

Committee on Extra-judicial Killings in Assam

Why in news?

 $n\n$

The Gauhati High Court has recently quashed the appointment of a committee that had probed the alleged extra-judicial killings in Assam.

 $n\n$

What is the case about?

 $n\n$

\n

• It relates to the extra-judicial killings in Assam during 1998-2001, often described as "secret killings".

۱n

• Close relatives of a number of United Liberation Front of Asom (ULFA) members were shot by unidentified killers.

\n

• A committee headed by Justice K N Saikia was formed in 2005 to look into this.

\n

 $n\n$

What were the Saikia panel findings?

 $n\n$

\n

- The committee submitted its report in 2006-07. \n
- It blamed the Home Department and sections of the government machinery of being involved in the killings.
- The report alleged a nexus between police and certain surrendered ULFA members.

\n

• It coined the term "ulfocide", and defined it as a general plan for killing of ULFAs, their families and relatives.

\n

• It claimed that these were caused after ULFA families failed to persuade their ULFA relatives to come for peace talks.

۱n

• It noted that the similarities in the killings indicate the remote planning from higher authorities.

\n

• Also, the weapons used were of a type generally used by police or the military.

\n

• Besides, there was police patrolling on the spot prior to and after the killings, but not during the time of the killings.

\n

 $n\n$

Why was the committee quashed?

 $n\n$

\n

• Four successive panels probed the killings and the Justice Saikia headed committee was the last.

۱n

 \bullet Notably, the earlier J N Sarma Commission probed six killings and submitted an interim report on three.

۱n

• The Saikia committee was thus challenged on the ground that the previous panel was still active.

\n

• As, under Sec 7 of Commissions of Inquiry Act, a gazette notification for discontinuation of an inquiry commission is mandatory.

• But no such notification was issued for the Sarma Commission.

 \bullet The court has now held that the Saikia panel was legally invalid. $\ensuremath{^{\backslash n}}$

 $n\n$

What are the other concerns?

 $n\n$

۱'n

- \bullet The Saikia Commission's report was said to be self-contradictory in parts. $\ensuremath{\backslash} n$
- This is because at one point it says that "there is no evidence to pinpoint responsibility".

\n

• But at another, it blames the then Home department of remotely orchestrating the killings.

۱n

 \bullet The investigation was also alleged to be politically motivated. $\ensuremath{^{\text{hn}}}$

 $n\n$

 $n\n$

Source: Indian Express

\n

