



© File photo, open source

# Rohingyas in India

State of Rohingya Muslims in India in absence of Refugee Law

©Report by Stichting the London Story

Kvk 77721306; The Netherland

[info@thelondonstory.org](mailto:info@thelondonstory.org)

[www.thelondonstory.org](http://www.thelondonstory.org)

[Twitter](#)

Foundation London Story is a registered NGO based in Netherlands with a wide network of friends and colleagues working in India. Our focus lies in documenting hate speech and hate crimes against Indian minorities.

The report on Rohingya report was prepared by Ms. Snehal Dote with inputs from Dr. Ritumbra Manuvie (corresponding author). The report was internally reviewed for editorial and content sanctity. The facts expressed in the report are sourced from reliable sources and checked for their authenticity. The opinions and interpretations are attributed to the authors alone and the Foundation can not be held liable for the same.

Foundation London Story retains all copyrights for this report under a CC license.

For concerns and further information, you can reach us out at [manuvie@thelondonstory.org](mailto:manuvie@thelondonstory.org)

## Contents

Background .....	3
Data .....	3
India's International Law Obligations.....	4
Timeline of Neglect and Discrimination on Grounds of Religion .....	5
Rationalizing exclusion, neglect, and dehumanizing of Rohingyas.....	7
Conclusion.....	8
References .....	8

# Report on India's Approach towards Rohingya

## Background

The Rohingya Muslims, originally inhabitants of the Rakhine State in Myanmar have been targets of the State for a long time (Mohajan, 2018). The Buddhist majority State has committed grave atrocities such as mass killings, persecutions and sexual assaults of the Rohingya Muslims (Albert & Maizland, 2020). The violence first surfaced in 2012 and later intensified in 2017-18 (Albert & Maizland, 2020). Since then, millions of Rohingya Muslims have sought refuge in neighbouring States of Bangladesh, India, Malaysia, Thailand and Indonesia (Albert & Maizland, 2020). They have also been called the “most persecuted minority in the world” by the United Nations (Human Rights Council, 2017; UNHCR, n.d.).

Trapped in the misery of persecution leading to statelessness and abandonment, the hardship of the Rohingya Muslims has worsened after fleeing to India. The further victimization of Rohingya refugees in India is on the ground of religion. Religious right-wing Hindutva trolls have accused Rohingyas to be an agent of Islamic terrorism and have been accused of carrying out militant attacks in parts of India (Chaudhury, 2018). Hindu right-wing media houses such as OpIndia and OneIndia have drawn elaborate conspiracy theories to link Rohingya involvement with the ISIS, Lashkar-e-Taiba. The generalized criminalisation of Rohingya Refugees as ‘terrorist’ is clearly caused due to their religion affiliation as Muslims. In the current report we focus on data surrounding the arrival of the Rohingya Refugees in India and the subsequent approach of the Indian government. The report also looks at India's obligations under International Law to protect Rohingya Refugees and highlights how through Citizenship Amendment Act, 2019 (CAA), Indian government has ignored its international responsibility of protection.

## Data

As of 2019, the State of Myanmar had a total population of 54 million people (The World Bank, 2019). It has been estimated that out of these 54 million, about 1.3 million people are Rohingyas living in Myanmar (Thawngmung, 2016). Following the persecution several Rohingya groups have fled to neighbouring states of Bangladesh and India. According to the Indian Home Ministry and Reuters, an estimated 40,000 Rohingyas sought refuge in India (Quadir, 2019; The Hindu, 2017). In January 2019, UNHCR India acknowledged the presence of 18,000 Rohingyas which are registered (UNHCR India, 2019). This means that several Rohingyas within India are living in protracted refuge conditions and continue to be stateless and statusless.

## India's International Law Obligations

India is not a signatory to the Refugee Convention, 1951 and does not recognise the Refugee Cards issued by the UNHCR (Shanker & Vijayaraghavan, 2020). This implies that Rohingyas within India do not particularly have a right to seek ration, jobs, housing, education etc. (Kinseth, 2019). As a result, most Rohingyas are believed to be involved in rag-picking, unskilled and unorganised jobs (Gulati, 2019).

