, India comprising: Council for Anti Poverty Action and Rural Volunteer, Centre for Social Development, Village Development Organisation, Social Upliftment & Rural Edn., Abundant Life Ministry, Rural Service Agency, Development of Human Potential, Action for Welfare and Awakening I Rural Environment, Rural Education and Action for Change Manipur, United Tribal Development Project, Christian Social Development Organisation, Chandel Khubol Social Welfare Arts and Culture Assn., Good Samaritan Foundation, Evangelical Assembly Churches, Joint Action for Relief and Development Association, Rural Aid Services, Integrated Rural Development Agency, Socio Economic Development Organisation, Centre for Community, Centre for Rural Development and Educational Organisation, Paomei Development Society Tungjoy, Zougam Institute for Community & Rural Development, Rural Development Association, Socio Economic & Environment Development Organisation, Integrated Rural Development Welfare Association, Tangkhul Theological Assn., Eastern Rural Development & Welfare Service, Participatory Action for Sustainable Development Organisation, Women Uion for Peace, Shalom Development Organisation, Rural Institute for Community Health and Dev., People's Resource Development Association, Rural Christian Development Society, New Life Foundation, Women Action for Development, Tribal Women Dev. Assn., All Manipur Women Assn., Environment and Economic Management Assn., Centre for Women Development, Rural Women Upliftment Society, Women In Holistic Development, Tuikhaphai Presbyterias Women Dev. Project, Rural Women Dev. Society, Women Development Agency, Tribal Women and Child Care Assn., Integrated Rural Management Agency, Umathel Women Development Association, Action for Women in Development, Women's Action for Reformation, Centre for Women, Grace Ministry, Rural Women & Children Dev. Organisation, Widow Welfare Society, Association for Rural Development & Women Empowerment, Womem Development Organisation, Development Agency for Tribal People, and Tamei Women Welfare Organisation, India (Joint Submission);

WGHR Working Group on Human Rights in India and the UN comprising of Action Aid India, Asian Centre for Human Rights, Citizens for Justice and Peace, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, FIAN India, HAQ: Centre for Child Rights, Housing and Land Rights Network, Human Rights Alert, India Alliance for Child Rights, Lawyers Collective, Multiple Action Research Group, National Campaign on Dalit Human Rights, Partners for Law in Development, and People's Watch, India (Joint Submission);

WV World Vision, Geneva, Switzerland;

ZIF Zo Indigenous Forum, Mizoram, India.

- ² NHRC-India, submission to the second cycle of the Universal Periodic Review of India, pp.1-6. The recommendations mentioned by NHRC-India can be found in document A/HRC/8/26 and A/HRC/8/26/Add.1.
- ³ NHRC, para. 7 and pars. 8-24.
- ⁴ NHRC, para. 20.
- ⁵ NHRI, p. 5, para. 14.
- ⁶ NHRC, p. 5, para. 15.
- ⁷ NHRC, p. 5, para. 16.
- ⁸ NHRC, p. 1, para. 5, p. 4, para. 8.
- ⁹ NHRC, p. 6, para. 23.
- ¹⁰ NHRC, p. 4, para. 10.
- ¹¹ NHRC, p. 5, para. 19.
- ¹² NHRC, p. 5, para. 21.
- ¹³ NHRC, para. 13.
- ¹⁴ NHRC, p. 5, para. 17.
- ¹⁵ NHRC, para. 11.
- ¹⁶ NHRC, para. 12.
- ¹⁷ NHRC, p. 6, para. 22.
- ¹⁸ NHRC, p. 4, para. 9; See also WGHR, para. 2.
- ¹⁹ NHRC, p.1.
- ²⁰ NHRC, para. 5.
- ²¹ NHRC, para. 20.
- ²² NHRC, para. 5.
- ²³ NHRC, para. 5.
- ²⁴ NHRC, para. 5.
- ²⁵ NHRC, para. 5.
- ²⁶ NHRC, para. 5.
- ²⁷ NHRC, para. 5.
- ²⁸ NHRC, p. 6, para. 25.
- ²⁹ NHRC, para. 5.
- ³⁰ NHRC, para. 6.
- ³¹ NHRC, p. 5, para. 18.
- ³² NHRC, para. 6.
- ³³ NHRC, para. 6.
- ³⁴ NHRC, para. 6.
- ³⁵ NHRC, para. 6.
- ³⁶ NHRC, para. 6.
- ³⁷ NHRC, para. 6.
- ³⁸ NHRC, para. 6.
- ³⁹ NHRC, para. 6.
- ⁴⁰ NHRC, para. 6.
- ⁴¹ JS 9, p. 2, para. 4. See also JS 20, p. 1; AI, p. 1; HRW, p. 1; IFJ, p. 5; IHRB, p. 5; LWF, p. 3, para. 5; and OFMI, p. 5.
- ⁴² JS 14, p. 9, para. 7. 1 and HAQ, p. 6, para. 10. 4; See also CRY, p. 2.
- ⁴³ ALRC, p. 3, para. 2.3; See also CRY, p. 2.
- ⁴⁴ ICJ, p. 5, para. 24 (i) and (x). For other recommendations see p. 5, para. 24 (ii) to (ix).
- ⁴⁵ WGHR, para. 37.

