

ENDLESS WAR

DISTURBED AREAS OF THE NORTH-EAST

PEOPLE'S UNION FOR DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS
JANUARY 1983

Published by

GOVINDA MUKHOTY

213, Jor Bagh

New Delhi-110003

for People's Union of Democratic Rights

Printed by : Nagri Printers Delhi-110032

Price : Rs. 2/-

When they grew criminal, they invented the idea of justice and in order to maintain it prescribed for themselves voluminous codes of law and to add security to these codes, they erected a guillotine.

Fyodor Dostoyevsky

CONTENTS

	<i>Page No</i>
1. Introduction	1
2. The Act	2
3. Enforcement	6
4. Validity	11
5. Conclusion	14

Introduction

In recent years the national media has been reporting, with regular frequency, about the violation of the democratic rights of the people of North-Eastern India, particularly in Nagaland, Mizoram and Manipur. The reports implicate a section of the law enforcing agencies of the state for these violations. They give instances of harrowing tales of rape, torture and murder of innocent citizens by the armed forces. The backdrop of their operations has been the continuing armed insurgency in some parts of the region, which has a history of its own dating back to the nineteenth century. Irrespective of the objectives and operations of the insurgency and the causes that sustained it for decades, it is necessary for the democratic sections of our society to examine the role of state agencies in the violation of constitutionally guaranteed rights of the people in this region. For, the attempt to win over the recalcitrant citizen's loyalty to the constitution of India cannot be made at the cost of that very constitution.

North-Eastern India consists of five states—Assam, Manipur, Meghalaya, Nagaland and Tripura—as well as two Union Territories—Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram. A population of 26,500,000 inhabits an area, overall, of 255,000 sq. kms. This predominantly tribal region (Assam, 11 percent ; Manipur, 90 percent ; Meghalaya, 85 percent ; Nagaland, 91 percent; Tripura, 29 percent ; Arunachal Pradesh, 87 percent ; and Mizoram, 70 percent ;) is characterised by its ethnic, linguistic and cultural distinctions. As a region it is also marked by economic backwardness. Except parts of the Brahmaputra valley in Assam (22.6 percent of the area of that state), the entire North-East has been declared as industrially backward in the Sixth Five Year Plan. It is within this kind of locale that armed insurgency, led by secessionist forces, is going on in some parts of the region.

The government, to deal with the insurgency, has armed itself with extraordinary powers under an act that is now called "The Armed Forces (Assam and Manipur) Special Powers (Amendment) act, 1972." Popularly known as The Disturbed Area Act, it has a unique character in that not only are the armed forces deployed under its provisions, but they also reign supreme over the civil powers.

In the context of regular reports about the violation of the rights of the people by the army, it is necessary to examine the source of the latter's legitimacy; the act, its enforcement and its constitutional validity.

II

The Act

On 26 January 1950 the Constitution of India came into force. Three years later the government began to acquire additional powers in the North-Eastern region with the passing of the "Assam Maintenance of Public Order (Autonomous District) Regulation Act, 1953". The act was applicable to what was known as the Naga Unit, consisting of the autonomous districts of Naga Hills and Tuensang (presently part of Nagaland). This act empowers the Governor to impose collective fines on the population (Section 7), to prohibit public meetings and processions (Section 10) and to detain anybody without a warrant (Section 17).

Later in 1958, the government brought forth "The Armed Forces (Assam and Manipur) Special Power Act, 1958." The act first came into force in the form of an ordinance, on 22 May 1958, twelve days after the budget session of Parliament was over. It was introduced in the Monsoon session of Parliament for ratification. At the time of its introduction, the then Deputy Chairman of the Rajya Sabha, Shri P. N. Saprú, pointed out that the act had appeared in the form of an ordinance barely twelve days after the end of the previous session of Parliament and there had been no need for such urgency. Several Members of Parliament opposed it on the grounds that the blanket powers being conferred on the army by this act would lead to the violation of the Fundamental Rights of the people, that this act would circumvent the Constitution by effectively imposing an Emergency in these areas without actually declaring one and that it abrogated the powers of the civil powers in favour of the armed forces. Notwithstanding these prophetic voices of dissent, the act was passed after a brief discussion, that lasted for three hours in the Lok Sabha and for four hours in the Rajya Sabha. Parliament then approved it with retrospective effect from 22 May 1958.

In the words of the then Home Minister, Shri Govind Ballabh Pant, the act "virtually extended to the disturbed areas of Assam and Manipur...the regulation that was imposed in the Naga Unit." in essence, the act empowered the Governor to declare any area covered by it as disturbed and in any area declared to be disturbed the army authorities were to be given special powers.

