



Distr. GENERAL

S/6710/Add.14 30 December 1965

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

/ . . .

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE CESERVANCE 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 24 December 1965, the date of the last report on the subject (5/6710/Add.15), is presented in this report.

### General

2. At a meeting in New Delhi on 15 December 1965, the Chief of Army Staff, Indian Army, informed the Chief Military Observer of UNMOGIP and the Chief Officer of UNIPCM of his intention to order a unilateral cessation of firing by all formations, effective 26 December at 1700 hours, unless actually under attack.

3. On 22 December, the Chief of General Staff, Pakistan, agreed to take similar action. This was confirmed by a letter dated 24 December addressed to the Chief Officer of UNIPCM. In this letter, the Chief of General Staff stated that Pakistan had had no intention in the past of disturbing the cease-fire except in self-defence and that, in view of the decision taken by the Indian Chief of Army Staff, he would issue fresh orders to his troops in order to re-emphasize his stand.

4. On the morning of 27 December, the Chief Officer of UNIPCM sent messages to the Indian Chief of Army Staff and the Pakistan Chief of General Staff, respectively, to take note of the commitments made by both sides and to express confidence that the concurrent action taken by them would help to ensure observance of the cease-fire in the entire area of conflict, in keeping with the demand set forth in the Security Council resolutions of 20 September and 5 November 1965.

5. However, reports received from Observers in the UNIPCM area of operation indicated that as of 27 December, Indian formations had not received the no-firing order.

65-34594

6. As indicated in paragraph 20 below, a firing incident took place in the Kotli-Naushera sector on the morning of 27 December, the responsibility for which was attributed by Observers in the area to the Indian side. In connexion with this breach of cease-fire, which took place after 1700 hours on 26 December, the Acting Chief Military Observer of UNMOGIP addressed a message to the Indian Vice-Chief of Army Staff, expressing regret at this contravention of the newly reached agreement and requesting assurance that other such incidents would not be tolerated by the Indian Command.

7. On 29 December, the Indian Vice-Chief of Army Staff stated that since the Pakistan Chief of General Staff had confirmed his agreement to issue no-firing orders, he agreed to take similar action and would confirm it in writing on the return of the CCAS, who was out on tour.

8. On 29 December, Observers on the Indian side reported that no-firing orders had been received by the respective formations.

#### Skardu-Kargil and Domel-Tangdhar Sectors

9. No incidents relating to these sectors were reported during the period under review.

10. With regard to complaints which had been submitted to the Secretary-General at Headquarters by the Permanent Representatives of India and Fakistan, Observers reported the following:

(a) The Indian complaints in S/6927, paragraph 4, in S/6945, paragraph 4 (construction of bunkers), in S/6952, paragraph 1, in S/6973, paragraph 2 (second part), and in S/6977, paragraph 16, were not considered as violations of the cease-fire.

(b) Regarding the Fakistan complaint in S/6894. paragraph 89, and the Indian complaints in S/6925, paragraphs 1 and 2, in S,6926, paragraphs 2 and 3, and in S/6945, paragraphs 2 and 4,(machine-gun fire), investigation was inconclusive for lack of evidence.

(c) The Indian complaint in S/6968, paragraph 2, refers to an incident already reported by the Observers (see S/6710/Add.12, para. 3).

/...

1...

### Rawalakot-Uri sector

11. The Indian local command at Uri complained that Pakistan troops had fired at an Indian position located in the Bedori bulge, 10 miles north-north-vest of Funch, with 3-inch mortars and rifles at 1400 hours and again at 1510 hours on 12 December. The Pakistan local command at Rawalakot complained that Indian troops had fired at a Pakistan position in the same area with 3-inch mortars and medium machine-guns between 1800 and 2000 hours on the same day. The Observers in the area confirmed both complaints, but they indicated that the Indian troops had fired in retallation of the firing initiated by Pakistan forces. 12. With regard to complaints relating to this sector which had been submitted to the Secretary-General at Headquarters by the Permanent Representatives of India and Pakistan, Observers reported the following:

(a) The Indian complaints in S/6927, paragraph 5, in S/6939, paragraph 1, in S/6945, paragraphs 6 and 7, in S/6952, paragraph 2, and in S/6977, paragraphs 1 and 2, were not considered as violations of the cease-fire.

(b) The Indian complaints in S/6925, paragraph 3, and in S/6968, paragraph 15, refer to cases already reported by the Observers (see S/6710/Add.10, para. 2, and S/6710/Add.12, para. 9).

