

ABOUT ENSAAF

ENSAAF—a U.S.-based organization launched to enforce human rights and fight impunity in India—works with survivors to engage in advocacy and outreach, documents violations, and educates the public about human rights abuses in India. ENSAAF has five programs: Community Advocacy, Human Rights Education, Legal Advocacy, Media and Human Rights, and United Nations. ENSAAF, which means Justice in many South Asian languages, acts to implement the international rights to knowledge, justice, and reparation. The board of directors comprises human rights lawyers Sukhman Dhama and Jaskaran Kaur, as well as Professor Peter Rosenblum of Columbia Law School.

ONGOING PROJECTS

Narratives Project: ENSAAF continues to collect narratives from the survivors of human rights abuses in Punjab, currently living in the U.S. ENSAAF believes that a human rights movement driven by survivors can challenge impunity at every level. Towards this end, ENSAAF is working to meet survivors, record their narratives, and encourage them to build an association of families in North America who have survived human rights violations in Punjab.

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

- 1 The Extradition Case of Kulvir Singh Barapind
- 2 Developments in the Disappearance Trial of Jaswant Singh Khalra
- 4 News Flashes
- 4 Nanavati Report on 1984 Pogroms Submitted to Government
- 8 ENSAAF Board of Directors

THE EXTRADITION CASE OF KULVIR SINGH BARAPIND

Sukhman Dhama

On March 9, 2005, the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals denied senior Sikh Student Federation activist Kulvir Singh Barapind's habeas petition, and found that his extradition was proper in two of three charges. The third charge was remanded to the district court to determine if it fell under the political offence exception. This decision is inconsistent with the Circuit's recent law, and further, it gives foreign governments the incentive to submit baseless and politically motivated extradition requests, knowing that US courts will not critically examine the evidence in the appropriate context.

Just two days prior, the court ruled in Hayes v. Brown that false evidence presented by a prosecutor to a judge and jury, and his failure to correct the record, violated the due process rights of the defendant. This finding led the court to grant the defendant's habeas petition. In Hayes, the prosecutor failed to disclose all of the deals he made with a crime witness to the judge and jury. The prosecutor told the witness' lawyer about a deal, but instructed the lawyer not to tell his client. Thus, when the witness was cross-examined about any deals he made with the prosecution, he could honestly testify that he did not make any deals, and thus avoid perjuring himself. The witness could have been charged with a crime relating to the defendant's crime. However, since he agreed to testify against the defendant, the prosecutor did not charge him. The prosecutor voluntarily disclosed this deal to the judge and jury. The deal not disclosed to the judge and jury, or the witness for that matter, concerned the witness's prior crimes, completely unrelated to the crime for which the defendant was being tried. Notwithstanding the inability of the witness to be influenced by a deal that he did not know existed, and ignoring the ample credible evidence, the court concluded that the

Continued on page 3

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE DISAPPEARANCE TRIAL OF JASWANT SINGH KHALRA

Vanessa Pon

In recent months, there have been several developments in the case of the disappearance of human rights activist Jaswant Singh Khalra. Most importantly, key witness Kuldeep Singh gave his testimony recounting the torture and murder of Khalra, and the disposal of his dead body.

Case background

On September 6, 1995, Punjab police abducted human rights activist Jaswant Singh Khalra from his home in Amritsar. For several months, Khalra had received death threats from senior police officers, particularly Senior Superintendent of Police (SSP) Ajit Singh Sandhu. They warned Khalra to stop his investigations into mass illegal cremations. In January of that year, Khalra and Jaspal Singh Dhillon had filed a writ petition in the Punjab and Haryana High Court to impel it to investigate their discovery of mass illegal cremations in three crematoria in Amritsar. They alleged that these cremations were of people earlier abducted and disappeared by the Punjab police. The High Court dismissed the petition. They moved the Supreme Court, but the Punjab police abducted Khalra before the Supreme Court could hear the matter.