It is submitted humbly that while India is neither a Party to the 1951 Refugee Convention nor the 1967 Refugee Protocol, India is signatory to several core treaties which requires states to ensure access to basic human rights and human dignity for all and provide basic protection to people seeking asylum in India. For example, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) 1948, grants persons a right to seek asylum in other countries if they face the threat of persecution in their homeland [Article 14]. Similarly, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) and Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) provides affirmative rights to ensure dignity, respect for life and liberty and conducive environment for children to grow. India is a signatory to all three of these conventions which create binding legal obligations through Article 51(c) of the Constitution of India which directs the State to “foster respect for international law and treaty obligations in the dealings of organized peoples with one another”.

Indian courts in various decisions have interpreted Fundamental Rights incorporated in Part III of the Constitution, according to the contours of International Law. In the case of *People's Union for Civil Liberties v. Union of India* AIR 1997 SC 568, the Supreme Court of India had held that the provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) are directly enforceable in India and can be used in effectuating the provisions of the Constitution. In another case of *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan* (1997) 6 SCC 241, the Supreme Court of India incorporated the entire CEDAW in Indian Law. Further, in the case of *Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India* 1996 5 SCR 241, Customary International Law was held to be automatically incorporated in the domestic law in the absence of any contrary provision. Nevertheless, the approach of the Indian government in providing protection and assistant to Rohingyas fall short of its international obligation and responsibility to protect. It is contended that the neglect of Rohingya refugees is primarily on grounds of religion and in-line with Indian state's growing discrimination and persecution of its own Muslim minorities.

### Timeline of Neglect and Discrimination on Grounds of Religion

The table below gives a timeline of discriminatory responses of the Indian Government, its officials, and the judiciary, to the Rohingyas in India.

Date	Event	Explanation
08 August 2017	Centre orders States to identify and deport foreign nationals staying illegally (Haidar & Singh, Government firms up plan to deport Rohingyas, 2017)	<p>The Home Ministry via its advisory No. 24013/29/Misc./2017-CSR.III(i) delegated power to state governments for identification and deportation of foreign nationals staying illegally. It also directed the states to “sensitize all law enforcement and intelligence agencies”. It also stated that “infiltration” from Myanmar aggravated security challenges.</p> <p><b>States do not have power to deport asylum seekers without giving a due regard to their individual and collective cases. Such deportations are violative of the non-refoulement principle.</b></p>
06 September 2017	Prime Minister Modi’s “concern” on “extremist violence” in Rakhine State (The Wire, 2017)	<p>During his visit to Nay Pyi Taw, Prime Minister Modi said, “<i>We are partners in your concerns over the loss of lives of security forces and innocent people due to the extremist violence in Rakhine State</i>”. In his address Prime Minister Modi reiterated the Myanmar government’s stand on Rohingyas without any regard to the rampant human rights violation and humanitarian crisis against Rohingyas in Myanmar.</p>
08 September 2017	India refuses to sign Bali Declaration (Haidar, 2017)	<p>India rejected the joint statement by the World Parliamentary Forum. The statement expressed concern about the deaths and fleeing of the Rohingya Muslims. India rejected it on the grounds that the session was to discuss about SDGs and not country specific clauses.</p>
09 September 2017	Indian Ministry of External Affairs Issues Statement during Myanmar Visit (Government of India, 2017)	<p>India strongly condemned “terrorist attacks on Myanmar security forces in Rakhine State”. The statement highlighted that during the Prime Minister’s visit on 06 September 2017, he had agreed to aid Rakhine State Development Programme. The statement has no mention of Indian’s help to Rohingyas or condemnation</p>