(c) The Pakistan complaint in S/6894, paragraph 123, also refers to a case already reported by the Observers (see S/6710/Add.12, para.  $1^{h}$  (B)).

(d) Regarding the Pakistan complaints in S/6894, paragraphs 2, 3, 6, 83, 84, 86, 87, 119-122, 125-127 and 129, investigation was inconclusive for lack of evidence.

## Rawalakot-Punch sector

13. The Fakistan local command at Rawalakot complained that Indian troops had shelled with 3-inch mortars a Fakistan position located 2 miles north-west of Balnoi between C9CC and L0CC hours on 19 December. This complaint was confirmed by Observers.

14. The Observers in the forward areas reported that Pakistan troops had fired towards an Indian picket located 4 miles west-north-west of Punch at 0930 hours on 20 December.

15. With regard to complaints relating to this sector which had been submitted to the Secretary-General at Headquarters by the Permanent Representatives of India and Pakistan, Observers reported the following:

(a) The Indian complaint in 5/6968, paragraph 5, was not considered as a violation of the cease-fire.

(b) Regarding the Pakistan complaint in  $S_{0}/6894$ , paragraph 135, and the Indian complaints in  $S_{0}/6925$ , paragraph 13, in  $S_{0}/6927$ , paragraph 6, in  $S_{0}/6968$ , paragraph 3, in  $S_{0}/6973$ , paragraphs 4, 7 and 8, and in  $S_{0}/6977$ , paragraph 4, the investigation was inconclusive for lack of evidence.

(c) The Indian complaints in 5/6945, paragraph 8, and in 5/6968, paragraph 4, refer to incidents already reported by the Observers (see 5/6710/ Add.10, para. 4 and 5/6710/Add.11, para. 8 (a)).

(d) The Pakistan complaint in S/6894, paragraph 126, also refers to a case already reported by the Observers (see S/6710/Add.9, para.9).

### Kotli-Galuthi sector

16. The Pakistan local command at Kotli complained that, between 1920 hours on 22 December and 0340 hours on the 23rd, Indian troops had shelled Fakistan positions located west, south-west and west-south-west of Caluthi with 3.7 Ecwitzers and 4.2-inch mortars. Investigation of this complaint by Observers was inconclusive. Eoth sides fired and it was not possible to determine which side fired first.

17. The Fakistan local command also submitted the following complaints:

(a) Between 0615 and 1500 hours on 25 December, Indian troops shelled Pakistan positions west and south-west of Caluthi and another Pakistan position in the Mendhar area with 3-inch and heavy mortars.

(b) Between 1225 and 1415 hours on the same day, Indian troops shelled a Pakistan position 4 1/2 miles south of Falnoi with 3-inch mortars and field artillery. The Observers confirmed these complaints, but indicated also that Pakistan troops had returned the fire.

18. With regard to complaints relating to this sector which had been submitted to the Secretary-General at Headquarters by the Permanent Representatives of India and Pakistan, Observers reported the following:

(a) Regarding the Pakistan complaints in S/6894, paragraphs 11, 12, 17, 21, 22, 24, 30, 31, 34, 36, 44, 48, 49, 63, 64, 67, 71, 91, 103, 111, 112 and 114 and the Indian complaints in S/6968, paragraph 7, and in S/6977, paragraph 8, investigation was inconclusive for lack of evidence.

S, 6710, Add.14 English Page 5

(b) The Indian complaints in S/6975, paragraph 16, and in  $S_76976$ , paragraph 7, refer to cases already reported by the Observers (see S/6710/Acd.10, paragraphs 14 (e) and 15 (b)).

(c) The Pakistan complaints in S/6894 paragraphs 15, 13, 19, 20, 28,  $\geq$ ) and 33 (see S/6710/Add.8, paragraph 13) and paragraphs 35, 37, 38 and 40-47, 51-55, 58-62, 66, 68, 72-76 and 78-82, (see S/6710/Add.12, paragraph 14 (a)) also refer to cases already reported by Observers.

(d) The Pakistan complaints in S/6894, peragraphs 98-100, were confirmed.

### Kotli-Naushera sector

19. The following complaints submitted by the Pakistan local command at Kotli were investigated by Observers in the sector:

(a) Between 1000 and 1235 hours on 24 December, Indian troops shelled a Pakistan position in the Janghar-Khuiratta area with 4.2-inch mortans.

