

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW
MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 4 | Issue 3

2021

© 2021 *International Journal of Law Management & Humanities*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.ijlmh.com/>

Under the aegis of VidhiAagaz – Inking Your Brain (<https://www.vidhiaagaz.com>)

This Article is brought to you for “free” and “open access” by the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities at VidhiAagaz. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Journal of Law Management & Humanities after due review.

In case of **any suggestion or complaint**, please contact Gyan@vidhiaagaz.com.

To submit your Manuscript for Publication at **International Journal of Law Management & Humanities**, kindly email your Manuscript at submission@ijlmh.com.

Prisoners of War vis-a-vis Case Study of India Pakistan

MEGHA¹

ABSTRACT

*The humane treatment of prisoners of war had not become a concern until the second part of the nineteenth century. Many of the hardships that prisoners suffered during World War I were not prevented by the Hague Regulations, but they did provide a rational foundation for regulation.. The regulations' main flaws were a lack of definition and the lack of any enforcement measures, in addition to failing to foresee difficulties that developed during World War I. Following the First World War, a Geneva conference enacted new, more complex laws. The new rules, like the old ones, were not prepared for the new kinds of conflict that emerged as a result of their acceptance in the World War. Further, the cases of **Dharam Pal Singh**, Major Ashok Suri, Flight Lieutenant K Nachiketa have been discussed.*

Keywords: Prisoners Of War, India, Pakistan.

I. INTRODUCTION

Although fighters and other persons directly involved in hostilities are military targets who may be attacked, they are entitled to protection once they surrender or are deemed hors de war. The Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions, as well as the First and Third Geneva Conventions, guarantee this protection (GC), which deal with the care of the "wounded, sick, & shipwrecked" and "prisoners of war" (POW), respectively; Additional Protocol I is amended (for international conflicts). Although these conventions are legally binding as treaties, the major clauses are in any case customary.

The humane treatment of prisoners of war had not become a concern until the second part of the nineteenth century.² Many of the hardships that prisoners suffered during World War I were not prevented by the Hague Regulations, but they did provide a rational foundation for regulation.. The regulations' main flaws were a lack of definition and the lack of any enforcement measures, in addition to failing to foresee difficulties that developed during World War I. Following the First World War, a Geneva conference enacted new, more complex

¹ Author is a student at Himachal Pradesh National Law University, Shimla, India.

² International law; Oppenheim; p.367 (Lauterpacht) 1952

laws.³ The new rules, like the old ones, were not prepared for the new kinds of conflict that emerged as a result of their acceptance in the World War.

II. PRISONERS OF WAR DEFINED

The Third Geneva Convention, which was signed in 1949 and governs the treatment of prisoners of war, is a comprehensive code that emphasizes the necessity for humane treatment in all circumstances. The definition of prisoners of war in Geneva Convention III has been regarded as the elaboration of combatant status,⁴ is of particular relevance. It covers members of a party's military forces, as well as irregulars like militia or volunteer corps who fight alongside a party to the conflict, as long as they fulfil four conditions: being "commanded by a person responsible for his subordinates; having a fixed distinctive sign recognisable from a distance; carrying arms openly; and conducting operations in accordance with the Geneva Conventions."

The extent to which resistance personnel were covered was limited by the need to adhere to the four standards outlined in this article, which reflected the Second World War's experience. Guerrilla warfare has been used in the Third World and during the decolonization process since 1949. As a result, pressure increased to broaden the definition of soldiers eligible for prisoner of war status to include those who, in practice, rarely met the four qualifications.

III. STATUS DETERMINATION

The concept of "combatant's privilege" has three key implications under International Humanitarian Law. First, the privileged fighter is allowed to participate in hostilities, and as a result, he or she can't be prosecuted for carrying weapons or attacking enemy targets unless the activity is considered a war crime.⁵ Second, the opposing forces regard him or her as a viable target. Third, such warriors are granted Prisoners of War status in the case of capture.