		towards the persecution of Rohingya Muslims by the Myanmar state.
14 September 2017	Initiation of <i>Operation Insaniyat</i> by the Indian Government (Government of India, 2017)	India aided Bangladesh in hosting a large number of Rohingyas. It provided food kits and necessities with a view to leverage Bangladesh as a host nation. State in India has not provided food or necessities to Rohingyas arriving in India.
15 March 2018	India rejected that its Border Security Forces is pushing back Refugees, denied recognition to Rohingya Muslims in the name of 'National Interest' (Union of India, 2018)	<p>A petition in the Supreme Court was filed for the recognition and protection of Rohingya Muslims in India in the case of <i>Mohammad Salimulah v. Union of India</i>, Writ Petition (Civil) No. 793 of 2017. In an affidavit filed on behalf of the Union of India, it was submitted that the Border Security Forces is "performing its duties" to promote the security of India by stopping Rohingyas entering without passports.</p> <p>The petition was denied on the grounds that the submission was based only on newspaper reports. Further, the affidavit states that increasing influx of Rohingyas is the "<u>root cause of spread of terrorism</u>".</p>
04 October 2018	Supreme Court rejects plea to stop deportation of seven Rohingya Muslims (The Indian Express, 2018)	In response to the first instance of deportation of Rohingyas, the Supreme Court said that it is "not inclined to interfere" with the decision of the Central government. The judgement by the apex court failed to acknowledge the responsibility to protect under the international law.
12 December 2019	Enactment of the Citizenship Amendment Act (CAA), 2019	The newly enacted CAA provides fast-track citizenship to people arrived in India from Afghanistan, Bangladesh and Pakistan before 31 December 2014 and belonging to the Hindu, Sikh, Buddhist, Jain, Parsi or Christian community. While the Act is touted by the Home Minister of India as a refugee policy, it excludes Muslims, including Rohingya refugees. It is contended that the Act is violative of right to equality granted under Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

03 January 2020	Plans to deport Rohingya Muslims from India (The Indian Express, 2020)	In a statement given by the Union Minister of State in the Prime Minister's Office, post the enactment of the CAA, Dr. Jitendra Singh expressed that the Central Government was "considering ways" to deport the Rohingya Muslims. He said that the CAA does not grant citizenship to the Muslim asylum-seekers. As a result, the Rohingya Muslims would be deported to Myanmar. He further stated that the CAA is also applicable in the Union Territory of Jammu and Kashmir which holds a sizable Rohingya population.
17 March 2020	India mentions the words "Rohingya", "Ethnic" and "Persecution" (India, 2020).	In the counter affidavit submitted on behalf of the Union of India in the case of <i>Indian Union Muslim League v. Union of India</i> , Writ Petition (Civil) No. 1470 of 2019, India finally acknowledged that Rohingya Muslims faced ethnic persecution. However, it said that these asylum seekers came to India instead of Bangladesh in the lookout for jobs.

### Rationalizing exclusion, neglect, and dehumanizing of Rohingyas

Under the current Bhartiya Janta Party (BJP) government in India there has been a rise in Hate and hate crimes against Muslims in general. We talk about this in a separate report also submitted along-side. The response of the Indian State under BJP to Rohingya refugees is in line with its wider discriminatory and derogatory approach towards Indian Muslims. Treatment of Rohingya Muslim asylum seekers is in sharp contrast of India's treatment of Buddhist refugees in Tibet and Byllakuppe. In 1951, India welcomed Tibetan (Buddhist) refugees and granted them asylum in India. Tibetans are given Refugee Certificates in India which grant them all rights as Indian citizens except the right to vote and right to government employment (Singh, 2017). In the 1980s, the Afghan-Soviet war brought about 60,000 Afghan (majority Sikh and Hindu) refugees in India. Although they have not been granted Indian citizenship, the government has provided them necessary aid at all times, in association with the UNHCR and the National Human Rights Commission (Singh, 2017). The Sri Lankan civil war in the 1980s also brought the Tamil (Hindu) refugees in India. Currently settled in camps in the southern state of Tamil Nadu, the Indian Finance Minister assured that about 95,000 Sri Lankan refugees would be given Indian citizenship under the CAA (Babu, 2020). In all these instances, the response of the Indian



government is in stark contrast to that of the entry of the Rohingyas who are primarily Muslims, but equally persecuted.