Key witness Kuldeep Singh gave his testimony recounting the torture and murder of Khalra, and the disposal of his dead body.

On September 11, 1995, the Supreme Court responded to a telegram about Khalra's disappearance and issued notice to the Punjab government to produce Khalra or account for his whereabouts within a week. After no further information was received, on November 15, 1995, the Court directed the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) to investigate Khalra's disappearance. On July 30, 1996, the CBI submitted its report. Despite evidence in the report regarding the torture and disappearance of Khalra, the officers were only charged with "kidnapping with the intent to secretly and wrongfully confine a person." The accused in the case include SSP Ajit Singh Sandhu, who allegedly

committed suicide about five years ago, two Deputy Superintendents of Police (DSPs), three Station House Officers (SHOs), and two low-ranking police officers.

For a detailed background on the case, the role of the CBI in investigating and prosecuting the case, and harassment faced by witnesses up until 2003, please read Chapter 1 of *Reduced to Ashes: The Insurgency and Human Rights in Punjab* (<http://www.punjabjustice.org>). This article discusses news within the last few months.

Three of the key witnesses have been implicated in false criminal cases, ranging from bribery, to rape, to robbery, to establishing a terrorist organization.

Police harassment of witnesses and lawyer

Throughout the trial, witnesses have reported police harassment and intimidation. Three of the key witnesses have been implicated in false criminal cases, ranging from bribery, to rape, to robbery, to establishing a terrorist organization. Rajiv Randhawa, the witness to Khalra's abduction, was arrested a couple of times to prevent his appearing in court to testify. His experiences have been documented in several reports by Amnesty International.

In November 2004, Kuldeep Singh, a key witness and former Special Police Officer, expressed no confidence in Punjab police security and requested that a Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF) vehicle replace the Punjab Police vehicle that was bringing him to court. He stated that the Punjab police driver was purposefully delaying him and threatening him.

In January 2005, the Khalra Mission Committee and the Punjab Human Rights Organisation sent a letter to Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and Punjab Chief Minister Amrinder Singh demanding the removal of Patiala Inspector General Rajinder Singh for harassing and intimidating witnesses. The letter described the harassment faced by key witnesses in Khalra's trial.

Continued on page 5

prosecutor's deliberate concealment of the deal tainted the entire trial. Further, the failure of the prosecutor to correct the record following the presentation of false evidence, also violated the defendant's constitutional rights. Thus, after 20-years of imprisonment, the defendant was set free.

Barapind has been in detention for the past 12 years, as his asylum and extradition cases have been litigated. The entire eight years of habeas proceedings have been tainted by fabricated evidence, passed through the United States Attorney, presented by the Indian government. The Indian government attempted to submit affidavits procured through torture in support of their extradition request, with one affiant dying from the police torture. The district court, recognizing that statements extracted through torture cannot be admitted as reliable or credible evidence, or be used to establish probable cause, dismissed the charges that were based on the statements procured through torture. Several more charges were dismissed because the police fabricated evidence to support the charge or the charges came under the political offense exception. This left three charges, which the 9th Circuit recently ruled upon.

In Barapind's case, the entire eight years of habeas proceedings have been tainted by fabricated evidence, passed through the United States Attorney, presented by the Indian government. The Indian government attempted to submit affidavits procured through torture in support of their extradition request, with one affiant dying from the police torture.

Notwithstanding evidence presented by Kulvir Singh Barapind that these charges were also based on fabricated statements, including presenting statements from eyewitness to the crimes stating they never identified Barapind as the Indian government alleges, the court concluded that it could not determine if the statements were true. Even if the district court and appellate court could not establish the veracity of the statements relating to the remaining three charges, it should have viewed them as wholly unreliable given the Indian government's practice, acknowledged by the court, of knowingly submitting false evidence throughout eight years of proceedings. Further, it was also shown that the Indian police officer, Satish Kumar Sharma, who

collected the affidavits to support the extradition request, was a torturer and killer. In October 2004,

[The district court] should have viewed...[the statements relating to the remaining three charges] as wholly unreliable given the Indian government's practice, acknowledged by the court, of knowingly submitting false evidence throughout eight years of proceedings. Further, it was also shown that the Indian police officer, Satish Kumar Sharma, who collected the affidavits to support the extradition request, was a torturer and killer.