(b) Between 0555 and 1100 hours and again between 1445 and 1545 hours on 26 December, Indian troops shelled and fired at Pakistan positions in the Janghar-Khuiratta area with field artillery, heavy mortars and recoilless rifles. The Observers confirmed the foregoing complaints. Regarding the second complaint, they also indicated that Pakistan troops had returned the fire. 20. The Observers stationed in the forward areas reported that Indian troops had shelled a Pakistan position located 6 1/2 miles south-east of Khuiratta between 0905 and 0925 hours on 27 December and another position 5 1/2 miles north-east of Janghar between 0950 and 1010 hours on the same day. Pakistan troops did not return the fire. As reported in paragraph 7 above, the Acting Chief Military Observer of UNMCGIP addressed a message to the Indian Vice-Chief of Army Staff regarding this breach of cease-fire by Indian troops.

21. With regard to complaints relating to this sector which had been submitted to the Secretary-General at Headquarters by the Permanent Representatives of India and Pakistan, Observers reported the following:

(a) The Pakistan complaints in S/6894, paragraphs 4, 7-10 and 14, refer to cases already reported by the Observers (see S/6710/Add.6, para. 18, and S/6710/Add.11, para. 18).

(b) The Indian complaints in S/6925, paragraphs 6, 7 and 8, also refer to incidents already reported by the Observers (see S/6710/Add.9, para. 20).

(c) Regarding the Palistan complaints in S/6891, paragraphs 25, 26, 101, 109, 110, 130 and 133, and the Indian complaint in S/6939, paragraph 5, investigation was inconclusive for lack of evidence.

(d) The Indian complaint in S/6977, paragraph 10, was not considered as a violation of the cease-fire.

(e) The Pakistan complaint in S/6894, paragraph 39, was confirmed.

#### Bhimber-Akhnur sector

22. A delayed report from Observers confirmed a complaint submitted by the Indian local command at Akhnur to the effect that Pakistan troops had fired at an Indian observation post located 8 1/2 miles west-north-west of Akhnur with 81 mm mortars and machine-guns between 1500 and 1800 hours on 22 October, killing one Indian soldier.

23. With regard to complaints relating to this sector which had been submitted to the Secretary-General at Headquarters by the Permanent Representatives of India and Pakistan, Observers reported the following:

(a) The Pakistan complaints in S/6394, paragraphs 1 and 5, and the Indian complaints in S/6926, paragraphs 5 and 7 (first part), in S/6939, paragraph 7, in S/6945, paragraphs 17 and 13, in S/6952, paragraphs 9 and 10, in S/6963, paragraphs 12 and 13, in S/6973, paragraphs 11 and 12 and in S/6977, paragraphs 12-14, were not considered as violations of the cease-fire.

(b) Investigation of the Indian complaint in S/6973, paragraph 13, was inconclusive for lack of evidence.

#### Sialkot-Jammu sector

24. No incidents relating to this sector were reported during the period under review.

25. With regard to complaints which had been submitted to the Secretary-General at Headquarters by the Permanent Representative of India, Observers reported the following:

(a) The complaints in S/6926, paragraphs 10 and 11, in S/6927, paragraph 7, in S/6939, paragraph 9, in S/6945, paragraph 21, in S/6952, paragraph 11, in S/6968, paragraphs 17 and 22-25, in S/6973, paragraphs 23 and  $2^{l_1}$ , and in S/6977, paragraphs 18 and 19, were not considered as violations of the cease-fire.

/ . . .

1 . . .

(b) Regarding the complaints in S/6926, paragraphs 3, 21 and 26, in S/6925, paragraph 17, in S/6968, paragraph 18, in S/6973, paragraphs 18, 20 and 21, and in S/6977, paragraph 17, investigation was inconclusive for lack of evidence.

(c) The complaint in S/6925, paragraph 18, was confirmed.

(d) The complaint in S/6968, paragraph 16, refers to a case already reported by the Observers (see S/6710/Add.11, paragraph 21).

## Pasrur-Khasa sector

26. The Indian local command alleged that Pakistan troops had fired from a Fakistan observation post north of Mardana (GR 295730) at 0950 hours on 24 December. During the investigation of this complaint by Observers, the Pakistan troops agreed verbally on 25 December to remove this post and the Observers confirmed on 28 December that the post had been removed. The Observers also reported that Indian troops had removed one of their observation posts at GR 862095, to which the Pakistani forces had objected.

## Lahore-Khasa-Narla sector

27. Both sides complained of sniping in the Dograi area (GR 7311) on 24 December. Observers in the area were unable to determine which side had fired first. 28. The Pakistan local command complained that an exchange of fire had taken place south of Barki (GR 7596) on 25 December, as a result of which a Pakistan soldier was wounded. Observers in the area found no evidence supporting this complaint.