## Conclusion

The timeline of key responses shows that state has failed to acknowledge and act on its international legal responsibility to protect and have instead created societal as well as legal barriers for arrival and acceptance of Rohingya refugees in India. In 2015, the BJP led government altered the Passport Act, 1967 and the Foreigners Act, 1946 to exclude people belonging to Muslim community to enter India without passport or in search of asylum. The 2019 amendment through the Citizenship Amendment Act (CAA) reiterates the position of Indian government from 2015. The enactment of anti-Muslim laws such as the CAA has not only instilled fear in the minds of Rohingya Muslims but also Muslims who are citizens of India. In a report by the Anadolu Agency, Ali Johar, a youth Rohingya leader speaking of the CAA said that the CAA has instilled fears in the minds of the Rohingya Muslims and more than 3000 persons have left for Bangladesh to avoid the hateful vilification and deportation on account of being Muslims (Kapoor, 2020). He also said that many have also considered converting to other religions. The fear due to state oppression of minorities clubbed with the main-stream narrative of Rohingya being terrorist, termites, and unwanted criminal elements with connection to Islamic terrorism has created a wider narrative which seeks to criminalize and dehumanize Rohingyas in India.

## References

- Albert, E., & Maizland, L. (2020, January 23). *The Rohingya Crisis*. Retrieved from Council on Foreign Relations: <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/rohingya-crisis>
- Babu, G. (2020, January 19). *There will be process to give citizenship to Sri Lankan Tamil refugees: FM*. Retrieved from Business Standard: [https://www.business-standard.com/article/current-affairs/there-will-be-process-to-give-citizenship-to-sri-lankan-tamil-refugees-fm-120011900335\\_1.html](https://www.business-standard.com/article/current-affairs/there-will-be-process-to-give-citizenship-to-sri-lankan-tamil-refugees-fm-120011900335_1.html)
- Baker, R. (2010). Customary International Law in the 21st Century: Old Challenges and New Debates. *The European Journal of International Law*, 21(1), 173-204.
- Banerjee, S., & Basu Ray Chaudhury, A. (2020, February 10). *ICJ's judgement on the Rohingya and its challenges*. Retrieved from Observer Research Foundation: <https://www.orfonline.org/expert-speak/icjs-judgement-rohingya-its-challenges-61233/>

- CEDAW . (2014, November 5). *General recommendation No. 32 on the gender-related dimensions of refugee status, asylum, nationality and statelessness of women*. Retrieved from Refworld: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/54620fb54.html>
- Chaudhury, D. R. (2018, July 12). *Rohingya terrorists linked to pro-Pak terror groups in Jammu & Kashmir*. Read more at: [https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/defence/rohingya-terrorists-linked-to-pro-pak-terror-groups-in-jammu-kashmir/articleshow/55046910.cms?utm\\_source=contentofinter](https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/defence/rohingya-terrorists-linked-to-pro-pak-terror-groups-in-jammu-kashmir/articleshow/55046910.cms?utm_source=contentofinter). Retrieved from The Economic Times: <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/defence/rohingya-terrorists-linked-to-pro-pak-terror-groups-in-jammu-kashmir/articleshow/55046910.cms>
- Costello, C., & Foster, M. (2015). Non-refoulement as Custom and Jus Cogens? Putting the Prohibition to the Test. In *Netherlands Yearbook of International Law 2015*. T.M.C. Asser Press.
- Darusman, M., Coomaraswamy, R., & Sidoti, C. (2019). *Report of the independent international fact-finding mission on Myanmar*. Geneva: United Nations.
- Government of India. (2017, September 14). *Operation Insaniyat - Humanitarian assistance to Bangladesh on account of influx of refugees*. Retrieved from Ministry of External Affairs: [https://mea.gov.in/press-releases.htm?dtl/28944/Operation\\_Insaniyat\\_\\_Humanitarian\\_assistance\\_to\\_Bangladesh\\_on\\_account\\_of\\_influx\\_of\\_refugees#:~:text=Operation%20Insaniyat%20%2D%20Humanitarian%20assistance%20to%20Bangladesh%20on%20account%20of%20influx%20of](https://mea.gov.in/press-releases.htm?dtl/28944/Operation_Insaniyat__Humanitarian_assistance_to_Bangladesh_on_account_of_influx_of_refugees#:~:text=Operation%20Insaniyat%20%2D%20Humanitarian%20assistance%20to%20Bangladesh%20on%20account%20of%20influx%20of)
- Government of India. (2017, September 9). *ituation in Rakhine State of Myanmar*. Retrieved from Ministry of External Affairs: <https://mea.gov.in/press-releases.htm?dtl/28931/Situation+in+Rakhine+State+of+Myanmar>
- Gulati, V. (2019, August 16). *Rohingya refugees in Jammu pray for safety post Article 370*. Retrieved from Outlook India: <https://www.outlookindia.com/newscroll/indian-govts-fascist-tactics-in-kashmir-will-fail-imran/1597943?scroll>
- Haidar, S. (2017, September 09). *Bali action puts India on other side of the Rohingya debate*. Retrieved from The Hindu: <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/bali-action-puts-india-on-other-side-of-the-rohingya-debate/article19646341.ece>

