File Ref: HR/50

24th July 2014

Mr. Frank La Rue,
Special Rapporteur on the Promotion and Protection of the
Right to Freedom of Opinion and Expression

Mr. Maina Kiai,
Special Rapporteur on the Right to Freedom of Peaceful
Assembly and of Association

Ms. Margaret Sekagya,
Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights Defenders

Joint Urgent Appeal (JUA) of 27th March 2014 from three Special Procedures Mandate
Holders on the alleged intimidation of a human rights defender

Further to my letter of 10 July 2014 addressed to Ms. Jane Connors, Chief of Special Procedures
Branch with copy to you, and the response of Ms. Connors dated 22 July 2014 on the above
subject.

I take this opportunity to redirect the communication under reference to you and look forward
to your early response.

Ravinatha Aryasinha
Ambassador / Permanent Representative

Copies:

i. Ms. Jane Connors,
Chief of Special Procedures Branch,
Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)

ii. Mr. Hanny Megally,
Chief of Asia Pacific, Middle East and North Africa Branch,
Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)
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Ms. Margaret Sekaggya,
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Joint Urgent Appeal (JUA) of 27th March 2014 from three Special Procedures Mandate Holders on the alleged intimidation of a human rights defender

I have the honour to write to you with reference to your Joint Urgent Appeal of 27 March 2014 addressed to me, which refers to alleged acts of intimidation committed against Mr. Visuvalingam Kirupaharan, a human rights defender who attended a Side Event of the 25th session of the Human Rights Council at Palais des Nations, Geneva, on 21 March 2014.

I hereby wish to seek clarification from you as to why this Joint Urgent Appeal has been referred to the Government of Sri Lanka through me, considering that the reference to the sequence of events in the letter have no connection whatsoever with the Government of Sri Lanka.

I observe that the Side Event referred to in the letter has been organised by the International Buddhist Foundation (IBF), an NGO, and not by the Government of Sri Lanka. I also observe that the journalist from the Divaina newspaper based in Colombo who approached Mr. Kirupaharan and allegedly intimidated him, as referred to in your letter, is from an independent private newspaper over which the Government of Sri Lanka has no control.

It is further observed that the factual description of the alleged violation included in the Joint Urgent Appeal is markedly vague, even to the extent that it fails to indicate the identity of the alleged violator, who is merely referred to as 'a journalist for Divaina newspaper, based in Colombo'.
In perusing the sequence of events referred to in the Joint Urgent Appeal, it is my considered view that the incident has no connection to the Government of Sri Lanka. The reference in the letter to 'further concerns being expressed at the use of the media in Sri Lanka in defaming individuals who legitimately interact with the UN and its human rights mechanisms', has no basis and is uncalled for. The request contained in the letter to verify the authenticity of the facts alleged or to provide details therefore does not arise.

In this context, I refer to Articles 6 and 9 of the Human Rights Council Resolution 5/2 delineating the Code of Conduct for Special Procedures Mandate Holders which explicitly require that Mandate Holders seek to establish facts based on 'objective, reliable information ... that they have duly cross-checked to the best extent possible', and more importantly, that 'the communication should not be manifestly unfounded or politically motivated'. It is respectfully submitted that a reliable account of the alleged incident, subject to cross-verification of facts would reasonably have revealed fundamental facts establishing that this communication has no relevance to the Government of Sri Lanka.

It is therefore the considered view of the Government of Sri Lanka that this Joint Urgent Appeal is in contravention of the Human Rights Council Resolution 5/2, particularly Articles 6, 9 and 10; as well as the Manual of Operations of the Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council adopted in August 2008, especially Chapter II(B)(G), Paragraph 43, The incident referred to in the Joint Urgent Appeal, is not addressed to the Government of Sri Lanka.

In this context, I kindly request you to withdraw this Joint Urgent Appeal. I look forward to your response in this regard.

I thank you for your kind cooperation, and please accept the assurances of my highest consideration.

Ravinatha Aryasingha
Ambassador / Permanent Representative

Copies:

i. Ms. Jane Connors,
Chief of Special Procedures Branch
Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)

ii. Mr. Hanny Megally,
Chief of Asia Pacific, Middle East and North Africa Branch,
Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)