- ⁴⁶ HRW, p. 5. See also IFJ, p. 5; LWF, p. 3, para. 5.
⁴⁷ WGHR, para. 39, recommendations.
⁴⁸ AI, p. 5.
⁴⁹ JS 2, p. 6, recommendation 1.
⁵⁰ CHRI, p. 7, para. 28. See also AI, p. 6.
⁵¹ JS 2, p. 6 and AI, p. 6.
⁵² JS 14, p. 6. See also IHRB, p. 5
⁵³ IFJ/HRFJK, p. 5.
⁵⁴ JS13, p. 10, recommendations, para. 43.
⁵⁵ JS 10, p. 3. See also JS 9, p. 3, para. 6; JS 11, p. 7, para. 27 a); and IHRB, p. 5.
⁵⁶ JS 11, p. 10, para. 39 a). See also AI, p. 6.
⁵⁷ ERI, p. 2, recommendation 2.
⁵⁸ JS 3, para. 7.
⁵⁹ JS14, p. 7, recommendations 5 and 6.
⁶⁰ JS 3, para. 8. See also JS 14, p. 7, recommendation 5; HAQ, p. 2, para. 3; and CRY, p. 2, para. b.
⁶¹ See also, HRW, p. 4, recommendations.
⁶² IHRB, p. 5, recommendations.
⁶³ JS20, p. 2. See also HRW.
⁶⁴ JS 12, p. 9, para. 30. See also HRW.
⁶⁵ JS20, p. 2. See also HRW, p.3.
⁶⁶ JS 16, p. 2, para. 4.
⁶⁷ JS 16, p. 2, para. 4 and p. 3, para. 8.
⁶⁸ JS 16, p. 4, para. 15.
⁶⁹ JS 16, p. 6.
⁷⁰ JS 18, p. 7, para. 3.
⁷¹ CRY, section 3, para. B, p. 3. See also HAQ, para 10.
⁷² AI, p. 5. See also JS 20, p. 1, WGHR, para. 3.
⁷³ HAQ, p. 2, paras. 4, 5. See also JS10, pp. 5-6.
⁷⁴ WGHR, para 3 and recommendation.
⁷⁵ JS 18, p. 7, recommendations 1 and 2. See also WGHR, para. 3.
⁷⁶ JS 9, p. 3, para. 7.
⁷⁷ JS9, p. 2, para. 5.
⁷⁸ ICJ, p. 6, para. 24, recommendations (xxiv) and (xxv).
⁷⁹ CSW, p. 1, recommendation, para. 4.
⁸⁰ JS 9, p. 13, recommendation 10.
⁸¹ JS2, p. 6, recommendation 6.
⁸² CSW, p. 4, para. 19. See also JS 2, p. 6, recommendation 6.
⁸³ CHRI, para. 28, recommendation.
⁸⁴ IFJ/HRFJK, p. 5, recommendations.
⁸⁵ ERT, paras. 2 and recommendation, para. 22.
⁸⁶ JS9, p. 13, recommendation 11.
⁸⁷ JS20, p. 3.
⁸⁸ PVCHR, p. 2.
⁸⁹ WGHR, para. 60. See also JS20, pages 3 and 9
⁹⁰ WGHR, paras. 59 and 62.
⁹¹ JS 3, para. 25, recommendation 4. See also, JS3, para. 21.
⁹² ERI, p. 5, recommendation 9.
⁹³ JS9, paras. 14-15.
⁹⁴ JS20, p. 16. See also WGHR, paras. 60 and 68, JS11, paras. 40 and 42, ACJP, p.3 and PVCHR, pp.2-4.
⁹⁵ ALRC, p. 5, para. 3.7.
⁹⁶ JS 3, p. 5, para. 25.
⁹⁷ JS9, para. 19.
⁹⁸ LWF, p. 2, para. 2. See also JS 11, paras. 40 and 43; CSW, p. 1, paras. 5-8.
⁹⁹ JS12, para. 25.