ENSAAF submitted a letter to the Court discussing its primary and secondary research on, among other issues, Sharma's role in perpetrating arbitrary detention, extrajudicial execution, and disappearances.

If, as in Hayes v. Brown, one incident of presenting false evidence undermines the entire trial, surely, numerous incidents of false evidence also violate the defendant's right to a fair trial. Moreover, the Indian government had eight years to correct its record of lies, yet failed to do so, again violating Barapind's constitutional rights. Based on the reasoning set forth in Brown, the Court should have concluded that the false evidence being used to prosecute Barapind from abroad, and the failure to correct the record, tainted his right to a fair trial. Accordingly, his habeas petition should have been granted. In this case, however, the court ignored its own maxim: "One of the bedrock principles of our democracy, implicit in any concept of ordered liberty, is that the State may not use false evidence to obtain a criminal conviction."

Kulvir Singh Barapind now faces the prospect of being tried in Indian courts, knowing from experience that prosecutors fabricate evidence to convict alleged criminals. Unfortunately, his will not be the first case of a politically motivated prosecution based on fabricated evidence, including statements extracted under torture. Punjab police and state prosecutors routinely violate the due process rights of Sikhs, which have led to indefinite detentions, convictions with long prison sentences, and death.

NEWS FLASHES

Read ENSAAF's blog on human rights in India.

*On February 1, 2005, S.S. Virk took over as the Director General of Punjab Police. The Akali Dal (Amritsar) and others have protested his appointment because of his role in torture and extrajudicial executions during the police counter-insurgency operations of the 1980s and 1990s.

*In 2004, the Punjab police headquarters received 6,261 complaints from Punjab State Human Rights Commission, 376 from the National Human Rights Commission, and 46 from the National Human Rights Commission for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes at Delhi. The Punjab State Human Rights Commission reported 87 custodial deaths.

*In January, Davinder Pal Singh Bhullar stated that the police had forced him to confess to the September 11, 1993 blast outside the Indian Youth Congress Building that killed 9 people. The police then used this confession to fabricate a case against him to prevent him from pursuing the case of his missing father.

*There were two heavily publicized deaths under Punjab police custody in February: Satnam from Lohian village in Jalandhar and Rajinderjit Singh from Phool Kurd village in Ropar were tortured to death by police after refusing to accept involvement in theft cases. In another case of custodial death, a magisterial inquiry indicted a Station House Officer and several police officers for torturing Rakesh Kumar to death in June 2004.

*On February 28, the U.S. Department of State released its 2004 Country Report on Human Rights Practices in India. The report highlights the continuing impunity for disappearances in Punjab and police violations of human rights. The report also discusses the failure of the National Human Rights Commission to actively pursue the mass cremations case in Punjab.

*In March 2005, The U.S. revoked the visa of Gujarat Chief Minister Narendra Modi because of his complicity in the 2002 Gujarat pogroms and persecution of religious minorities.

NANAVATI REPORT ON 1984 POGROMS SUBMITTED TO GOVERNMENT

Vanessa Pon

On February 9, 2005, the Justice Nanavati Commission submitted its 200-page report on the 1984 pogroms of Sikhs to Home Minister Shivraj Patil. Although the report has not yet been tabled in Parliament or released to the public, the Home Minister has revealed that the report does not indict the top Congress leadership.

The National Democratic Alliance (NDA) government appointed the commission led by Justice GT Nanavati in May 2000 to investigate the 1984 pogroms. Its report was due for release on March 31, 2003, but this deadline was repeatedly extended. At the same time, Justice Nanavati also heads the inquiries into the 2002 Gujarat massacres of Muslims and the unauthorized colonies in Delhi.

