

2/2/13

Gmail - Re:



Theva neethi dhas Ganapathy <gindhas220658@gmail.com>

Re:

1 message

Amman Ahluwalia <aman.ahluwalia@gmail.com>
To: anjali@paraskuhad.com, balani60@yahoo.com, vinod kumar <drcandaman@yahoo.com>, Theva neethi dhas
Ganapathy <gindhas220658@gmail.com>, sadhanasandhu <sadhanasandhu@yahoo.co.in>

Dear All,

I have seen a copy of the draft affidavit, as well as comments of administration in trail mail. My views:

1. I think it is important that a map be filed - which clearly shows the reserve area, buffer zone, and settlement areas excluded from buffer zone. The Court order has asked for an affidavit only for the purpose of showing the settlement areas (of course, it wrongly refers to settlements in reserve area - whereas they probably meant buffer zone). Thus, our affidavit should provide the map. You may bring additional copies of the map for the hearing, and the present copies can be used for filing.

2. I agree that we should point out the effect of the directions of the Court, as well as the reduction in number of vehicles - as suggested by the administration. However, in an affidavit meant to apprise the court of various facts - one cannot have a "prayer" for modification of the order. We may, however, say something to the effect of: "While the directions of this Hon'ble Court are presently being complied with in every respect, the implementation of these directions has undoubtedly had consequences for a section of persons who were dependent on transport through the ATR - either for their own need, or for their livelihood. The Petitioner therefore craves leave and liberty to place the necessary facts before this Hon'ble Court, and seek appropriate directions at the time of hearing with respect to travel along the ATR."

3. Of course, one issue that remains - and cannot really be addressed in an affidavit - is the central problem that we have notified a buffer zone, and then proceeded to exclude every settlement from this buffer zone. It could easily be argued that the entire exercise is a needless farce, which only seeks to protect the Jarawas in name - and nothing more. The condition appended to the Buffer Zone notification is weak and subjective - and does not go very far in protecting Jarawa interests. The Administration undoubtedly has to balance Jarawa interests with Settler interests - but the balance seems to have been drawn in a very one sided way. The Court may therefore have a legitimate grievance, and the Administration will need to be ready with answers on this point.

Amman

On Tue, Feb 19, 2013 at 5:47 PM, <anjali@paraskuhad.com> wrote:

----- Forwarded message from balani60@yahoo.com -----

Date: Mon, 18 Feb 2013 18:55:20 -0800 (PST)

From: bala manian <balani60@yahoo.com>

Reply-To: bala manian <balani60@yahoo.com>

To: Theva neethi dhas Ganapathy <gindhas220658@gmail.com>

Cc: "anjali@paraskuhad.com" <anjali@paraskuhad.com>, "drcandaman@yahoo.com" <drcandaman@yahoo.com>

Sir,

Pl see draft affidavit . This will be settled with ASG soon.

regards

----- End forwarded message -----