- 100 JS12, para. 26.
101 JS12, para. 25.
102 JS20, p. 4.
103 JS1, p. 1.
104 CRIN, p. 3.
105 ICJ, p. 6, para. 24 (xx).
106 AI, p.2.
107 WGHR, para. 39.
108 WGHR, para. 36.
109 ALRC, p. 3, para. 2.5. See also JS20, p.8.
110 ALRC, p. 3, para. 2.5.
111 WGHR, para. 37.
112 ALRC, p. 3, para. 2.7.
113 ALRC, p. 3, para. 2.5.
114 WGHR, para. 42.
115 WGHR, para. 43.
116 JS19, para. 3.2.
117 JS19, p. 4, para. 6.3. See also WGHR, para. 44.
118 JS18, paras. 3-6.
119 CSW, para. 12.
120 WGHR, para. 75.
121 JS19, paras 1 – 5 and recommendations, para. 6. See also, AI, p. 7.
122 AI, p. 4. See also WGHR, para. 40.
123 WGHR, para. 41.
124 JS12, para. 31.
125 GIEACPC, p. 1. See also CRIN, p. 3, recommendation 2.
126 PVCHR, p. 3.
127 HRW, p. 5.
128 See also JS11, para. 25.
129 JS11, para. 7.
130 JS11, para. 8.
131 JS4, para. 1. See also paras. 11, 20, 27, 31 and recommendations paras. 34-45.
132 JS10, para. 1.2 a., p. 3.
133 JS10, para. 1.2 c., p. 4.
134 OMGA, p. 3, para. 1.
135 JS 11, p. 4, recommendations, para. 15 b) and e).
136 JS3, para. 18.
137 ACJP, p. 6, recommendation 2.
138 CHRI, p. 3, para. 13.
139 CHRI, p. 3, para. 14.
140 CHRI, p. 3, para. 14. See also, recommendations, p. 4, para. 17.
141 ICJ, p. 5, para. 24, recommendation xii).
142 CHRI, para. 12.
143 WGHR, para. 58, recommendation.
144 ALRC, para. 5.8. See also ALRC, para. 2.9.
145 HRW, p.4, recommendations.
146 UNM-M, p. 6, recommendations, paras. 24 and 26. See also JS 12, p. 10, para. 33.
147 IFJ/HRFJK, p. 5.
148 JS22, p. 1, recommendation 1.
149 CHRI, p. 5, para. 19.
150 JS20, p. 6.
151 CHRI, p. 6, para. 24.
152 ICJ, p. 5, para. 24, recommendation (xiii).
153 HAQ, p. 4, para. 8.3.
154 JS14, p. 11, recommendation 17.
155 WGHR, para. 57.