In addition, another act, meant specially for Nagaland, came into force in 1962. It was called "The Nagaland Security Regulation Act of 1962." This act required the prior consent of the concerned authority to enable the armed forces to enter or leave any village covered by it (Section 3). It empowered the concerned authority to move the entire population, or a section of the population, of a village, the total animal population or a section of it, from the village to another (Section 5). Further, it prohibited any legal proceedings to be instituted against any person who had acted in accordance with the provisions of this act (Section 36).

In November 1970, the government, by the use of a notification from the Home Ministry, extended the area covered by the 1958 act to the then existing Union Territory of Tripura.

Finally, in September 1972, the government brought forth fresh amendments to the 1958 act, repealing some of the previous acts and regulations. The objectives of the amendments, as stated by the incumbent Home Minister, Shri K. C. Pant, were threefold: "Firstly, it is proposed that the Armed Forces (Assam and Manipur) Special Powers Act, 1958 may have uniform application in all the five states and the two Union Territories in the North-Eastern region." Secondly, it sought to state clearly that the Governor of these states and the Administrator of the two Union Territories would have the power to declare an area as disturbed. Thirdly, "It is proposed to take that power also for the central government." It is this act in its amended form and called "The Armed Forces (Assam and Manipur) Special Powers (Amendment) Act, 1972" which is on the statutes today.

In its present form the Act has Seven Sections. Section 1 gives its title and specifies the area covered by the Act. Section 2 defines the armed forces as "the military forces and air forces of the Union." It defines a "disturbed area" as any "area which is for the time being declared by notification under Section 3 to be a disturbed area."

Section 3 of the act empowers "the Governer...or the Administrator...or the central government" to "declare the whole or such part of such state or Union Territory to be a disturbed area" if he or she "is of the opinion that the whole or any part...as the case may be, is in such a disturbed and dangerous condition that the use of armed force in aid of the civil power is necessary." Once the area is declared disturbed, Section 4, 5 and 6 of the act comes into force.

Section 4: Any commissioned officer, warrant officer or any other person of equivalent rank in the armed forces may, in a disturbed area.

(a) if he is of the opinion that it is necessary to do so for the maintainance of public order, after giving such due warning as he may consider necessary, *Fire upon or otherwise* use force, even to the causing of death, against any person who is acting in contravention of any law and order for the time being in force in the disturbed area, prohibiting the assembly of five or more persons or carrying weapons or of firearms, ammunition or explosive substances;

(b) If he is of the opinion that it is necessary so to do, to destroy any arms dump, prepared or fortified position or shelter from which armed attacks are made or *are likely to be made* or are attempted to be made or any structure used as a training camp for armed volunteers or utilised as a hideout by armed gangs or absconders *for any offence*;

(c) arrest, without warrant, any person who has committed a cognisable offence or against whom a reasonable suspicion exists that he has committed or is about to commit a cognisable offence and may *use force as may be necessary* to effect the arrest;

(d) enter and search without a warrant any premises to make any such arrest as aforesaid or to recover any person believed to be wrongfully restrained or confined or any property reasonably suspected to be stolen or any arms, ammunition or explosive substances believed to be unlawfully kept in such premises, and may for that purpose use such force as may be necessary;

Section 5: any person arrested and taken into custody under the act shall be made over to the officer-in-charge of the nearest

police station with *the least possible delay*. together with a report of circumstances occasioning the arrest.

Section 6: No prosecution, suit or other legal proceedings shall be instituted, except with previous sanction of the central government, against any person in respect of anything done or purported to be done in exercise of powers conferred by this act.

Section 7 of the act deals with the repeal of various acts and regulations hitherto in force in the area. (Emphasis added in all cases)

The account of the act provided above, and particularly the parts we have emphasised, bring out certain distinctive features of the act. They are:

1. The act merely requires the subjective satisfaction of the concerned authority to declare an area as disturbed; as such no objective criterion for such a declaration has been laid down in the act. Likewise, there is no place for review of the notification once the area has been declared as disturbed and no role is assigned to the Legislature.
2. The central government can declare any area to be disturbed even if the state government is not in favour of it.
3. The Act empowers the concerned authority to deploy armed forces only in aid of the civil power. Yet, the role of the civil authorities has nowhere been demarcated in the Act. On the contrary, Section 4 makes the armed forces virtually replace the civil authority.
4. The Act endows even low ranking army personnel, such as a Lance Naik, with extra-ordinary powers,
5. The Act contains no stipulation on any reasonable limitations of the use of force when it is considered necessary to do so.
6. All kinds of institutions, without any qualification or reservation, are within the purview of the Act.
7. It makes it possible for woman suspects to be searched, arrested and detained by the male officers and it gives scope for such searches to be undertaken during the day and night.
8. It makes it possible to arrest or search without warrant for any alleged offence that is not necessarily related to the basic objective of the Act, i.e., the maintenance of public order, and thus gives blanket powers to the armed forces.

