



UNITED NATIONS
SECURITY
COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

S/6710/Add.9
15 November 1965

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

REPORT BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE OBSERVANCE OF THE CEASE-FIRE
UNDER SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 211 OF 20 SEPTEMBER 1965

Addendum

1. Information relating to the observance of the cease-fire which has been received from United Nations Observers since 5 November 1965, the date of the last report on the subject (S/6710/Add.8), is presented in this report.

General

2. In my report of 30 October (S/6710/Add.6), I indicated that the Chief Officer of UNIPOM had informed me, on 26 October, that in response to his approaches, both sides had agreed to ban test firing within 10,000 yards of the front lines. This agreement was limited to the firing of tank, anti-tank and artillery pieces. In a later message, dated 8 November, the Chief Officer of UNIPOM reported that both sides had now agreed that there would be no firing of smaller weapons, including rifles and machine-guns, or of any explosive device within 10,000 yards of the front lines without prior notification to the United Nations Observers in the area.

3. Recent incidents such as that of 8 November in the Chananwala-Muthianwala area (see para. 57 below) illustrate the dangers of unrestricted use of observation aircraft. The Chief Officer of UNIPOM has been seeking agreement from both sides to limit air activity. While some progress has been achieved in his discussions with both sides, no final agreement has yet been reached.

Domel-Tangdhar sector

4. Observers visiting the Lipa Valley area reported that Indian troops had fired with small arms at Bijildhar village, which is located on the Pakistan side of the cease-fire line and four and a half miles south south-east of Tangdhar, and at a Pakistan position located five miles south of Tangdhar, at 1230 hours on 21 October, and that they had shelled with mortars two other Pakistan positions located seven miles south south-east of Tangdhar between 1230 and 1530 hours on 29 October. The Observers also noted that Pakistan troops had fired with mortars

at Indian positions located four miles south of Tangdhar shortly after Indian troops had opened fire on Jijildhar.

5. Observers stationed in the Tithwal area reported that Indian troops had fired at and shelled three Pakistan positions located four and a half miles south south-west of Jura between 1950 and 2150 hours on 28 October and between 1850 and 1855 hours on 29 October.

6. The Indian local command at Tangdhar complained on several occasions between 28 October and 2 November that Pakistan troops had constructed a number of bunkers in the vicinity of Tangdhar, respectively five miles south south-east, six miles south, nine and a half miles south-east, ten miles south-west, seven miles south-west, five miles south south-west of this village. This allegation was confirmed by the Observers in the area.

Domel-Uri

7. The Indian local command complained on several occasions between 27 October and 4 November that Pakistan troops had constructed bunkers nine miles south-west of Uri. This was confirmed by Observers.

8. A complaint submitted by the Indian local command at Uri on 30 October alleged that Pakistan troops had constructed some bunkers eight and a half miles west of Uri. This complaint was also confirmed by Observers in the area.

Rawalakot-Punch sector

9. A complaint received from the Pakistan local command at Rawalakot alleged that Indian troops had shelled a Pakistan position located three and a half miles north-west of Balnoi between 2120 and 2255 hours on 27 October with three-inch mortars and field artillery. This complaint was confirmed by Observers in the area.

10. The Indian local command at Punch complained on 5 November that Pakistan field artillery had shelled an area located seven and a half miles west south-west of Punch between 1030 and 1500 hours on 5 November. This complaint was confirmed by Observers stationed in the area, who reported that two Indian soldiers had been wounded as a result of the Pakistan shelling.

11. A further complaint submitted by the Indian local command at Funch on 4 November alleged that Pakistan artillery had shelled three Indian positions located three, six and seven miles, respectively, south-west of Funch during the night of 2-3 November and another Indian position located five miles south-west of Funch between 1105 and 1250 hours on 3 November. This was confirmed by Observers.

Kotli-Galuthi sector

12. The Pakistan local command at Kotli complained on 23 October that Indian troops had shelled Pakistan positions located south and west of Balnoi between 1945 hours on 22 October and 0640 hours on 23 October with field artillery and mortars. The Observers stationed in the forward areas confirmed this complaint, but reported that Pakistan artillery had also fired during the same time and that it was not possible to determine which side had started the firing.