- Haidar, S., & Singh, V. (2017, August 18). *Government firms up plan to deport Rohingyas*. Retrieved from The Hindu: <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/government-firms-up-plan-to-deport-rohingyas/article19511385.ece>
- Human Rights Council. (2017, December 5). *Human Rights Council opens special session on the situation of human rights of the Rohingya and other minorities in Rakhine State in Myanmar*. Retrieved from OHCHR: <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=22491&LangID=E>
- Human Rights Watch. (n.d.). *Rohingya*. Retrieved from Human Rights Watch: <https://www.hrw.org/tag/rohingya>
- India, U. o. (2020, March 17). *Counter Affidavit on Behalf of Respondent in the case of Indian Union Muslim League v. Union of India, Writ Petition (Civil) No. 1470 of 2019*. Retrieved from Supreme Court Observer: [https://scobserver-production.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/case\\_document/document\\_upload/1191/Counter\\_Affidavit\\_filed\\_by\\_Union.pdf](https://scobserver-production.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/case_document/document_upload/1191/Counter_Affidavit_filed_by_Union.pdf)
- Kapoor, C. (2020, August 24). *Hate campaign haunts Rohingya refugees in India*. Retrieved from Anadolu Agency: <https://www.aa.com.tr/en/asia-pacific/hate-campaign-haunts-rohingya-refugees-in-india-/1951269>
- Kinseth, A. S. (2019, January 29). *India's Rohingya shame*. Retrieved from Aljazeera: <https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2019/1/29/indias-rohingya-shame/>
- Mewara, L. (2019, March 18). *Deportation of Rohingyas Violates International Law, Legal Precedents in India*. Retrieved from The Wire: <https://thewire.in/law/deportation-rohingya-supreme-court>
- Mohajan, H. K. (2018, January 18). History of Rakhine State and the Origin of the Rohingya Muslims. *The Indonesian Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 2(1), 19-46. Retrieved from Munich Personal RePEc Archive.
- OHCHR. (n.d.). *The principle of non-refoulement under international human rights law*. Retrieved from OHCHR: <https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Migration/GlobalCompactMigration/ThePrincipleNon-RefoulementUnderInternationalHumanRightsLaw.pdf>