9. No specific duration of time is given within which the arrested person has to be handed over to the police. The Act merely recommends the "least possible delay."

10. Any aggrieved citizen, or for that matter, even a state government, has no channel of redressal against any erring official.

The implications of each of these distinctive features will be clear once we review the enforcement of the Act over all these years,

III.

Enforcement

In January 1955, Mengung chungu area of Nagaland was brought under the Assam Maintenance of Public Order (Autonomous District) Regulation Act, 1953. Since then the area has continued to be under declaration of disturbed area. Other areas that have progressively been declared to be disturbed can be noted from the following chronology.

Declaration as Disturbed Area	Notified Area
January 1955	Mengungchungu, Nagaland
January 1956	The entire Naga Hill District
July 1956	Naga areas of Manipur
January 1965	Entire Mizoram.
August 1978	Manipur Valley
January 1980	North Kamrup, Assam*
April 1980	All Assam (except Cachar district)*
June 1980	South, West Hill areas, Tripura
September 1982	Jampui Hill district, Tripura

(* These two notifications were withdrawn on 2 Augst 1980)

Following the declaration of areas to be disturbed, one by one, the strength of the military and para-military forces in the region has increased many-fold. In 1976 according to the Bureau of Police Research and Development, Government of India, the entire North-East had a total of 34,500 civil police and 20,000 armed police; the ratio of the police force per thousand of the population was found to be much higher than the average for the rest of India.

According to recent estimates, there are, at present, 17 battalions each of the Assam Rifles and the CRPF (with each battalion consisting of 2,000 personnel) and eight battalions of the Border Security Force (with each battalion consisting of 10,000 men) in the region. They are backed by state forces such as four battalions of Manipur Rifles, seven battalions of Nagaland Armed Police and one each of the Mizoram Armed Police and the Rajasthan Armed Constabulary. This force is backed by the army forces, whose precise strength could not be ascertained. (Nor can it be automatically related to this Act since it is a border area). In fact, ten out of seventeen battalions of the Assam Rifles, three out of eight battalions of the BSF and three out of seventeen battalions of the CRPF are under the direct command of the army. (Source; Indian Express, 14 December 1982).

With this background, the Act was enforced in these areas from the early '50s. During the period of its operation many affected citizens and concerned human rights organisations have gone to court for redressal. Apart from individual cases of habeas corpus moved from time to time, there are three specific petitions that are directly related to the provisions of the Act.

In April 1980 Shri Indarjeet Barua moved the Gauhati High Court challenging the Act, when parts of Assam were notified as disturbed. On 17 April the Gauhati High Court ordered an interim stay on the operative Sections 4 and 5 of the Act and this was upheld by the Supreme Court two days later. The case is now pending before the Supreme Court.

In November 1980, the Human Rights Forum of Manipur challenged the Act as being ultra vires of the Constitution and prayed the Supreme Court to quash the order of September 1980 declaring parts of Manipur as disturbed area. This petition is pending before the Supreme Court.

In April 1982 the Naga People's Movement For Human Rights (NPMHR) filed a petition in the form of a letter. This petition is also pending before the Supreme Court.

A review of all these petitions and the counter affidavits filed by the government gives us specific instances concerning the enforcement of this Act, especially in relation to the distinctive features of the Act identified above.

1. In all these areas, except in the case of Assam, no area which is notified as disturbed at any time has been denotified, despite other

government claims that the situation has been improving. The absence of any objective criterion about declaring an area as disturbed as well as the absence of any provision for review of the notification has led to the Act becoming a permanent enforcement in these parts of the North-East.

2. In September 1982, in Tripura the army, according to a report in the Indian Express, requested the state government to declare Jampui Hill district as disturbed. But the state government declined as it felt there was no need for such extraordinary powers. Yet, by the middle of September, the central government had unilaterally declared the area as disturbed. Thus, the Act makes it possible for the centre to overrule the wishes of a legally elected state government.

