

REFUGEE STATUS APPEALS AUTHORITY
NEW ZEALAND

REFUGEE APPEAL NO 76173

AT AUCKLAND

Before: C M Treadwell (Member)

Counsel for the Appellant: I Uca

Appearing for the Department of Labour: No appearance

Date of Hearing: 14 and 15 February 2008

Date of Decision: 5 May 2008

DECISION

INTRODUCTION

[1] This is an appeal by a single man from Sudan, aged in his early twenties, against a decision of a refugee status officer declining him the grant of refugee status.

[2] The crux of the appellant's claim is that, following the death of his father at the hands of the *janjaweed* militia in Darfur and the ensuing scattering of the rest of his family, he fled the area and is afraid of returning to Sudan for fear of meeting a similar fate.

[3] The central issue is the question whether the appellant's characteristics, including his ethnicity, African (as opposed to Arab) appearance, youth and displacement create a real chance of him being persecuted if he returns to Sudan.

THE APPELLANT'S CASE

[4] The account which follows is a summary of the evidence given by the appellant on appeal. It is assessed later.

[5] According to the appellant, he is a member of the Reizegat tribe, an Arabic tribe traditionally from the north of the country. His paternal great-grandfather had been a member of another tribe but had been kidnapped and made to work as a servant for a Reizegat family. Eventually, he had been permitted to marry another servant, an African woman of the al-Mesalit tribe and had become part of the Reizegat tribe. The result is that, while the appellant is of African appearance, the appellant's family align themselves with the Reizegat tribe.

[6] The appellant was born and raised in X village, some 30-40 kilometres from Y town in northern Darfur. His father was a cattle farmer. The family lived in a wattle and daub hut, as did everyone else in the village. There was no electricity in the village and water was drawn from a nearby well.

[7] The appellant attended primary school in the village, predominantly Islamic studies. He experienced occasional discrimination from Arab students, who would call him a slave and deride him for not being of pure Arab blood. The adults would not, however, permit such bullying and took action when it occurred.

[8] In about 1991, the appellant (aged about 6 years) stopped attending school full-time, in order to assist his father with the cattle herding. Alternating between school and tending the cattle became his way of life for the next decade.

[9] In the mid 1990s, the appellant's only paternal uncle, AA, left the village to live in Khartoum. Although he had never met them, the appellant knew that he also had two maternal aunts living there.

[10] The appellant quit school completely in about 2001 or 2001, to assist his father on the farm. As well as growing sorghum, the family owned over 30 cattle and various other animals. The cattle were mainly kept for milk though, on occasion, surplus beasts would be taken by the appellant's father to a man named BB in Y town to be sold.

[11] In 2003, the Sudanese government began a campaign of terror and intimidation against the people of Darfur. Using the *janjaweed* militia and the Sudanese army, villages of certain tribes, such as the al-Fur, al-Mesalit and al-Zagawah would be attacked and the inhabitants forced to flee. The *janjaweed* included many men from the al-Reizegat tribe, among others, though no-one from the appellant's village joined or supported them.

[12] In July 2003, the appellant's father obtained for him a Sudanese identity card. The appellant left it at home when he went out, carrying only a photocopy of the card to show officials if he was stopped for any reason. Although he had become eligible for military service at 18, there was usually no-one in their remote area to enforce such requirements. On the one occasion he was required to show his copied identity card to the police, when taking cattle to Y town in 2005, the police made no mention of military service obligations and the appellant surmised that it was something which they enforced only periodically.

[13] In late September 2006, the appellant and his father were watering the cattle at their trough by the village well when *janjaweed* militia members arrived with their own cattle. They demanded that the appellant's father make way and allow their cattle to drink from his trough. An argument ensued, with the appellant's father telling the men to fill their own trough. Other villagers were present and they backed the appellant's father. Eventually, the *janjaweed* gave up. As they departed, they told the appellant's father they would be back to teach him a lesson.

[14] The following day, the appellant set off on his own to take four cattle to Y town for sale. The walk took five or six hours and he reached the town about midday. BB paid him for the cattle and also gave the appellant a further sum of money for his father.

[15] By the time the appellant was ready to return, it was late in the day and BB invited him to remain overnight.