13. Another complaint submitted by the Pakistan local command alleged that Indian troops had fired at and shelled Pakistan positions located south and west of Balnoi between 0740 hours and 1700 hours on 25 October with recoilless rifle, machine-guns, mortars and field artillery. The Observers stationed in the area heard recoilless rifle and machine-gun fire from Indian positions, but indicated that Pakistan troops had also fired and that it was not possible to determine which side had started the firing.

14. The Pakistan local command at Kotli complained on 26 October that Indian troops had fired at and shelled Pakistan positions located west and south of Balnoi between 1900 hours on 25 October and 0400 hours on 26 October with machine-gun and field artillery. Observers who were present in the area reported that Indian artillery had shelled a Pakistan position three and one half miles south south-east of Balnoi between 2000 hours on 25 October and 0400 hours on 26 October.

15. An account of the Indian attack during the night of 2-3 November on Pakistan positions located approximately three miles south-east of Balnoi and extending from one to two miles on the Indian side of the CFL is set forth in the last report on the observance of the cease-fire (see S/6710/Add.8, para. 20).

Investigation of that incident revealed that Indian troops had used three infantry battalions plus one in reserve, supported by field and medium artillery as well as mortars, for that attack. Indian troops had reportedly occupied the Pakistan positions located on the Indian side of the CFL by 0600 hours on 3 November. Indian troops reported that they had suffered 125 dead and 275 wounded. The Pakistan casualties were not known.

Kotli-Naushera sector

16. A complaint received from the Pakistan local command at Kotli alleged that Indian troops had shelled three Pakistan positions located six and a half miles south south-east of Khuiratta between 1600 and 1715 hours on 21 October with field artillery and heavy mortars. The Observers stationed in the forward areas confirmed this allegation.

17. A complaint received from the Pakistan local command at Kotli alleged that Indian artillery had shelled an area near the Mirpur-Janghar road approximately five and a half miles south-west of Janghar at 0900 hours on 26 October. Observers in the area confirmed this allegation, but also stated that Pakistan medium artillery had shelled an Indian position two miles south-west of Mandhar during the same time.

18. On 27 October, the Pakistan local command at Kotli complained that Indian troops, supported by artillery, mortar and machine-gun fire, had crossed the CFL and attacked two Pakistan positions located one mile and half a mile, respectively, on the Pakistan side of the CFL and eight miles and eleven miles, respectively, north-east of Khuiratta between 2100 and 2300 hours on 26 October. The Observers investigating the complaint confirmed the attack on the Pakistan position located eight miles north-east of Khuiratta.

19. The Pakistan local command at Kotli complained on 5 November that Indian troops had shelled a Pakistan position located six miles south south-east of Khuiratta between 0600 and 0700 hours on 5 November. The Observers stationed in the forward area confirmed the allegation.

20. The Indian local command at Naushera complained on 7 November that Pakistan troops had shelled with field artillery the area controlled by Indian forces in

the Janghar sector at 1045 hours on 7 November and had intruded into the same area. The Pakistan local command at Kotli complained on the same day that Indian troops had shelled two Pakistan positions located six miles south south-east of Khuiratta between 0950 and 1035 hours and between 1230 and 1345 hours on 7 November with field artillery and two other Pakistan positions located approximately seven miles south south-east of Khuiratta between 1035 and 1110 hours on the same day with medium guns. Observers stationed in the forward areas on both sides confirmed the shelling of Pakistan positions and also reported that Pakistan artillery had returned the fire. Both sides agreed to stop the firing after intervention by the Observers.

21. On 11 November, the Indian local command at Naushera complained that Pakistan troops had fired two 100 mm ground missiles toward the area of GR SQ 155 at 1745 hours on 10 November. This firing was reported by Observers in the forward areas at 1755 hours on 10 November. The Observers saw an exploded missile immediately after the firing.

