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Arbitrary detention in Sri Lanka

In 1983, at the outbreak of the civil war in Sri Lanka, the International Commission of Jurists concluded that Sri Lanka’s abuses of prisoners constituted a “systematic” and “almost universal” practice; that year, for example, 53 Tamil inmates were killed by Sinhalese guards at the Welikada high security prison. Thirty years later, the system remains unchanged and the systematic abuse of prisoners continues to be the norm; in November 2012 it was reported that 27 inmates were killed at Welikada prison. Continuing abuses highlight the unchanging nature of Sri Lanka’s detention policy and the associated violations of human rights that have resulted in over 11,000 internments since the end of the civil war in 2009.

While States have acknowledged the on-going violations committed by the Government of Sri Lanka, the Government has failed to address these concerns. This intransigence with respect to human rights and the rule of law is evidenced by the recent Universal Periodic Review (UPR), wherein the Sri Lankan government rejected 100 of 210 recommendations, the largest number of outright rejections in the UPR’s history.


Sri Lanka’s international obligations

Sri Lanka is a party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which contains stringent regulations intended to safeguard against abuse in detention. Article 9 prohibits arbitrary detention – including in the context of a legitimate derogation under a state of emergency – while establishing further protections with respect to an individual’s right to a fair trial within a reasonable timeframe, and the right to be informed of any charges.

The civil war: emergency regulations & prevention of terrorism act (PTA)

During the civil war, tens of thousands of individuals were detained under the Prevention of Terrorism Act and the Emergency Regulations. While the majority of these individuals were ethnic Tamils suspected of association with the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam...
(LTTE), Sinhalese and Muslim civilians were also arrested and subject to ill treatment.  
For example, Amnesty International reports that two Sinhalese political activists detained 
on suspicion of assisting the LTTE were subject to particularly severe treatment, coupled 
with intense media coverage intended to vilify the individuals.  
As of December 2011, one of these Sinhalese activists, arrested in 2006, is still awaiting trial at Bogambara prison. 
While detention-related abuses disproportionately affect the Tamil community, Sri Lanka’s 
detention policies and practices have serious consequences for the entire population.

Post-civil war: The ‘emergency’ is lifted, but the PTA continues

In August 2011, Sri Lanka lifted the declared state of emergency. 
However, the Government of Sri Lanka has continued to keep the Prevention of Terrorism Act in force, 
elements of which violate international obligations under Article 9 of the International 
Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, as discussed below. The Government has also 
introduced supplementary provisions in order to detain LTTE suspects without charge or trial, 
some of which have been deemed unconstitutional by leading Sri Lankan constitutional lawyers.

Detention without charge

Under Section 9(1) of the Prevention of Terrorism Act, individuals may be arrested without 
charge and detained for up to 18 months by a detention order. While detainees must be 
brought before a magistrate within 72 hours of their arrest, the magistrate “shall order the 
remand of [the individual] until the conclusion of the trial”. 
This order cannot be challenged in court. 
As an example of this practice, it is reported that as of December 2011, 42 of the 65 Tamil detainees held in Anuradhapura prison have yet to be charged, 
after two to six years in prison. 
Evidence also indicates that where protections are 
afforded, such as an individual’s right to be informed of the reasons for their arrest, such 
protections have been consistently violated in practice.

Arbitrary detention

The Working Group on Arbitrary Detention considers a deprivation of liberty to be 
arbitrary when “the total or partial non-observance of the international norms relating to the
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right to a fair trial... is of such gravity as to give the deprivation of liberty an arbitrary character. The length of detention in waiting for a trial can last years, often without charges ever being brought; these policies suggest that the Government of Sri Lanka is systematically carrying out arbitrary detention. Individuals being held without these protections amounts to a violation of the right to be informed of charges against an individual as well as the right to trial within a reasonable timeframe, guaranteed under Articles 9(2) and 9(3) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The use of emergency laws and the Prevention of Terrorism Act in Sri Lanka has resulted in a culture of impunity wherein arbitrary detentions and widespread torture and ill treatment has become the norm. Further, the UN Committee against Torture recently stated that it was “seriously concerned” regarding the “widespread use of torture... in police custody.” Between 1998 and 2011, the Asian Human Rights Commission documented 1,500 cases of police torture in Sri Lanka, which indicates a pattern of arbitrary detention resulting in an environment whereby detainees are more susceptible to torture and other forms of ill treatment.

A number of individual issues will now be addressed.

**Detention for political beliefs**

The Government of Sri Lanka claims that there are 318 political prisoners currently incarcerated. However, documentation by Sri Lankan activists indicates that up to 810 detainees are currently in detention for their political beliefs, many of whom have been awaiting charge for at least five years.

**Transfers and access to information regarding detainees**

Several prisoners’ families interviewed by the Sri Lanka Campaign for Peace and Justice in late 2012 stated that their relatives have been transferred between at least three prisons during their detention – often to delay their release – without any prior information or reasons for transfers given. According to Section 7(3) of the Prevention of Terrorism Act, police have the power to transfer a detainee without judicial permission or supervision. With no central registry in place, these unsupervised transfers can result in an individual...
effectively becoming lost in the system, with a substantial risk for abuses of this policy, such as torture and disappearances.\textsuperscript{27}

Thousands of families have also had limited access to their relatives, and are often denied all access.\textsuperscript{28} This issue is exacerbated because families typically received little to no information from the authorities regarding the whereabouts or health of detainees, implicating the right to respect for family life.\textsuperscript{29}

The following case study is illustrative with respect to a number of the human rights issues addressed above.

**Case study: Vavuniya prison**

According to a study by the Sri Lanka Campaign for Peace and Justice, in June 2012, following a riot at Vavuniya prison, 205 prisoners were transferred to Anuradhapura prison. Twenty-eight of these detainees were allegedly tortured with the involvement of up to 250 prison guards, resulting in two deaths.\textsuperscript{30} One of the most critical cases involved Mariadas Delroxan. On a visit prior to the riot, Delroxan’s father remembers Delroxan saying to him, “If they don’t release us [from prison], we will die.” Delroxan’s father next saw his son in the hospital, with a large bandage on his head and injuries indicating broken bones. The guards would not allow him to see the lower half of Delroxan’s body. After many hours in a coma, Delroxan died as a direct result of the injuries sustained during his detention. The authorities did not inform Delroxan’s family about his involvement in the riot or the injuries he sustained; his father learned of the riot from neighbours.

**Recommendations**

Prisoners are being held in captivity for extended periods of time without charge or trial. We therefore call upon the Government of Sri Lanka:

- To immediately end all forms of arbitrary detention;
- To immediately release all political prisoners or to bring charges against them by a specified date, while complying with the requirements of international human rights law;
- To invite the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention and the Special Rapporteur on Torture to visit Sri Lanka on an official mission to ensure transparency and accountability regarding detention policies;
- To allow an independent investigation into the Vavuniya prison riot of June 2012;
- To provide clear justification for the transfer of prisoners with adequate notification to families;
- To make public the list of detainees as pledged by the Government of Sri Lanka during the UPR 2009 and 2012.

\textsuperscript{27} The International Commission of Jurists has recognised the link between practices in Sri Lanka and the increased risk of torture and ill treatment. See International Commission of Jurists, Sri Lanka: Briefing paper – Emergency laws and international standards (1st edn, International Commission of Jurists, 2009)\textsuperscript{[13]}.  
\textsuperscript{29} Supra note 8, p. 27.  