In the course of its inquiry, the Nanavati Commission received more than 10,000 affidavits and examined 197 witnesses. It collected new affidavits, and also analyzed the original affidavits submitted to the Misra Commission, and held public hearings of senior police officers, army personnel, and government officials. The report examines the role of politicians and police responsible for maintaining law and order at the time, and give its findings on the causes and course of the massacres.

The Nanavati Commission considered more evidence than the Misra Commission, which in 1987 submitted its report exonerating senior police officials and politicians. In the course of its inquiry, the Nanavati Commission received more than 10,000 affidavits and examined 197 witnesses. It collected new affidavits, and also analyzed the original affidavits submitted to the Misra Commission, and held public hearings of senior police officers, army personnel, and government officials. The report examines the role of politicians and police responsible for maintaining law and order at the time, and give its findings on the causes and course of the massacres. Volume I of the report discusses the events of November 1984 while Volume II consists of

Continued on page 7

Kikkar Singh, for example, initially told the CBI that he saw Khalra in police custody in October 1995, witnessed signs of torture on his body, and helped him eat. Kikkar Singh's police detention was independently corroborated by a judicial inquiry. He and his father, however, were subsequently charged with five false criminal cases, and after spending 2.5 years in police detention, turned hostile in Khalra's case. The letter also described false criminal charges against witness witness Rajiv Randhawa, Kirpal Singh Randhawa, and petitioner Paramjit Kaur.

Since the initiation of the case in 1996, until August 2004, only two witnesses had completed their testimony. Kikkar Singh had turned hostile, and the second person was Paramjit Kaur, the wife of Jaswant Singh Khalra. Paramjit Kaur said that it took the Patiala Court two and a half years to record her statements. "The witnesses in the case are facing tremendous physical and mental pressure from the Punjab police for not appearing in the court," she stated.

Further, the accused police officers have still not been removed from their posts in Amritsar and Tarn Taran, despite a Supreme Court order. One of the key accused police officers, DSP Jaspal Singh, is still posted in Amritsar City.

On March 24, 2005, Brjinder Sodhi, one of the lawyers representing Paramjit Kaur, stated that accused Surinderpal Singh threatened to kill him as he was about to enter the court. This threat followed a series of similarly threatening phone calls.

Witnesses testify

In February, witness testimony from Rajiv Randhawa and Kuldeep Singh pieced together Khalra's final hours, implicating KPS Gill, then Director General of Punjab Police. Human Rights Watch has described Gill's counter-insurgency operations, Operation Rakshak II, as "the most extreme example of a policy in which the end appeared to justify any and all means, including torture and murder."

Rajiv Singh Randhawa testified that on September 6, 1995, the day of the disappearance, he sat in Khalra's drawing room while Khalra washed his car outside outside. Rajiv Singh went outside upon hearing

raised voices and saw a police team headed by DSP Jaspal Singh. The team also included the now deceased DSP Ashok Kumar, SHOs Surinderpal Singh, Satnam Singh and Jasbir Singh, SI Amarjit Singh, ASI Rachhpal Singh, and Head Constable Prithipal Singh. Jaspal Singh told Khalra to accompany the police officers because he had been called by the Tarn Taran SSP Ajit Singh Sandhu. Jaspal Singh then pushed Khalra into the Maruti van and said "kaam ho gaya" (the work is finished) into his walky-talky to a senior police officer. Rajiv Singh identified the police officers facing trial as those who abducted Khara.

On February 16, Kuldeep Singh testified that he served as SSP Ajit Singh Sandhu's gunman when Sandhu was posted at Tarn Taran in 1995. He was taken to Sandhu's residence by SHO Satnam Singh, where Khalra was illegally detained. There, Kuldeep Singh saw KPS Gill spend half an hour in the room with Khalra. During the journey back to the Jhabal police station with Khalra, SHO Satnam Singh told Khalra that he could have saved himself if he had listened to the "advice" of KPS Gill. At Jhabal police station, Kuldeep Singh was responsible for providing Khalra's food and kept the keys to the room where Khalra was detained.