Bhimber-Akhnur sector

22. The Indian local command at Akhnur complained on 29 October that Pakistan troops had fired at an Indian position located eleven miles north-east of Chhamb between 2115 and 2130 hours on 25 October with 81 mm mortars. This complaint was confirmed by Observers in the area.

Sialkot-Jammu sector

23. A complaint from the Indian local command at Jammu alleged that Pakistan troops had started patrolling forward of their positions in the area of Alhar railway station on 25 October. The Observers who were present in the area reported that Pakistan troops had moved forward of their positions and patrolled about in a provocative manner.

Pasrur-Khasa sector

24. An Indian patrol confronted a Pakistan patrol on 2 November at Ballahr (GR 117183) on the international border. Both sides refused to withdraw and dug

in at the village. An investigation by Observers in the area disclosed that neither army had been in occupation of the village at the time of the cease-fire and that both sides had patrolled freely in the area. The Pakistan local commander indicated that his troops would withdraw to the Pakistan side of the border if Indian troops would withdraw behind the river line west of Chhajwal (GR 170200) and cease their patrolling. The Indian local commander refused to accept this proposal as he claimed it was his right to patrol up to the border. Both sides agreed to maintain the status quo while Observers were attempting to find an equitable solution to this problem.

25. Both Indian and Pakistan troops moved forward of their lines and dug new trenches about fifty yards in the area of GR 832089 (north-west of Alhar) on 7 November. The Indians alleged that Pakistan troops had moved forward first and this was admitted by the Pakistan side. The Observers in the area succeeded in getting both sides to move back to their original positions.

26. Investigations carried out by Observers with regard to the Indian complaints contained in document S/6826, paras. 18 and 19, in S/6827, paras. 12 and 13, and in S/6867, para. 33, revealed that the alleged activities had taken place in or behind the known Pakistan forward defended localities (FDLs).

27. Regarding the Indian complaints contained in document S/6852, para. 25, in S/6862, para. 16, in S/6867, para. 34, the Observers reported that they could not find concrete evidence supporting the allegations.

Lahore-Khasa-Narla sector

28. With regard to the firing incident of 5 November in the Siphon area (S/6710/Add.8, para. 25), the Observers in the area reported that firing had begun as a result of an attempt by Indian troops to bulldoze channels in order to alleviate flooding of their forward positions by Pakistan forces. The Observers also reported that Indian troops had subsequently begun to flood the Pakistan-held area in the Bambansala-Ravi-Bedian canal and Kohail distributary region (GR 7499).

29. Observers reported on 8 November that they had succeeded in widening the area separating Indian and Pakistan troops in the Bhasin sector (GR 7316). Both sides agreed to abandon some trenches and bunkers in the forward area which were filled or dismantled under the Observers' supervision. The distance between the respective front lines was thus widened to approximately 100 yards. The Observers considered that this separation, although minor, would help in reducing tension in this sensitive sector.
30. A delayed report received from Observers in the Jahman area on 9 November indicated that Pakistan troops had fired with light and medium machine-guns on an Indian observation aircraft flying over Jahman (GR 7882) behind the Indian forward lines at 1040 hours on 5 November. The Observers who were at Jahman at the time verified that the aircraft was over Indian territory and that the Pakistan fire came from positions west of Jahman at GR 764832, 767832 and 763037.
31. The Indian local command complained that Pakistan troops had fired on Indian positions in the Bhaini bridge area (GR 713158) on 9 November. The Observer investigating this complaint could not confirm it as they considered the available evidence inconclusive.
32. The Indian complaints set forth in document S/6805, paras. 15, 16, 22 and 23, in S/6808, paras. 20 and 21, in S/6812, paras. 12-16, in S/6813, paras. 16-22, in S/6819, paras. 15-18, in S/6826, paras. 14, 21-23 and 25, in S/6827, paras. 14, 15, 19-21 and 23, in S/6832, paras. 30-34 and 38-43, in S/6840, paras. 13-15, 17 and 18, in S/6841, paras. 18 and 20-23, in S/6842, para. 13, in S/6848, paras. 14 and 15, in S/6862, paras. 18, 19 and 21, in S/6867, paras. 29, 30, 36-40, in S/6874, para. 14, in S/6875, paras. 17-20 and the Pakistan complaints in document S/6811, para. (i), and in S/6815, para. (iv), were investigated by Observers in the area concerned. They reported that the alleged activities had taken place in or behind the forward defended localities (FDLs) of the respective sides. They noted that there was a constant dispute in the area as to the location of the FDLs. Both sides had been slowly moving forward of their lines and any activity which took place in rear of the new FDLs was considered by the other side as a violation of the cease-fire. The Observers were attempting to solve this problem, but had so far met with no success.
33. Regarding the Pakistan complaint contained in document S/6849, para. 1, the Observers reported that there had been some forward movement in the area by both sides. It had not been possible to determine which side had moved first.