- Quadir, S. (2019, January 21). *Rohingya Muslim group fleeing India to Bangladesh stuck on 'zero line'*. Retrieved from Reuters: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-myanmar-rohingya-india-bangladesh/rohingya-muslim-group-fleeing-india-to-bangladesh-stuck-on-zero-line-idUSKCN1PF0PD>
- Rautray, S. (2019, December 6). *Changes to Passport, Foreigners Acts still pending in top court* Read more at: [https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/politics-and-nation/changes-to-passport-foreigners-acts-still-pending-in-top-court/articleshow/72392806.cms?utm\\_source=contentofintere](https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/politics-and-nation/changes-to-passport-foreigners-acts-still-pending-in-top-court/articleshow/72392806.cms?utm_source=contentofintere). Retrieved from The Economic Times: <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/politics-and-nation/changes-to-passport-foreigners-acts-still-pending-in-top-court/articleshow/72392806.cms?from=mdr>
- Shanker, R., & Vijayaraghavan, H. (2020, November). Refugee recognition challenges in India. *Forced Migration Review*. Retrieved from Forced Migration Review.
- Singh, K. (2017, September 14). *Here is how various refugee communities have fared in India*. Retrieved from The Indian Express: <https://indianexpress.com/article/india/rohingya-muslims-refugee-myanmar-india-bangladesh-4843379/>
- Sundaram, J. R. (n.d.). *Decoding India's Stand on the Rohingya Crisis*. Retrieved from Centre for Public Policy Research: <https://www.cppr.in/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Decoding-India%E2%80%99s-Stand-on-the-Rohingya-Crisis.pdf>
- Talmon, S. (2015). Determining Customary International Law: The ICJ's Methodology between Induction, Deduction and Assertion. *The European Journal of International Law*, 26(2), 417-443.
- Thawngmung, A. M. (2016). The politics of indigeneity in Myanmar: competing narratives in Rakhine state. *Asian Ethnicity*, 1-21.
- The Hindu. (2017, September 5). *India firm on deporting Rohingya*. Retrieved from The Hindu: <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/other-states/india-firm-on-deporting-rohingya/article19625028.ece>
- The Indian Express. (2018, October 4). *SC rejects plea, 7 Rohingya to be handed over to Myanmar in first deportation today*. Retrieved from The Indian Express: <https://indianexpress.com/article/india/sc-rejects-plea-against-deportation-seven-rohingya-set-to-be-handed-over-to-myanmar-today-5385769/>

- The Indian Express. (2020, January 3). *Centre's next step is to deport Rohingyas from the country: MoS Jitendra Singh*. Retrieved from The Indian Express: <https://indianexpress.com/article/india/centre-to-deport-rohingyas-from-the-country-jitendra-singh-citizenship-law-6198058/>
- The Wire. (2017, September 6). *In Suu Kyi Meeting, Modi Shares 'Concern' Over Extremist Violence by Rohingya Outfit*. Retrieved from The Wire: <https://thewire.in/external-affairs/modi-aung-san-suu-kyi-myanmar-rohingya>
- The World Bank. (2019). *Population, total - Myanmar*. Retrieved from The World Bank: <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL?locations=MM>
- UNHCR India. (2019, January 4). *UNHCR seeking clarification from India over returns of Rohingya*. Retrieved from UNHCR: <https://www.unhcr.org/news/press/2019/1/5c2f2a374/unhcr-seeking-clarification-india-returns-rohingya.html>
- UNHCR India. (2019, July 31). *Rohingya refugees fled violence in Myanmar at a staggering rate in 2017 - and the numbers keep growing*. Retrieved from UNHCR: <https://www.unhcr.org/rohingya-emergency.html>
- UNHCR. (2007, January 26). *Advisory Opinion on the Extraterritorial Application of Non-Refoulement Obligations under the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol*. Retrieved from UNHCR: <https://www.unhcr.org/4d9486929.pdf>
- UNHCR. (n.d.). *Rohingya Refugee Crisis - Background*. Retrieved from UNHCR: <https://www.unrefugees.org/emergencies/rohingya/>
- Union of India. (2018, March 15). *Affidavit on Behalf of Respondent in the case of Mohammad Salimullah v. Union of India, Writ Petition (Civil) No. 793 of 2017*. Retrieved from Supreme Court Observer: [https://scobserver-production.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/case\\_document\\_resource/document\\_upload/38/Affidavit\\_by\\_UOI\\_-\\_Rohingya.pdf](https://scobserver-production.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/case_document_resource/document_upload/38/Affidavit_by_UOI_-_Rohingya.pdf)