[16] As he neared the village the following day, the appellant was met by a friend, who told him that the *janjaweed* had been to the village the previous night and had killed the appellant's father before burning down the family hut and stealing the cattle. The appellant's mother and his younger brothers had fled into the bush and had not returned. The appellant ran to the village and confirmed what had occurred. His father had already been buried by the villagers, in accordance with Islamic custom.

[17] Overwhelmed, the appellant left the village with the intention of finding his uncle in Khartoum. He walked to a nearby town, Z, where he hitched a lift on a truck heading in that direction for the sum of 40 *dinars*.

[18] After a trip of five or six days, the truck reached the city of Sennar, where the driver told the appellant that he would be going to the town of Kassala, on the Eritrean border, before going to Khartoum.

[19] The appellant stayed with the truck as far as Kassala, where he disembarked in order to buy a meal at a small restaurant. While he was eating, he saw the police arrive and start to check the truck. To avoid them, he remained in the restaurant, where the proprietor engaged him in conversation and warned him that there were many checkpoints on the road to Khartoum.

[20] On leaving the restaurant, the appellant found that the truck had departed without him. Uncertain what to do, he returned to the restaurant and sought the advice of the proprietor, who invited him to remain there overnight, in the hope of finding another vehicle the following day.

[21] The next day, however, the proprietor told the appellant that a better option would be to accompany a group of visiting Eritrean coffee traders who were at the restaurant. The traders would take the appellant to the Red Sea, where he could get a boat to Saudi Arabia and find work.

[22] The appellant agreed with this proposal and the proprietor assisted him by exchanging the remainder of his 80,000 *dinars* for US\$3,000. The proprietor gave the appellant the names and addresses of Sudanese people he knew in Saudi Arabia who would help him. He reassured the appellant that he knew the Eritrean men and that it would be safe for him to travel with them. The proprietor paid the Eritreans from the appellant's money.

[23] The following day, the appellant accompanied the Eritreans by vehicle to the border, where one of the men escorted him around the border post on foot while the vehicle went through. Once in Eritrea, they rejoined the vehicle and drove to a village where the appellant waited some two weeks.

[24] One afternoon, the appellant was collected and driven for some 12-13 hours to the coast where, the next day, he boarded a *sambuk* with 18 others, bound for Yemen. The appellant did not know the cost of the trip and simply allowed one of the Eritreans to pay the captain from his funds.

[25] After a crossing of two to three days, the passengers were dropped ashore at a remote location in Yemen. They were met by an Eritrean man and some Yemeni nationals, who escorted the group bound for Saudi Arabia on foot to the

village of Hareedh. After a wait of one or two days, they were taken by donkey across the border to the village of Samidhah in Saudi Arabia. On being asked, the appellant paid their guide US\$100.

[26] The next day, the appellant was taken to Jeddah by vehicle. There, he telephoned CC, one of the contacts he had been given by the restaurant proprietor in Kassala. In turn, CC introduced the appellant to DD, a Reizegat Sudanese living permanently in Saudi Arabia, with whom the appellant went to stay.

[27] After two weeks, DD introduced the appellant to EE, a Saudi national who needed a goat-herd. The appellant began working for him for 500 *riyals* (approximately NZ\$190) per month and moved to live at EE's compound some distance from Jeddah.

[28] Some two months later, in January 2007, the appellant was nearly caught in a police swoop on illegal migrants in a nearby town, where he was shopping. Frightened, he contacted DD again and told him that he was not able to work for EE. DD initially suggested that he could arrange for the appellant to return to Sudan but, when the appellant explained that he did not want to return there because of the *janjaweed*, DD introduced him to a Somali man, FF, who told the appellant that he could arrange the appellant's travel to New Zealand on a false Saudi passport.

[29] The appellant agreed to the plan and gave FF a photograph of himself and 5,000 *riyals* (approximately NZ\$1,900) as requested. In return, the appellant received a passport in the name of GG, together with an air ticket from Jeddah to Dammam. From Dammam (still in Saudi Arabia) to Bahrain, the appellant caught a taxi. There, he bought a ticket from Bahrain to New Zealand, via Riyadh and Hong Kong, for approximately 5,000 *riyals* (NZ\$1,900), leaving him only US\$50 in his pocket.