34. Regarding the Indian complaints set forth in document S/6764, paras. (ix)-(xiii), in S/6768, paras. xvii to xxvii, in S/6773, paras. vii and xi, in S/6780, paras. 5 and 7, in S/6805 paras. 19, 25 and 26, in S/6812, para. 17, in S/6813, para. 23, in S/6819, para. 23, in S/6826, para. 24, in S/6827, para. 24, in S/6840, paras. 16, 19 and 21, in S/6841, paras. 17 and 19, in S/6842, para. 11, in S/6848, paras. 16, 17 and 19, in S/6862, para. 20, in S/6867, para. 41, in S/6874, para. 13, in S/6884, paras. 18, 22 and 25 and the Pakistan complaints in document S/6800, para. 5, in S/6815, para. (iii), and in S/6849, paras. 2, 4, 7, 8, 29 and 30, the Observers reported that they could not find concrete evidence supporting the allegations. They pointed out in this connexion that many of those allegations had been received several days after the alleged events, which made their investigation extremely difficult.

35. Regarding the Indian complaints contained in document S/6773, para. (x), in S/6781, para. (xv), in S/6794, paras. (x) and (xi), in S/6808, para. 23, in S/6832, para. 26, in S/6840, para. 20, in S/6842, para. 14, in S/6848, para. 20, and in S/6874, para. 12, the Observers reported that both sides had fired in the alleged incidents and that it had not been possible to determine which side had started the firing.

36. Regarding the Indian complaint contained in document S/6805, para. 21, the Observers reported they were in the area at the time of the incident and that the shots appeared to have been directed at them. This matter had been brought to the attention of the Pakistan commander responsible for the Lahore sector.

37. Regarding the Indian complaint set forth in document S/6842, para. 12, the Observers, who were in the area at the time of the alleged incident, stated that the Pakistan aircraft did not fly forward of the Pakistan FDLs. They further reported that Indian troops at Dograi fired on the aircraft when it was still over Pakistan territory.

38. With regard to the Indian complaint in document S/6867, para. 35, the Observers reported that Pakistan troops, while admitting that they had fired, claimed that Indian troops had also fired, which was denied by the Indian side.

39. The Indian complaint in document S/6884, para. 26, refers to the incident of 3 November in the Siphon area (S/6710/Add.8, para. 25).

40. The Pakistan complaint in document S/6753, para. (ii), was confirmed by Observers (see S/6710/Add.3, para. 24).

41. The Indian complaint in document S/6788, para. 9, was also confirmed by Observers.

Rukhanwala-Narla-Popa Rai-Ferozepore sector

42. The Indian complaint regarding Pakistan intrusion in the Gajjal area (S/6710/Add.S, para. 29) was investigated by Observers in the area. The Observers reported that the shooting started on 31 October when an Indian patrol proceeding along a track from Gajjal to Jhuggian Nur Muhammad (GR 9755) to visit a police post there clashed with a Pakistan observation post set up near the track and that both sides had fired small arms, light mortars and grenades. The Observers could not determine which side was to blame for the incident. They reported that a tentative agreement had been reached by both sides whereby Pakistan troops would continue to man their observation post while Indian troops would continue to use the track.