There, Kuldeep Singh saw KPS Gill spend half an hour in the room with Khalra.

DSP Jaspal Singh, his body guard Arvinder, Sarhali SHO Surinderpal Singh, Manochahal SHO Jasbir Singh, Prithipal Singh and Balwinder Singh Gora came to the police station in separate cars. Kuldeep Singh then said that the police officers started beating Khalra. Then, "I was asked to get a glass of hot water by SHO Satnam Singh." As he was heating up the water, he heard two shots. When he rushed to the room where Khalra was kept, he saw Khalra's body and Satnam Singh with a gun in his hand. Satnam Singh then told him to go where the cars were parked. Balwinder Singh Gora backed up the Maruti van, and he and Arvinder put Khalra's body in the back of the vehicle. "I saw blood oozing out of Khalra's chest," said Kuldeep Singh.

Around 10 pm, the three vehicles reached Harike, where Arvinder and Balwinder Singh Gora

Continued on page 6

threw Khalra's body in to a canal. Then the cars proceeded to the Harike guest house, where other police officials, including SSP Ajit Singh Sandhu, were present.

Kuldeep Singh said that he remained silent so long after the murder out of fear. He finally decided to report the murder three years after it happened when he heard a human rights activist give a speech about Khalra in 1997. "I kept quiet because I was mortally afraid of Ajit Singh Sandhu and only decided to speak up after he committed suicide," he said. "Trying to speak the truth has been the most difficult decision of my life ... After I deposed before the CBI in 1998, the accused police officials met me and claimed the CBI officials who had recorded my deposition had already apologised to K. P. S. Gill for the same. This, as well as a false case registered against another witness in the case, shook me and I gave a statement that Khalra's widow had paid a witness." After he was able to get CRPF security, Kuldeep Singh said he found the courage to speak the truth.

"I kept quiet because I was mortally afraid of Ajit Singh Sandhu and only decided to speak up after he committed suicide," Kuldeep Singh said. "Trying to speak the truth has been the most difficult decision of my life ..."

On February 21, Khalra's widow, Paramjit Kaur, asked the CBI to summon KPS Gill for his connection to "encouraging custodial deaths and fake encounters." She added that "the CBI should make up for the lapse it had earlier committed by omitting Gill's name from the chargesheet and should move the court for summoning him in the Khalra case ... Between January 23 and till date at least three crucial eyewitnesses have shed their fear and told the court how Jaswant Singh was abducted, detained in a police station, done to death and the body thrown into a canal without last rites Burial with honour is accorded even to an enemy soldier, but was not granted to Jaswant Singh Khalra in his own country though he was exposing the cremation of about 25,000 bodies by policemen in the cremation grounds of Amritsar and Tarn Taran."

Cross-examination of Kuldeep Singh

From March 2 to 4, defense lawyers examined Kuldeep Singh. On March 3, police officers set up a security picket at the entrance to the District Courts complex, and allowed the security personnel of the accused police officers to enter, but denied entrance to Kuldeep Singh's CRPF security personnel, delaying court proceedings.

During Kuldeep Singh's cross-examination, the defense avoided asking questions directly relating to his earlier testimony. Defense lawyers questioned Kuldeep Singh about his whereabouts since his February 16 deposition, not about the subject of that deposition – Khalra's torture and the disposal of his body. The defense tried to portray that Kuldeep Singh was avoiding the court after his February 16 deposition. When asked by the defense, Kuldeep Singh refused to disclose his location from February 16 to 20 due to "security reasons," and again from February 21 to 27 when he said he was prescribed medical rest.