3. In July 1978, the former SDO of East District, Manipur, submitted before an enquiry commission about how the army forced him to clamp curfew in the district in October 1976. The army, in the absence of the District Commissioner (DC) attempted to force the SDO to sign the curfew order, which the latter refused to do. Subsequently, the military authority got an official of Tehsildar rank, who is wholly incompetent in law, to sign the same order, after which they attempted to backdate it.

The counter affidavit filed by the Union government in the NPMHR case includes a certificate by an army officer: "It is certified that the DC of Ukhrul, Mr G.P. Joshi, visited the village Huinig Aching on 07 Mar 82 from 0700 hrs. to 1100 hrs. and instigated the villagers against the security forces..." This was signed by five village officials and one Captain Sumet Singh of 21 Sikh Regiment.

The report of the All-Woman's Fact-finding Team (which included a PUDR representative) that investigated the aftermath of an ambush in Naga villages of Manipur, mentions an instance of detention and interrogation of the District Commissioner of East District in February 1982.

In all these instances what is evident is the conflict between the civil and the military authorities, with the latter enjoying a superior position by virtue of the Act.

In January 1981 Mrs Nungshitombi Devi moved the court in a habeas corpus petition in an attempt to trace her husband.

Her husband Chaoba Singh, the 43 years old father of seven children, had been taken away by the Security Forces from his home at Imphal thirteen days earlier. The petition was dismissed but Chaoba Singh still remains untraced.

In April 1981 two mothers jointly moved the Gauhati High Court in an attempt to trace their sons who had been picked up by the security forces. The petition was dismissed in September but the nineteen year old Thokchom Loliendra and the twenty-two year old Kangujam Loken remain untraced.

The Human Rights Forum, Manipur, in its writ petition quotes an instance of a CRPF jawan killing a pregnant woman in the market place of Imphal. The government, in its counter-affidavit, admitted that "on 27th April 1980, while a CRPF vehicle was passing through the main market in Imphal town, one round got accidentally fired from the rifle of a CRPF jawan resulting in the death of a woman vendor and injuries to two others." But exactly how a single round killed one person and injured two others is not explained in the counter-affidavit.

In the petition filed by NPMHR, atrocities by the security forces are listed under six heads : Sexual assault on woman, mass torture, desecration of religious institutions, forced labour and collective fines and abduction. In each case, it documents systematically the cases of reported atrocities over a long period of time. In addition, it cited more than 30 cases of torture from the medical registrar of a local hospital.

On March 3, 1982, Pastor P. Mashangva of Huishu village and Pastor Mahangthei of Chingai were abducted and tortured in the army camp for a week without food. They were subjected to electrocution of soft and private parts, hanged upside down, made to dig their own graves, according to a NPMHR petition.

An old lady, Dzuviu, of Kohima village, narrated to the NPMHR fact-finding team in 1978 of how a girl from Lotha Naga area was first raped and then hung upside down by the army; she also told them of how a pregnant woman was shot in the legs, after which a rope was tied around her neck and she was dragged around in public. Four girls were tortured and raped in Yankeli Baptist Christian Church on 11 July 1971 by the army. They were all less than 18 years in age.

The report of the All-Woman's team gives specific instances of molestation and rape of young girls in Paprei, Phungcham and Kairai villages. It gives the general method of interrogation by the army as electric shocks (in the private parts), brutal beatings and general humiliation, giving specific instances of the arrest and torture of village headmen, pastors, students, ex-servicemen, teachers, businessmen and government servants. It also provides specific instances of looting by the jawans.

In April 1982, two alleged extremists, Md. Tayeb Ali and Ahmed Ali were killed in a reported encounter with the army in Kwatka Khunon, Manipur. A little later, the Chief Minister of Manipur, Keishing, announced in the Assembly that the police investigations had revealed nothing against them. The government paid an ex-gratia payment of Rs. 10,000 to each of the families of the deceased.

All these scattered segments of evidence, all culled from the petitions filed either at the Gauhati High Court or at the Supreme Court, establish the implications of the working of the Act described in the preceding section.

4. Even a low ranking army personnel like a Lance Naik has been conferred extra-ordinary powers by this Act, which makes it possible for individual Jawans to indulge in the harassment of villagers at all hours including at midnight.
5. The absence of any stipulation concerning the use of force makes it possible for the Army Jawans to indulge in the indiscriminate beating-up of innocents.
6. By covering in its purview all manner of structures the Act makes it possible for the army to enter houses, educational institutions and churches. While the law permits them to demolish these structures, they, however, choose to convert them into their interrogation camps.
7. The absence of any safeguard in the Act regarding treatment of women make them, as well as children, vulnerable, particularly at night.
8. By giving blanket powers to arrest anybody for any offence without a warrant, the Act makes it possible for the army to detain

innumerable ordinary citizens ranging from poor peasants to pastors.