[30] On arrival in New Zealand on 15 March 2007, the appellant sought refugee status at the airport. He was interviewed by a refugee status officer on 26 and 27 April 2007. His application was declined on 7 December 2007.

[31] Since his Refugee Status Branch interview, the appellant has established telephone contact with DD in Jeddah and has spoken to him on a number of occasions. Through him, the appellant has caused enquiry to be made for his

mother and brothers and has established that they are living in Khartoum with his paternal uncle. He has not been able to contact them directly, however.

[32] The appellant says that, if he returns to Sudan, he will be compelled to return to his village in Darfur because he has never lived anywhere else in Sudan. In Darfur, he will be at risk of harm at the hands of the *janjaweed* and the Sudanese army. It will make no difference that he is of the Reizegat tribe because he looks African, not Arab and he will be presumed to be a supporter of the south.

[33] The appellant also fears being conscripted into the Sudanese army. He is now of an age to be conscripted and, if returned to Sudan, could not avoid the authorities when he arrives at the airport. Further, his illegal departure will bring him to their attention and, even if he is not punished for it, it will raise his profile in terms of his likely conscription.

[34] The appellant objects to serving in the Sudanese army, which is, he believes, engaged in unjustified and reprehensible attacks against a civilian population – a population of which he himself formed a part.

Documentary evidence

[35] The Authority and the appellant have been provided with the file of the Refugee Status Branch, including copies of all documents submitted by the appellant at first instance.

[36] The appellant submits the following:

- (a) The copy of his Sudanese identity card, which he says he has carried with him at all times.
- (b) A brief letter dated 3 February 2008 by HH, a Sudanese refugee claimant presently in New Zealand, attesting to the fact that it is possible to travel illegally between Eritrea and Sudan, for money.
- (c) A letter dated 3 February 2008 by JJ, also a Sudanese refugee claimant presently in New Zealand, attesting to his belief that the appellant is genuinely Sudanese, from Darfur.
- (d) An email dated 7 February 2008 by KK, a Sudanese living in New Zealand, attesting that he met the appellant last year and is satisfied

that the appellant is Sudanese, from the “Rezeygat” tribe by his father and the “Mossalet” tribe by his mother.

- (e) An undated letter from LL, a Sudanese living in New Zealand, attesting that he works closely with the African community here and has visited the appellant many times. He is satisfied that the appellant is Sudanese and grew up in Darfur, an origin established by the tribal marks on his face.
- (f) An undated letter, sent by fax on 25 January 2008, from DD, in Jeddah, stating (as translated):

“I am a Sudanese man living in Saudi in the city of Jeddah.... I met [the appellant] approximately in November 2006.

[The appellant] is a Sudanese young man. I know that he is from al-Zregat tribe and a Masalit and stayed with me at my house for a while. He told me about his problems in Sudan and I found work for him with someone called [EE].

[The appellant] cannot go back to Sudan and he is at risk. He was forced to leave Saudi.

[DD]”

[37] Counsel for the appellant has submitted written opening and closing submissions and refers the Authority to various items of country information which are, as relevant, referred to hereafter.

THE ISSUES

[38] The Inclusion Clause in Article 1A(2) of the Refugee Convention relevantly provides that a refugee is a person who:

“... owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it.”

[39] In terms of *Refugee Appeal No. 70074/96* (17 September 1996), the principal issues are:

- (a) Objectively, on the facts as found, is there a real chance of the appellant being persecuted if returned to the country of nationality?

- (b) If the answer is yes, is there a Convention reason for that persecution?

ASSESSMENT OF THE APPELLANT'S CASE

[40] Before considering those issues, however, it is necessary to address the question of the credibility of the appellant's account.

[41] There were a number of aspects of the appellant's account which give rise to reservations as to his truthfulness. The notion, for example, that a poorly educated young goat-herd, who had rarely been to a town or city, should manage to travel from a remote farming village in Darfur, via truck, car, boat, foot and aeroplane, through seven countries, to New Zealand has a strong flavour of implausibility. So too does the fortuity with which he says that he found himself in possession of the money (an enormous sum, by Darfurian standards) just at the right moment to fund such travel. That he should have managed to negotiate the complexities of international air travel, transiting through two other countries, is surprising.