On March 2, the court dismissed two applications demanding that KPS Gill be issued summons. The two applications had been filed by Kuldeep Singh and Shaheed Bhagat Singh Brigade through Naresh Kumar. The court dismissed the applications on the grounds that only the prosecution or the complainant in the case could file such applications.

During his cross-examination on March 9, Kuldeep Singh explained his earlier retraction of his statement to the CBI that implicated a number of senior police officials. He stated that he retracted his statement under pressure from the accused police personnel and the Punjab Police assigned to guard him. The accused police officers forced him to give a statement to the press that he had been offered Rs 50,000 by Paramjit Kaur, and he was forced to file a false complaint against her. He said that he found the courage to stand by the truth only after he obtained CRPF security.

Although the trial was ordered to be completed in six months in fall 2004, the trial still proceeds.

Vanessa Pon is a third year student at UC Berkeley. Her majors are Economics and Political Economy of Industrial Societies. She is currently interning for ENSAAF and works on ENSAAF's blog and newsletter.

the evidence collected by the Commission. Justice Nanavati has stressed that the report is recommendatory.

According to leaked news sources, although the Commission felt that the violence was "organised" and "systematic" in several areas, it neither directly indicted the Congress party nor the then prime minister Rajiv Gandhi for their role in the violence. Justice Nanavati has said that "the evidence does indicate a pattern in which the riots took place and the pattern in which the attacks took place on the Sikhs," but the report allegedly maintains that the entire Congress Party cannot be held responsible for the acts of individual politicians and local gangs.

However, these sources also reveal that the Commission has been critical of the late Narasimha Rao, Home Minister at the time, for his failure to react quickly to maintain law and order. The Commission also has reportedly enough evidence from witnesses to recommend a re-investigation of cases against some party leaders, including Congress MP Sajjan Kumar, former Union Minister HKL Bhagat, and former Delhi MP, Dharamdas Shastri. Although the commission could recommend a reinvestigation of them, it seems

The Commission also has reportedly enough evidence from witnesses to recommend a re-investigation of cases against some party leaders, including Congress MP Sajjan Kumar, former Union Minister HKL Bhagat, and former Delhi MP, Dharamdas Shastri.

unlikely to be effective: Kumar has already been acquitted in one major case by the Delhi High Court, and Bhagat is now medically unfit and cannot make a statement. Although the Commission is also likely to recommend departmental inquiries of senior Delhi police officers at the time, the Commission allegedly maintains that the police as an institution cannot be blamed for the acts of individual officers.

It is unclear whether this report will impact the struggle for justice for the victims of the massacres. Despite its findings, the Commission cannot actually pronounce on the guilt of anyone; instead, it can only ask for re-investigation in cases that the police had filed as "untraced" but where witnesses have come forward to depose against individuals who perpetrated violence.

Further, the remarks of the Home Minister have made it clear that the Centre is in no hurry to make the report public or to table it in Parliament and Congress appears confident that the report will not be politically damaging to the party.

Despite its findings, the Commission cannot actually pronounce on the guilt of anyone; instead, it can only ask for re-investigation in cases that the police had filed as "untraced" but where witnesses have come forward to depose against individuals who perpetrated violence.

The families of the victims of the massacres do not express much hope in the Commission's ability to secure justice for them. Rather, the investigation and re-investigation of commissions seem more like a tactic to delay justice. Nanki Kaur, a widow who lost her husband and half a dozen family members during the massacres, said, "Murderers are roaming free. Our innocent husbands and children were killed. We haven't got justice in twenty years. And we don't expect it from Nanavati." Over the last 20 years, a commission of inquiry and eight committees have been set up to investigate the pogroms.