43. A Pakistan complaint alleged that Indian troops had moved approximately two platoons into the area of GR 956565 at 1000 hours on 6 November. This position is located near the Gajjal-Bhukkiwala track which leads to the Indian police post mentioned in the preceding paragraph. The Indian side claimed that Pakistan troops had fired in this area prior to 1500 hours, on 6 November. The Observers investigating the above allegation concluded that both sides were responsible for the firing on the Gajjal-Bhukkiwala track. They observed that each side had positioned troops in the area well forward of their lines. These troops had since been withdrawn.

44. A further Pakistan complaint alleged that Indian troops had fired on Pakistan positions from the area of GR 7875, 7974 and 7973 (west of Rajoke) at 0730 hours on 8 November with small arms and mortars. After investigating this incident, Observers reported on 9 November that both sides had fired small arms in the area along the Indian salient north of Chathanwala (GR 7774) and west of Rajoke (GR 7875, 7974 and 7973). The Observers were unable to determine which side had started the firing.

45. A report received from Observers on 9 November indicated that Pakistan troops had fired on an Indian light aircraft in the Kalia-Sankhatpa area (GR 8066) at 1120 hours on 7 November. The Pakistan local commander admitted the firing, but

claimed that the aircraft was over Pakistan territory at the time. The Observers could not ascertain whether this assertion was correct.

46. An exchange of small arms fire took place between India and Pakistan troops in the area of GR 837438, north-east of Sanda Wizam, from 1945 hours to 2300 hours on 10 November. The Observers in the area could not determine which side had fired first.

47. On 10 November, complaints were received from the Pakistan local command to the effect that Indian troops attempted to dig new trenches in the area of GR 790702 west of Thatti Jainal Singh and that Pakistan Observation aircraft flying over Pakistan territory had been fired at by Indian troops from the area of GR 844591, north-east of Khem Karan. Those complaints are being investigated by Observers.

48. Investigations carried out by Observers with regard to the Indian complaints set forth in document S/6805, para. 20, in S/6819, paras. 20 and 21, in S/6826, paras. 15-17 and 20, in S/6827, paras. 17 and 27, in S/6832, para. 29, in S/6840, para. 22, in S/6874, para. 15, in S/6875, paras. 21 and 23-25, and in S/6884, para. 27, revealed that the alleged activities had taken place on or behind the Pakistan forward lines.

49. Regarding the Indian complaints set forth in document S/6805, paras. 18 and 24, in S/6827, paras. 18 and 22, in S/6832, paras. 35, 36 and 44, in S/6862, para. 23, and in S/6884, para. 28, and the Pakistan complaints in S/6800, paras. 6-8, in S/6815, paras. (v) and (vi), in S/6849, para. 28, and in S/6870, paras. 1 and 3, the Observers reported that they could find no concrete evidence supporting the allegations.

50. With regard to the Indian complaints contained in document S/6819, para. 24, in S/6827, para. 26, in S/6841, para. 31, in S/6842, para. 15, in S/6867, para. 42, in S/6874, para. 16, in S/6875, paras. 22, 26 and 27, and in S/6884, paras. 20-24, and the Pakistan complaints in S/6815, paras. (i) and (ii), and in S/6849, paras. 20, 21, 24 and 26, the Observers reported that both sides had fired in the alleged incidents and that it was not possible to determine which side had started the firing.

51. The Pakistan complaint set forth in document S/6849, para. 12, was confirmed by Observers. The Observers found a new Indian trench which had not been in existence when they last visited the area on 6 October. Their attempts to have Indian troops withdraw from this new position were not successful.

52. The Indian complaint in document S/6862, para. 22, was also confirmed by Observers.
53. Investigation on the Indian complaint in document S/6875, para. 29, revealed that Indian soldiers had been fired on by Pakistan troops while patrolling forward of their front line.
54. During the investigation on the Pakistan complaint in document S/6870, para. 4, the Indian side admitted to the Observers that they had fired one round of rifle fire. They indicated, however, that it was an accidental shot and the Observers found no evidence that the round was directed at Pakistan positions.