[42] Nonetheless, there are aspects of the account which are clearly true. It is accepted, for example, that the appellant is a Sudanese man, aged approximately 20, of mixed African and Arab heritage, who comes from the Darfur region. The letters in support speak of his intimate knowledge of Darfurian traditional cooking, medicine and customs and confirm that his dialect is appropriate for the region and that he bears appropriate tribal markings.

[43] It *might* be that the photocopy of the identity card is false. It *might* be that the fax from DD is a concoction. It *might* be that the letters of support from four Sudanese men in New Zealand (including a community support worker) are untrue. But none of the documents give reason, on their face, for being doubted. If they are to be given weight, then their corroborative value is relatively high.

[44] As to his testimony, the appellant has related his account on four occasions – at the airport, in his written statement, to the Refugee Status Branch and to the Authority. He has been fulsome and consistent in his evidence throughout – not with the perfection of an account learned by rote but with the close proximity that being questioned by several different people, at different times, brings.

[45] Notwithstanding the inherent implausibility of a person in the position of the appellant undertaking the journey he says he has, there is nothing other than the unease which that implausibility engenders which would justify the Authority rejecting his credibility. On the evidence before it, the Authority concludes that the appellant should be accorded the benefit of the doubt. His account is accepted as truthful.

Country conditions

[46] A number of recent decisions of the Authority have canvassed the background to the Darfur conflict, notably *Refugee Appeal No 75655* (29 September 2006), *Refugee Appeal No 75968* (19 February 2007) and *Refugee Appeal No 76074* (22 November 2007). The relevant information therein can be summarised as follows.

[47] The conflict in Darfur has historical origins but the modern crisis escalated in February 2003, when rebel groups from the Fur, al-Mesalit, and Zaghawa tribes, demanded an end to chronic economic marginalisation in the Darfur region and sought power-sharing with the Arab-ruled government. In particular, they rose up against the encroachment of Arab farmers who were driven onto traditional African land by climatic change.

[48] The government's response was to target the civilian populations from which the rebels were drawn. It engaged in ethnic manipulation by organising a military and political partnership with the nomadic Arab militia known as the *janjaweed*, whom it armed, trained, and gave impunity for all crimes committed. See *Human Rights Watch* "Darfur Destroyed: Ethnic Cleansing by Government and Militia Forces in Western Sudan", May 2004 Vol 16, No 6(A).

[49] By early 2004, government and *janjaweed* attacks against villages in Darfur had caused massive displacement and casualties and forced hundreds of thousands of people into makeshift camps in Sudan and in Chad. It is estimated that by November 2004, some 70,000 people had been killed and 1.5 million civilians displaced. See *Freedom House* "Sudan – Country Report, 2004".

[50] On 25 January 2005, the UN International Commission of Inquiry on Darfur reported to the UN Secretary-General that, while the Sudanese government did not pursue a genocidal policy directly or through the militias under its control, it committed violations of humanitarian and international law which could be

considered war crimes. See www.ohchr.org/english/docs/darfurreport.doc. In particular, it recorded:

“...Government forces and militias conducted indiscriminate attacks, including killing of civilians, torture, enforced disappearances, destruction of villages, rape and other forms of sexual violence, pillaging and forced displacement, throughout Darfur. These acts were conducted on a widespread and systematic basis, and therefore may amount to crimes against humanity. The extensive destruction and displacement have resulted in a loss of livelihood and means of survival for countless women, men and children. In addition to the large scale attacks, many people have been arrested and detained, and many have been held *incommunicado* for prolonged periods and tortured. The vast majority of the victims of all of these violations have been from the Fur, Zaghawa, Massalit, Jebel, Aranga and other so-called 'African' tribes....”

The above conclusion that no genocidal policy has been pursued and implemented in Darfur by the Government authorities, directly or through the militias under their control, should not be taken as in any way detracting from, or belittling, the gravity of the crimes perpetrated in that region. As stated above genocide is not necessarily the most serious international crime. Depending upon the circumstances, *such international offences as crimes against humanity or large scale war crimes may be no less serious and heinous than genocide*. This is exactly what happened in Darfur, where massive atrocities were perpetrated on a very large scale, and have so far gone unpunished.”