The role of the police in the violence has resulted in a lack of documentation and evidence. Baby Kaur's husband was burnt alive before her eyes: "They registered only one FIR in a police station and clubbed all the cases and the statements under it and cremated all the bodies in an electric crematorium near Rajghat without postmortems." ENSAAF's report on the 1984 pogroms, *Twenty Years of Impunity*, demonstrates, for example, how grave lapses in police investigations, delays in filing cases, the failure to identify and investigate prosecution witnesses, the deliberate misrecording of witness statements, and the failure to comply with legal procedures precluded effective prosecutions against major perpetrators.

Twenty Years of Impunity reveals the systematic and organized manner in which state institutions, such as the Delhi police, and Congress (I) officials perpetrated mass murder in November 1984 and later justified the violence in inquiry proceedings. This report analyzes thousands of pages of previously unavailable affidavits, government records, and

Continued on page 8

arguments submitted to the 1985 Misra Commission. After a thorough discussion of the patterns and characteristics of the massacres, and administrative and judicial impunity, the report applies the international law of genocide and crimes against humanity to the pogroms, relating the massacres to international understandings of gross violations of human rights.

In order to address the violations that the Sikhs suffered during the pogroms, the government should hold accountable the individual party leaders and police officials, as well as the institutions, that organized, perpetrated and failed to respond to the massacres. All victims of human rights violations and their beneficiaries have the right to knowledge, justice, and reparation. This includes the State's duties to remember and acknowledge the violations in order to prevent its recurrence, to investigate, prosecute, and punish the perpetrators, and to ensure restitution, compensation, rehabilitation, and guarantees of non-repetition to the victims. To achieve these ends, commissions investigating the 1984 pogroms need to further investigate and document: the planning and execution of the pogroms by senior politicians and police; the impunity of those who refused medical aid or falsified post-mortem reports; the experiences of survivors who still have not been interviewed; the police obstruction of justice by concealing evidence and intimidating witnesses; the judiciary's failure to conduct fair trials; the continuing occupation of powerful governmental and security positions by individuals complicit in human rights violations; and other issues.

The destruction of evidence by police, harassment of witnesses, and political interference have prevented action against the perpetrators of the pogroms. Indian jurisprudence has the power to address human rights issues, but in practice, legislation and institutional procedures prevent these issues from being addressed. If the government continues to fail to hold individuals and institutions accountable for their violations of human rights, such events will continue to recur.

ENSAAF BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Sukhman Dhami: A graduate of American University, both the School of International Service and the Washington College of Law, Sukhman has interned for civil and human rights groups, such as the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. At the Public International Law and Policy Group, Sukhman drafted peace agreements and advised non-governmental organizations on legal reform issues. His diverse public interest experience includes representation of asylum seekers from Mali and Sierra Leone; and legal work on arbitrary detention before the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights.

Jaskaran Kaur: A graduate of Yale University and Harvard Law School, Jaskaran is a lawyer focusing on human rights documentation, research and advocacy on human rights issues in Punjab. She is a contributing author to *Reduced to Ashes: The Insurgency and Human Rights in Punjab*, which analyzes impunity and over 600 cases of extrajudicial execution and disappearance by Punjab's security forces. Jaskaran has also researched the judiciary's handling of habeas corpus petitions filed in Punjab by families of the disappeared, publishing her study in the *Harvard Human Rights Journal*.

Peter Rosenblum: Peter is the Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein Associate Clinical Professor in Human Rights at Columbia Law School. He joined the Human Rights Program at Harvard Law School in the fall of 1996 and served as Associate Director until 2002, when he became Clinical Director. Peter also held an academic appointment as Lecturer at Harvard Law School and oversaw clinical human rights projects with students. In 2003, Peter joined Columbia Law School. He was formerly Program Director for the International Human Rights Law Group and Human Rights Officer for the United Nations Centre for Human Rights. Peter has engaged in human rights research and field missions in Africa, Eastern Europe, and Asia.

CONTACT US

To receive the newsletter by email, get involved with ENSAAF, or donate, please contact info@ensaaf.org. Check out our website at www.ensaaf.org; and call us at 408.727.6122 or 415.259.7214.

Citations to articles available upon request.