Sulaimanke-Fazilka sector

55. Observers reported that both sides had fired with small arms and mortars in the area of Chananwala-Muthianwala (GR 2457-2458 and 2557-2558) between 2115 and 2300 hours on 5 November. This incident was being investigated by them.
56. Small arms firing was heard by Observers in the Qabal Shah area (GR 2661) at 0950 hours on 6 November. In this connexion, the Pakistan side alleged that Indian troops had fired on their screen positions and the Indian side complained that Pakistan troops had occupied new positions forward of their lines. The Observers reported that the Pakistan new positions were well forward of their previous forward positions. When the Pakistan company commander moved forward to inspect the new positions, Indian troops opened fire and Pakistan troops retaliated. The Observers were attempting to get Pakistan troops to move back to their original positions.
57. Indian troops fired on a Pakistan observation aircraft from the area of Chananwala-Muthianwala (GR 2557) at 1520 hours on 8 November. The Observers who saw the firing reported that the Pakistan aircraft was flying over Indian positions near Qabal Shah (GR 2661) at the time. When Indian troops fired at the plane, Pakistan troops retaliated by firing at Indian ground positions.
58. At 1125 hours on 9 November, an exchange of fire took place between Indian and Pakistan troops in the Alam Shah area (GR 2765). The Observers in the area

reported that the firing was started by Pakistan troops. The Pakistan troops stated that they had fired on Indian forces because those forces were extending their positions in the area. The Observers finding was that the Indian troops were not extending their positions forward, but were improving the positions they had previously occupied.

59. Mortar firing was reported in the Muthianwala area at 1350 hours on 10 November. The Observers in the area could not determine which side was responsible for this firing incident.

60. Investigations carried out by Observers with regard to the Indian complaints set forth in document S/6852, paras. 45 and 52, in S/6841, para. 52, in S/6862, paras. 24, 25 and 27 and in S/6867, paras. 45 and 48, and the Pakistan complaint in S/6870, para. 15, revealed that the alleged activities had taken place on or behind the forward lines of the respective sides.

61. Regarding the Indian complaints contained in document S/6775, para. (xiv), in S/6781, para. (xviii), in S/6788, para. 12, in S/6805, paras. 27 and 31, in S/6808, para. 27, in S/6812, para. 18, in S/6819, para. 25, in S/6825, para. 27, in S/6832, paras. 46 and 49-51, in S/6862, paras. 26 and 30, in S/6867, paras. 44, 47 and 49, and the Pakistan complaints in S/6784, paras. (i) and (ii), in S/6849, paras. 14, 19 and 22, and in S/6870, paras. 7, 11 and 16, the Observers reported that they could find no concrete evidence supporting the allegations.

62. As regards the Indian complaints contained in document S/6752, para. (c), S/6764, para. (xvii), in S/6768, paras. (xxviii)-(xxx), in S/6772, para. (xiv), in S/6781, paras. (xvii) and (xix), in S/6788, para. 10, in S/6794, para. (xii), in S/6808, para. 26, in S/6826, para. 26, in S/6827, para. 28, in S/6832, paras. 48 and 53, in S/6862, paras. 28 and 29, and in S/6875, para. 30, and the Pakistan complaints in S/6760, para. (i), in S/6771, paras. (i) and (ii), in S/6849, paras. 3, 5, 11 and 25 and in S/6870, paras. 8-10, the Observers indicated that both sides had fired in the alleged incidents and that it was not possible to determine which side had started the firing.

63. Investigation on the Indian complaint in document S/6841, para. 33, disclosed that the first incident, six and a half miles south-west of Fazilka, took place when Indian troops fired on Pakistan soldiers who they thought were constructing

new trenches and that the Pakistan soldiers returned the fire. The Observers reached no conclusive findings regarding the second incident in which they indicated both sides had fired.

Rahim Yar Khan-Jaisalmar sector

64. The Pakistan complaint regarding Indian attacks on Malesar and Raichand (S/6710/Add.4, para. 66) was investigated by Observers in the area. The investigation established that the two villages, which had been in Pakistan possession on 4 October, were in the hands of Indian troops on 8 October. The Indian local commander stated that he had taken those villages by force in retaliation for Pakistan shelling. The Observers found no evidence supporting the contention of Pakistan shelling.