In Geneva Convention III, Article 4(A)⁶, The people who are eligible for combatant's privilege and, in the event of capture, prisoner of war status is defined. Members of another party's armed forces, as well as irregulars such as militia or volunteer corps who fight alongside a party to the conflict, are eligible if they meet four criteria: they must be "commanded by a person responsible for his subordinates; have a fixed distinctive sign recognisable from a distance;

³ Convention Relating to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, July 27, 1929

⁴ Article 4(A), Geneva Convention III

⁵ Unprivileged or unlawful warriors can be tried and punished by military tribunals for behaviours that render their belligerency illegal. Privileged or lawful warriors can be captured and kept as prisoners of war, and they can only be prosecuted for severe offences such as war crimes or crimes against humanity.

⁶ Article 4, Geneva Convention III

carry arms openly; and conduct operations in accordance with the persons who fought alongside them." It makes no difference if the government is not the state's recognised representative. It is vital to note that the provisions of Article 4 of the Third Geneva Convention only apply to irregulars fighting alongside a conflicting party, not to that party's military troops. The case must be decided by a competent tribunal if there is any doubt concerning an irregular's status. The detainees must be assumed to be Prisoners of War until that conclusion is made.⁷ Furthermore, it is a Detaining Power's responsibility to demonstrate that detainees who were supposedly apprehended for their role in hostilities, do not deserve, to be held as Prisoners of War.⁸ This substantial burden relates to the harsh implications for the combatants in question, which include criminal penalties⁹ and the loss of their claim to additional rights protections as Prisoners of War under Geneva Convention III, which go beyond what is granted by international human rights law in several ways.

However, states have extended Prisoners of War status to those who aren't properly entitled to it under the convention on multiple occasions, as the United States did in Vietnam. This could redirect both the wish to assure equal treatment of their own soldiers if captured, as well as the underlying humanitarian ideals contained in IHL and manifested in the specific requirements of Geneva Convention III.

IV. RIGHTS OF A PRISONER OF WAR

The Third Geneva Convention has become the official declaration in the case of prisoners of war. The treaty, in addition to applying to all previous armed engagements, mentions internal battles, which is a noteworthy innovation.¹⁰ The convention defined prisoners in a way that included everyone who was likely to be captured in the course of hostilities. The Detaining Power, not the people, bears full and main responsibility for the treatment of prisoners of war. The detaining power has a universal obligation to treat detainees with humanity and protect them from harm.¹¹ Food, clothing, and medical attention must be provided for them.¹² They must be shielded from prying eyes of the general public.¹³ They are also entitled to extensive due process rights, including a trial in tribunals that follow the same legal standards as the

⁷ See Article 5 (2) Geneva Convention III in the establishment of an independent tribunal in the event of a dispute.

⁸ Article 45(1) and (2) AP I represent the presumption of prisoner of war status, which can only be overturned by a tribunal.

⁹ Under international law, they could be prosecuted for simply taking part, rather than for committing crimes.

¹⁰ International law cases and materials; Lori Damrosch, Louis Henkin, Richard Crawford Pugh, Oscar Schachter, Hans Smith (Eds); p.1621 (USA)2001

¹¹ Article 19 Geneva Convention III

¹² Article 20 Geneva Convention III

¹³ Article 13 Geneva Convention III

courts that would try the detaining state's military personnel.¹⁴ Experiments in medicine and science are not permitted. Regardless of color, ethnicity, religious beliefs, or political beliefs, all prisoners must be treated equally.¹⁵

The prisoner is obligated to provide a minutest amount of data at the time of confinement. He will not be tortured, and he will be allowed to keep his personal belongings.¹⁶ The conditions of the detention centre must meet the convention's requirements.¹⁷ The task that the prisoner is expected to do cannot be intrinsically hazardous, degrading, or directly related to military operations.¹⁸ Contact with his family and the ability to write letters must be granted to the inmate.¹⁹ It is necessary to establish procedures for filing complaints against the detention camp's administration.²⁰ The convention specifies punishments and disciplinary measures, as well as processes for determining culpability.²¹ The convention also stipulates that when a prisoner is detained, his or her belongings are forbidden to be sold.²² Prisoners of War must be sent home once hostilities have ended.²³

The Convention shall draw out the notion of a protective power designated by mutual consent to ensure compliance with the terms of the Convention. If the aggressors cannot agree on such appointment, the detention authority should seek that a neutral State, an impartial organisation or a humanitarian organisation substitute the protecting power. Each party commits to penalise anyone who is in breach of the established rules. Conventions Parties shall track those suspected of violating these Conventions.