9. By not specifying any time period for which the army can hold a detainee under its control, the Act makes it possible for the armed forces to detain any person indefinitely and torture him during detention.

10. The incidents cited above reveal a series of acts of omission and commission by the armed forces, ranging from petty offences like stealing household property to the murder of innocent citizens. The Act prohibits the people from any remedy in law whatsoever. Citizens can and have, however, approached the courts but all the habeas corpus petitions discussed above were dismissed despite the fact that the persons they concerned still remain untraced.

The account given above of the enforcement of the Act makes two things strikingly clear. Firstly, the violation of Fundamental Rights of the people in the disturbed areas cannot be dismissed as occasional instances involving stray deviants only. Secondly, almost all the instances stem from the salient features of the Act outlined above. This has to be viewed in the context of the fact that this Act is the source of legitimacy for the powers conferred on the armed forces, in the exercise of which constitutional rights are violated. Hence there is a need to test the constitutional validity of the Act itself.

Thus, the People's Union for Democratic Rights (PUDR) came to file a writ petition challenging the constitutional validity of The Armed Forces (Assam and Manipur) Special Powers (Amendment) Act, 1972.

IV

Validity

From the account given above it is clear that the Act abrogates or takes away the protection from laws which pertain to the Fundamental Rights (Article 13), Freedom of Speech and Expression, Freedom of Peaceful Assembly (Article 19), the Protection of Life and Liberty (Article 21) and Freedom of Religion (Article 25). The PUDR petition argues that the Act is unconstitutional precisely because it takes away these forms of protection.

According to the Constitution, Parliament does not have the power, except during the period of an Emergency, to enact legislation that falls within the list of the state's power exclusively (List II, Seventh Schedule) and this division of powers includes the realm of public order. The Forty Second Amendment of the Constitution, effected during the Emergency, inserted a provision in the Constitution that enabled the Union government to deploy its armed forces in any state of the country without the prior agreement of that state (Article 257 A). Correspondingly, a new entry was made in the Union List which brings the deployment of the armed forces, in aid of the civil power, under the competence of the Union government (entry 2A, List I, Seventh Schedule). The Janata government moved the Forty-Fourth Amendment which repealed Article 257 A but it could not repeal entry 2A since it lacked the requisite majority in the Rajya Sabha. This is how the Constitution today empowers the central government to pass laws relating to the deployment to the armed forces in any state in aid of the civil power. This was something that the Union government lacked in 1958 as well as in 1972. Nevertheless, the specific provision enables the Union government to deploy the armed forces only as an *aid to the civil power*. As the foregoing account has revealed, the provisions of this Act virtually subordinate the civil power to that of the armed forces. On another plane, the Constitution empowers the Union government to declare an area as disturbed only in the event of its already being under an Emergency; this is vastly extended by the real operation of the Act. On these grounds the PUDR petition has argued that parliament does not have the legislative competence to pass such an Act.

The Criminal Procedure Code of the land has certain institutional safeguards against arbitrary actions by the state that affect the rights of its citizens. Such safeguards include the presence of an Executive Magistrate or a Commissioned or Gazetted Officer as a pre-condition for the dispersal of an unlawful assembly, the requirement that any arrested person be produced before a Magistrate within 24 hours of arrest, that women be arrested or searched only by women officials and the like. None of these safeguards are recognised in the act.

The Criminal Procedure Code was amended in 1973 and a crucial innovation added to Chapter X. whereby "if it is necessary

for the public security that it (any unlawful assembly) should be dispersed, the Executive Magistrate of the highest rank who is present may cause it to be dispersed by the armed forces" (Section 130 (1)). Similarly, the armed forces may arrest or confine a person or an assembly under the directions of a Magistrate (Section 130 (2)). In such cases, the armed forces "shall use as little force and do as little injury to person and property" (Section 130 (3)). The armed forces can themselves disperse an assembly without the presence of the Executive Magistrate, with the proviso that they communicate with him as soon as possible and "thenceforward to obey the Magistrate's instructions" (Section 131). In other words, by this amendment, the normal law of the land can be used to deal with extra-ordinary situations in which the armed forces are called in. But such deployment is, nevertheless, subject to the usual safeguards laid down in the Code, whereby the armed forces remain under the direction of the civil administration.