[51] More recently, in September 2007, *Human Rights Watch* published its report “Chaos by Design: Peacekeeping Challenges for AMIS and UNAMID” Volume 19, No 15(A) noting, at pp 29-34:

"During the past three years, Darfur has experienced changes in the dynamics of the conflict, but there has been no dramatic or sustained improvement in security for civilians. Attacks may subside during the dry season, when farms are idle and nomads and farmers are in less contact with each other, and people have also learned to avoid provoking attacks by remaining indoors or travelling to and from markets at night. While this temporarily lowers the number of reported abuses, it does not indicate that the situation is improving....

Since January 2007 Darfur has also been the site of intense inter-tribal fighting amongst members of various Arab groups, many of whom belong to Sudan's security forces."

[52] In *Refugee Appeal No 76074* (22 November 2007) the Authority concluded, drawing on this information:

“[58] What emerges from this confused landscape is that a significant change in the dynamic of the conflict in Darfur has taken place since the Authority's decisions in *Refugee Appeal No 74884* (18 February 2004) and *Refugee Appeal No 75655*. The conflict no longer resembles a simple bi-polar government/rebel conflict but rather has morphed into a multi-polar conflict. This multi-polar conflict is increasingly assuming an inter-tribal nature in which armed conflict arises out of *localised* disputes, sometimes between former allied groups, over land, cattle or other resources. These new conflicts take place alongside the pre-existing Arab/Non-Arab ethnic conflict described by the Authority in *Refugee Appeal No 75655* at paragraphs [79]-[81] in which the Sudanese armed forces, acting as an instrument of *state* policy, continues to be implicated in acts which amount to

breaches of international humanitarian and human rights law - see, for example, Human Rights Watch Press Release *Sudan: New Clashed jeopardize civilians - Escalating Violence Highlights Need for Civilian Protection* (10 October 2007)."

[53] Current conditions in Sudan have not changed. The Authority has also had particular regard to the following more recent reports:

- (a) the *UN Human Rights Council* report "Human Rights Situations That Require The Council's Attention – Final Report on the Situation of Human Rights in Darfur..." A/HRC/6/19, 28 November 2007;
- (b) "Lives We Throw Away: Darfuri Survivors Tortured in Khartoum Following Removal From the UK", *Aegis Trust* report, October 2007;
- (c) "Darfur's New Security Reality", *International Crisis Group*, 26 November 2007; and
- (d) "Displaced in Darfur", *Amnesty International*, January 2008

[54] The picture remains bleak. Amnesty International record that more than 90,000 people are believed to have been killed in Darfur since 2003, with a further 200,000 having died from conflict-related causes. Over 2 million have been forced from their homes. The main target of government and militia hostility continues to be the African Fur, al-Mesalit, and Zaghawa tribes.

[55] The appellant's claim must be measured against this country information.

Objectively, on the facts as found, is there a real chance of the appellant being persecuted if returned to Sudan?

[56] Persecution is defined in refugee law as the sustained or systemic violation of basic or core human rights such as to be demonstrative of a failure of state protection. See J C Hathaway, *The Law of Refugee Status* (Butterworths, Ontario, 1991) pp104-108, as adopted in *Refugee Appeal No 2039/93* (12 February 1996) at p15.

[57] It will be recalled that the appellant anticipates a risk of being persecuted in Sudan on two grounds. First, he fears that, as a person of mixed Reizegat/al-Mesalit ethnicity, but with strongly African (rather than Arab) features, he will be at risk of physical harm at the hands of the *janjaweed* militia and government forces. Second, he says that, though he is of conscriptable age, he is opposed to serving

in the Sudanese Army because it is responsible for grave human rights abuses against the people of Darfur, predominantly those of African heritage and particularly those, like him, of al-Mesalit descent.

[58] The Authority is satisfied that there is a real chance of the appellant being persecuted if he returns to Sudan. In reaching that conclusion, the following factors are taken into account.

