



Human Rights Alert

Kwakeithel Thiyam Leikai
Imphal – 795001, Manipur, India
Phone : +91 385 2448159
Email : hramanipur@gmail.com

New Delhi/ 16 April 2018

Ref: HRA/PR-08/2018

PRESS RELEASE

EEVFAM v/s UoI case was heard in court number 4 of the Supreme Court of India today afternoon before a special bench constituted of Justice Madam B. Lukor and Justice U.U. Lalit. A status report of the investigation was already served to the judges on 13 April 2018. But the copy of the same is not served to the petitioners.

The petitioners submitted a compilation of 11 new FIRs shown in CBI website as filed after the last hearing of 12 March 2018. To each of these FIRs the corresponding original FIRs filed against the deceased were also attached. It is evident that in the original FIRs the security personnel involved in the incidents are clearly recorded where as in the new FIRs filed by the CBI against the security forces are no specific names were mentioned (except in one case involving Manipur Police).

The Amicus argued that the new FIRs were the ones pertaining to the cases where a Judicial Inquiry finding was already available and specific names of the units involved, the commanding officers and in some case the person who did the actual shooting were identified. But perhaps in an effort to vitiate, the FIR filed by the CBI is vaguely against “unknown personnel of ...”. She specifically pointed out that in the judicial inquiry pertaining to the Malom massacre of 2 November 2000 one Major George was specifically mentioned as the commander of the Assam Rifles personnel involved in the incident, but his name was not mentioned at all in the CBI FIR. And again in the judicial inquiry conducted in connection to the killing of Tejkumar in 2004 one Major Sanjeev Chopra and Major J.A. Khan are specifically named but they find no mention in the CBI FIR.

After hearing out the progress made in the investigation from the CBI counsel, the court directed them to file supplementary FIRs after duly going through the Judicial Inquiry reports. The court has also asked the NHRC to render its services to the CBI in this process.

The Amicus also pointed out the media reports of the harassment and intimidation of the victims and witnesses involved in the case, but the court passed no specific directives on this issue. Issues of lack of sufficient interpreter and the delay in submission of forensic reports were also discussed and shorted out

Yours sincerely,

(Babloo Loitongbam)
Executive Director