- ¹⁵⁶ PVCHR, p. 3.
- ¹⁵⁷ HRW, p. 4. See also, WGHR, para. 34. JS 5, paras. 34 and 10; ZIF, p. 2, recommendation 1; UNM-M, p.5, recommendation para. 23; IFJ/HRFJK, p. 5 and JS13, recommendation, para. 40.
- ¹⁵⁸ WGHR, para. 34. See also UNM-M, para. 14.
- ¹⁵⁹ KIIR, p. 6. See also IFJ/HRFJK, p. 5.
- ¹⁶⁰ WGHR, para. 66.
- ¹⁶¹ JS 6, p. 8, recommendation 1. See also JS 3, pp. 3-4; paras. 9-12; JS 14, p ara. 9, p.13.
- ¹⁶² JS21, para. 1.
- ¹⁶³ JS21, para. 2.
- ¹⁶⁴ JS21, para. 19.
- ¹⁶⁵ JS5, p. 8, recommendation, para. 31.
- ¹⁶⁶ JS5, pp. 4-5, para. 8.
- ¹⁶⁷ PCI, p. 2 and recommendations p. 4. See also JS18, p. 8, recommendation 9.
- ¹⁶⁸ JS18, p. 8, recommendation 15. See also recommendations 6-8.
- ¹⁶⁹ WGHR, para. 76.
- ¹⁷⁰ JW, p. 2.
- ¹⁷¹ JS15, paras. 5 – 11.
- ¹⁷² JS15, para. 21.
- ¹⁷³ CRY, p. 4.
- ¹⁷⁴ WGHR para. 23.
- ¹⁷⁵ JS9, p. 13, recommendation 9.
- ¹⁷⁶ JS11, para. 30.
- ¹⁷⁷ ALRC, p. 6, para. 4.6.
- ¹⁷⁸ WGHR, para. 11.
- ¹⁷⁹ JS 11, p. 5, para. 17.
- ¹⁸⁰ WGHR, para. 13.
- ¹⁸¹ WGHR, para. 7.
- ¹⁸² WGHR, para. 10.
- ¹⁸³ WGHR, para. 20 and recommendation.
- ¹⁸⁴ JS 8, p. 3, WV, p.2 and WGHR, para. 21.
- ¹⁸⁵ JS8, pp. 3-5. See also WV, pp. 3-5.
- ¹⁸⁶ WGHR, para. 17, See also JS 14; p. 8, para. 6.1.
- ¹⁸⁷ JS2, p. 6, recommendations' section.
- ¹⁸⁸ WV, p. 4.
- ¹⁸⁹ JS 2, p. 3, para. 6. See also JS 2, p.6, recommendations.
- ¹⁹⁰ HRW, p. 5.
- ¹⁹¹ JS 17, p. 4. See also HRW p. 4.
- ¹⁹² HRW, p. 5, recommendations.
- ¹⁹³ WGHR, para. 20, recommendation. See also WGHR, para. 19.
- ¹⁹⁴ JS6, para. 1, p. 3.
- ¹⁹⁵ JS15, para. 17.
- ¹⁹⁶ JS3, paras. 15 and 17-18.
- ¹⁹⁷ JS9, para. 27.
- ¹⁹⁸ ERI, p. 4.
- ¹⁹⁹ HRW, p. 4.
- ²⁰⁰ JS20, p. 16.
- ²⁰¹ UNM-M, para. 22.
- ²⁰² JS13, para. 33.
- ²⁰³ ERI, p.3, recommendation 3. See also HRW, recommendations p.5.
- ²⁰⁴ ERI, p. 5, recommendation 11.
- ²⁰⁵ NDN, p. 3.
- ²⁰⁶ NDN, pp. 10-11, recommendations.
- ²⁰⁷ ZIF, p.2, recommendation 2. See also JS13, para. 39.
- ²⁰⁸ IDMC, Chapter IV, p. 3/4.
- ²⁰⁹ IDMC, Chapter IV, p. 3/4.
- ²¹⁰ JS7, paras. 9 – 44.

²¹¹ JS13, paras. 36-37.

²¹² IHRB, pp.3-4.

²¹³ ALRC, paras. 4.1-4.6.

²¹⁴ JS11, para. 33. See also paras 32 and 35.

²¹⁵ IIPJHR, p. 2.

²¹⁶ See also AI, recommendation, p.7; JS11, recommendation para 39; JS13, recommendation, para. 39; and JS7, para. 29 and recommendation para 45.

²¹⁷ AI, recommendation, p. 6.

²¹⁸ JS11, p. 10, para. 38.

²¹⁹ WGHR, para. 74. See also ZIF, p. 2, recommendation 4.

²²⁰ IDMC, p. 7.

²²¹ WGHR, para. 21.

²²² WGHR, recommendation, para. 22.

²²³ JS12, p. 2, para. 8.

²²⁴ JS12, p. 9, para. 29.

²²⁵ JS12, p. 10, para. 35.