The Criminal Procedure Code is not applicable to the whole country. In some tribal areas of the North-East, covered under the Sixth Schedule of the constitution, the Criminal Procedure Code is not applicable in its entirety but is left to the discretion of the State government (Section 5, Sixth Schedule). It must however be noted that in an earlier judgement the Supreme Court had observed that even when the Code is not applicable in letter, it is so in spirit in these areas.

It is in the context of all these factors that the PUDR argues in its petition that there is no need for the Act after the introduction of Chapter X to the Criminal Procedure Code in 1973. The petition asks the Supreme Court to declare the act as unconstitutional and invalid. In addition, it asked for interim directions to extend the Criminal Procedure Code in its entirety, but particularly Chapter X to the North-East as a whole, to give orders restraining the army from camping in churches, from using churches as public places and from similarly using educational institutions as public places.

The PUDR filed its writ petition in November 1982. The one hundred and thirty two page petition names nine respondents. In addition to the five States and two Union Territories of the North-East, it also includes the Ministries of Home and Defence of the Union Government.

V. Conclusion

In terms of sheer numbers, the people living in the disturbed areas increased from 62,000 in 1955 to 2,672,000 in 1982. The disturbed areas grew in area from 2,000 sq. kms. to 60,000 sq. kms over the same period. Given the restrictions on mobility of the people and given the atmosphere of terror that pervades the region, it is not possible to conduct an independent and thorough investigation and to document the state of civil liberties and democratic rights of the people resident in these disturbed areas. It was in 1977 that the activists of the Naga People's Movement for Human Rights made their courageous breakthrough in bringing some facts to public attention. Since then reports have been coming in from very many quarters, chiefly investigative ones published in the national dailies and news magazines. In the last five years, every major daily and news magazine, without a single exception, has published such reports at one time or another. In addition, human rights organisations located in or connected with the region, such as NPM HR, the Human rights Forum, Manipur or the Woman's Rights Association, East District, Manipur, have been bringing out reports against all odds, regularly. Recently, an all womens' fact-finding team from Delhi made an investigation in Manipur. Since 1980 there has been a concerted attempt to approach the courts at various levels for redressal. These petitions and the counters filed by the government constitute a valuable source of information in themselves.

As a whole, the growing body of evidence that has accumulated is sketchy, unsystematic, sometimes unreliable and always incomplete. Yet it remains the kind of evidence that cannot be ignored. One cannot remain insensitive to persistent reports of sexual torture, cold-blooded murder, the burning of villages and the persecution of whole communities. The use of the armed forces by the state against its own citizens is not good either for the armed forces or for the people. This is exceptionally so because the intervention by the armed forces in this region, to mediate the conflict and maintain public order, is not a brief or temporary intervention directed to the handling of an extraordinary situation. The armed forces have been camping in some parts of the North-East for the past quarter century, to the extent of having become permanent fixtures of social life.

Hence the democratic public can no longer remain silent spectators. Irrespective of the inherent dilemmas involved in the political problem, we must face the facts and take a stand. For, in the ultimate analysis, neither legal safeguards nor judicial interventions can replace individual consciences and collective wisdom.

AN APPEAL

PUDR has filed a petition in the Supreme Court of India challenging the constitutional validity of the Armed forces (Assam and Manipur) Special Powers (Amendment) Act 1972. It is a big case likely to be long drawn out in which two ministries of the Union Government (Defence and Home), 5 states of the north-east and two Union territories are respondents.

But PUDR is a small organisation, with meagre financial resources. Though lawyers have offered their services free of cost other expenses will run into thousands of Rupees.

PUDR appeals to all those people who are concerned about the democratic rights of the people of the North-East to support the cause by giving donations. These donations in the form of Demand Drafts/Cheques (but not money orders), drawn in favour of "People's Union for Democratic Rights (Delhi)", may kindly be sent to :

Sumanto Banerji
D-33, Press Enclave
Saket
New Delhi-110017



FOR COPIES :

Bombay :

SUPER BOOK HOUSE
Sindh Chambers
Colaba Causeway
Bombay-400005

Calcutta :

KATHASHILPA
19, Shamcharan Dey Street
Calcutta-700073

Delhi :

PUDR
Via Sumanta Banerji
D-33, Press Enclave
Saket
New Delhi-110017

Andhra Pradesh :

SRJANA
Hanumakonda
Warangal-506009

Goa :

THE BOOK SHOP
Near Civil Court
Altinho Mapusa
Goa-403507