65. An Indian complaint alleged that a Pakistan platoon had attacked Ranoo (GR IM 1806) at 2515 hours on 5 November and that the attack continued until 0250 hours the next day. This was confirmed by the Observers in the area.

66. A report received from Observers in the area on 8 November indicated that the Pakistan side was concentrating troops in Achchri Toba (GR IM 0525) while Indian troops were being reinforced at the village of Tanot (GR IM 0725).

67. On 8 November, at 1555 hours, Observers saw Pakistan observation aircraft flying over Indian territory in the Asu Tar area (GR IQ 85).

68. Observers also reported that Pakistan aircraft overflew Indian-held territory at Jathir Tibba (GR IQ 7659) at 1315 hours on 8 November. This is an area that was retaken by Indian troops during their attack on Ghotaru (GR IQ 76) on 13-15 October (see S/6710/Add.5, para. 32).

69. With regard to the Indian complaints in document S/6827, para. 50, in S/6832, paras. 54, 55, 57 and 58, in S/6842, para. 15, in S/6848, paras. 25 and 26, in S/6875, para. 52 and in S/6884, para. 29, and the Pakistani complaints in S/6870, paras. 2, 14 and 20, the Observers reported that they could find no concrete evidence supporting the allegations made.

70. Investigation on the Indian complaint in S/6862, para. 31, revealed that there was a Pakistan patrol consisting of two vehicles in the area, but no large numbers of Pakistan troops as stated in the complaint.

71. The Pakistan complaints contained in document S/6760, para. (ii), in S/6766, in S/6784, para. (iii), in S/6795, paras. (viii) and (ix), and in S/6811, paras. (iii), (v) and (vi), refer to the events in the Desert area already reported to the Security Council (S/6710/Add.4), paras. 56-68, S/6710/Add.5, para. 52, and para. 64 above).

Mokhropar-Gadra sector

72. A Pakistan complaint alleged that Indian troops had occupied new positions in a salient west of Kelnor (CR QB 3625 and QB 4023) on 5 November. Observers found no evidence supporting this complaint.

73. Observers in the sector reported that at 0640 hours on 12 November, Pakistan troops had attacked an Indian position south-east of Roheri (CR QA 3985). The Observers, who flew over the Roheri area aboard a United Nations Otter aircraft on that day, saw the shelling which took place in the area. They also observed the presence of Pakistan light aircraft and Pakistan tanks in the area on the morning of 12 November. At 1502 hours, the Observers reported that Indian troops had withdrawn from their position, which was then occupied by Pakistan forces. In this connexion, the Observers recalled that during one of their earlier visits to the Roheri area, on 5 November, the Pakistan side had claimed that Indian troops had occupied the position after 27 October.

74. Investigation of the Pakistan complaints in document S/6800, para. 12, revealed that both sides had carried out considerable redeployment within their own positions since the events of 15 October.

75. With regard to the Pakistan complaints in document S/6800, para. 11, in S/6811, para. (iv) and in S/6849, para. 53, the Observers reported that the alleged activities had taken place on or behind the known Indian front lines.

76. Regarding the Indian complaint contained in document S/6781, para. (ix), the Observers reported that both sides had fired and that it was not possible to determine which side had started the firing.

77. Investigation of the Indian complaints in document S/6819, paras. 27 and 28, in S/6827, para. 31, in S/6862, paras. 32 and 33, and in S/6875, para. 31, and the Pakistan complaint in S/6789, paras. (i) and (ii), in S/6849, paras. 32 and 36, and in S/6870, paras. 17-19, yielded no concrete evidence supporting them.

78. Regarding the Pakistan complaint in document S/6870, para. 6, the Observers who visited the area on 25 October reported that the village of Dipla had been completely destroyed except for two family residences. But the findings of the investigation were inconclusive as regard determining the responsibility for the destruction of the village.