[59] First, regard must be had to the growing number of reports that document the risk faced by Darfurians who have been overseas, on being returned to Khartoum airport. As was noted in *Refugee Appeal No 75655* (29 September 2006):

“Internal flight and risk for returning Sudanese nationals

[96] In the UNHCR's assessment, the threats from the authorities and non-state agents are so widespread that:

‘... it cannot be said that there is an internal flight alternative anywhere in Sudan for asylum-seekers from Darfur, including for those who resided in Khartoum before the Darfur crisis. Sudanese of non-Arab Darfurian background returning to Sudan face a heightened risk of scrutiny by the security apparatus.’ (emphasis added)

[97] The UNHCR paper also addresses, specifically, the risks for Sudanese nationals who are forced to return to Sudan:

‘Forced returns to Sudan entail risks for certain categories of Sudanese, regardless of their place of origin, including Darfurians. These categories include young men of fighting age who are regularly singled out for detention and interrogation. These arrests are often pursuant to an administrative decree dated 28 February 1993 which authorises border authorities to arrest returning Sudanese who left after the June 1989 coup and who have stayed away for more than a year. Such individuals can be subject to investigations and necessary security measures. Currently, the decree is applied selectively, depending on the profile of the individual returning. Young men of a fighting age are particularly susceptible to be targeted.’ (emphasis added)

[60] To this must be added the October 2007 *Aegis Trust* report “Lives We Throw Away: Darfuri Survivors Tortured in Khartoum Following Removal From the UK”, a series of interviews with six Darfurians returned to Sudan between 2002 and 2005, following failed refugee applications. They give accounts of detention at the airport, interrogation, beatings and torture, including suspension by the wrists from a revolving fan, whipping with cables, being forced to watch executions, hanging upside down for many hours, cigarette burns and gassing. One was made to sign a document denying that he was a Sudanese national, whereupon he was ‘deported’ back to the United Kingdom.

[61] The particular characteristics of the appellant are such that he stands a real chance of being detained at the airport if he is returned to Sudan. He has been in

a 'western' country for nearly two years, has no Sudanese travel documents, is of Darfurian origin and African appearance, is single and is a "young man of fighting age". He is, as UNHCR says, particularly susceptible to being stopped at the airport. Once detained, he is at risk of serious physical mistreatment of the kind described by UNHCR and the *Aegis Trust*. It would amount to being persecuted.

[62] Second, even if he negotiated the airport, if the appellant were to return to Darfur now, he would do so as an already-displaced person. With the death of his father, the flight of his mother and brothers and the destruction of the family home, the appellant's prospects of being able to successfully resettle in his village are remote. Even if he did, the likelihood is that there will be future incursions into the village by the *janjaweed*. It is likely that, as a Darfurian of African appearance, he will be compelled to join the massive numbers of internally-displaced people living in makeshift camps, suffering ongoing attacks by the government forces and *janjaweed* and with a complete absence of state protection.

[63] The effect of forcing Darfurians into such marginalised conditions of itself constitutes 'being persecuted' for the purposes of the Refugee Convention. Such persons suffer numerous human rights violations, including (but by no means exhaustively) arbitrary interference with their privacy, security of the person, family unity, health, physical safety and ability to work and/or provide for themselves. See the relevant provisions of the 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the 1967 International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

[64] Even if the appellant were somehow to avoid such deprivations, the heightened vulnerability which attaches to being displaced, coupled with the appellant's mixed tribal ethnicity, his African appearance and the fact that he is a young, single man combine to create a real chance that he would suffer serious physical harm at the hands of either government forces or the *janjaweed*.

[65] It is not overlooked that the appellant has located his mother and brothers, apparently living with his uncle in Khartoum and the question arises whether the appellant could safely join them there. The short answer is that there is too little information for the Authority to determine this. The appellant has not had direct contact with his family and cannot say whether they are able to stay with his uncle indefinitely, or whether they are experiencing harassment or discrimination in Khartoum. In any event, the issue is addressed by the question of whether the

appellant would, in fact, be able to effect a return through the airport in safety, which has already been considered.

[66] Given the finding that there is a real chance of the appellant being persecuted, it is not necessary for the Authority to address the 'military conscription' question, save to note briefly the analysis at [86]-[95] of *Refugee Appeal No 75968* (19 February 2007), and to record that, if it *were* necessary, it would likely find that the appellant's objection to military service would meet the proposition set out in paragraph [85](iii)(a) and (b) thereof.

Convention reason

[67] The predominant reason for the harm feared by the appellant is his race.

CONCLUSION

[68] For the foregoing reasons, the appellant is a refugee within the meaning of Article 1A(2) of the Convention. Refugee status is granted. The appeal is allowed.

"C M Treadwell"

C M Treadwell
Member