29. Each side claimed that the other had fired isolated rifle shots during the night of 26 December along the front line from GR 7516 (Bhasin) to GR 7589. Observers could find no evidence to support the claim of either side.
30. With regard to complaints relating to this sector which had been submitted to the Secretary-General at Headquarters by the Permanent Representative of India and set forth in document S/7018, Observers reported the following:

(a) There was no evidence to substantiate the complaints in paragraphs 26, 23 (a, b and c), 32, 33, 34, 36 (incident of 10 December), 39 (a, b and d), 44 and 45.

(b) The activities alleged in paragraphs 29, 30 (a, b and c), 31, 37 and 40, took place within the known Fakistan forward defended localities (FDL's).

(c) The complaint in paragraph 39 (c) was confirmed.

(d) Investigation of the complaints in paragraphs 27, 35 and 39 (e) was inconclusive. Both sides fired and it was not possible to determine who fired first.

# Rukhanwala-Narla-Bopa Rai-Ferozepore sector

31. The Pakistan local command complained that Indian forces had fired at Pakistan troops in the Duhal Kuhna area (GR 822633) at 1745 hours on 28 December. No confirmation has been received from Observers.

32. With regard to complaints relating to this sector which had been submitted to the Secretary-General at Headquarters by the Permanent Representative of India and set forth in document S/7018, Observers reported the following:

(a) The activities alleged in paragraphs 30 (d), 51, 55, 57 and 64 took place within the known Pakistan FDL's.

(b) The complaint in paragraph 42 was confirmed.

(c) Investigation of the complaints in paragraphs 48 and 49 was inconclusive. Both sides fired, but it was not possible to determine who started the firing.

(d) There was no evidence to substantiate the complaints in paragraphs 56 and 62.

#### Sulaimanke-Fazilka sector

33. An Indian patrol deviated from its normal patrol route and engaged in a firefight with a Pakistan observation post in the area of GR 359789 (near Churka) at 1500 hours on 21 December. Both sides admitted having fired. The Observers noted that the Indian unit involved in this incident had only recently moved into the forward areas.

34. The Indian local command complained that Pakistan troops had fired at Indian police posts along the Sutlej river in the areas of Raja Motham (GR 621200), Dona Raja Dinanath (GR 601146) and Pireke (GR 433972) during the night of 25 December. Observers could find no evidence to support this complaint. 35. A further Indian complaint alleged that Pakistan troops had fired at Indian positions in the areas of Khananwala (GR 2557), Shamshabad (GR 3071) and Muzzam (GR 2670). Observers found no evidence to substantiate this complaint.

1 ...

36. With regard to complaints relating to this sector which had been submitted to the Secretary-General at Headquarters by the Permanent Representative of India and set forth in document S/7018, Observers reported the following:

(a) There was no evidence to substantiate the complaints in paragraphs 47, 49 (b and c), 52 and 53.

(b) The activities alleged in the complaint in paragraph 50 took place within the known Pakistan FDL's.

(c) Regarding the complaint in paragraph 59, the Observers found that Pakistan troops had dug new trenches and requested them to fill those trenches.

(d) Investigation of complaint in paragraph 63 was inconclusive. Both sides fired and it was not possible to determine who fired first.

#### Khokhropar-Gadra sector

37. On 23 December, the Indian local command complained that Pakistan aircraft had flown over the area of Gadra (QB 2964) on 17, 18 and 19 December. This complaint could not be verified by Observers.

33. A further Indian complaint alleged that Pakistan troops had occupied a new position near Ran (QB 0365) and had fired on Indian troops at 1630 hours on 19 December.

39. The Pakistan local command complained that Indian troops had fired with small arms, mortars and artillery at Pakistan positions east of Roheri (QA 954317) from 1330 hours to 1350 hours on 22 December. The Indian local command alleged that Pakistan troops had fired at its troops in the same area on 24 December. The foregoing incidents are a sequel to those of 20 and 21 December, which have been reported previously (see S/6710/Add.13, para. 55 (d)). The Observers investigating these incidents attributed them to clashes of opposing patrols. In this area, Indian troops had recently moved forward scme 2,000 yards and Pakistan troops about 4,000 yards. The Observers were unable to determine which side had moved forward first or had fired first. Both patrols had strengthened and dug in positions. The Observers attempted to negotiate a withdrawal by both sides, but as of 27 December had not succeeded in doing so.