Many of the general provisions of the Third Geneva War Prisoners Convention form part of the First and Second Geneva Conventions on the injured and the sick in the battlefield and maritime forces.

V. INFORMATION ON REASONS FOR ARREST AND DETENTION

The first condition for a proper international detention is that clear legal reasons should be provided for the arrest, followed by the necessity to establish the status of detainees and last, the detainees themselves should be provided with information on such matters. Only when this

¹⁴ Article 84, 99-108 Geneva Convention III

¹⁵ Article 16 Geneva Convention III

¹⁶ Article 17 Geneva Convention III

¹⁷ Article 22 and 23 Geneva Convention III

¹⁸ Article 22 and 23 Geneva Convention III

¹⁹ Section V Article 70-73 Geneva Convention III

²⁰ Article 78-90 Geneva Convention III

²¹ Article 82-88 Geneva Convention III

²² Article 18 Geneva Convention III

²³ Article 118 Geneva Convention III provides that 'Prisoners of War shall be released and repatriated without delay after the cessation of active hostilities.'

happens can the rights which individuals have under international law be enforced. The right to such information is recognised as one of the minimal protective criteria granted to those living in enemy hands by International Humanitarian Law and human rights law.

Article 75 (3) of Additional Protocol I provides:

*“Any person arrested, detained or interned for actions related to the armed conflict shall be informed promptly, **in a language he understands, of the reasons why these measures have been taken.** Except in cases of arrest or detention for penal offences, such persons shall be released with the minimum delay possible and in any event as soon as the circumstances justifying the arrest, detention or internment have ceased to exist”.*

Persons detained under international humanitarian law for war-related reasons have a right to be notified promptly of their custody reasons. Whether the person is suspected of committing a crime or not is unrelated.

The need for "promptness" does not involve any particular time-spans, for all situations, including (for as long as applicable) military reasons arising from people's incarceration in combat zones, have to be considered. As the ICRC Commentary to the additional protocol points out, it would, however, be contradictory to this paragraph to detain a person for longer than 10 days, even during the time of armed conflict without telling him why he is being jailed.²⁴

As a consequence, the detained individuals have the right to know the basis for their detention, under the minimum standards of International Humanitarian Law for the protection of all human rights.

VI. PROSECUTION- FAIR TRIAL RIGHTS

The law lays down core fair trial rights which must not be compromised when it comes to prosecuting prisoners of war. As mentioned previously, in the event of conflict offences, the legal status of a prisoner will influence the legitimacy of prosecution. Formerly privileged combatants (right to be treated as prisoners of war) cannot be prosecuted for war acts, although unfavourable fighting soldiers can fight without the right to do so. On the contrary, international crimes including war crimes and crimes against humanity may be prosecuted for all categories of inmates.

According to Geneva Convention III, any Prisoners of War facing judicial proceedings is

²⁴ Article 73(3) Geneva Convention III

entitled to a fair trial.²⁵ These rights are treated so seriously that "willfully depriving a prisoner of war of the rights to a fair and regular trial specified in this convention" is considered a grave violation for which states parties must pursue.²⁶

VII. ACCESS TO COUNSEL

The aid of a defence counsel is an indispensable way of guaranteeing that the fundamental rights of people suspected or accused of criminal offences are safeguarded by both International Humanitarian Law and International Human Rights Law.

Regardless of their situation as prisoners of war, civilians or anybody entitled to core human rights minimums, the International Humanitarian Law allows anyone suspected of committing a crime both explicitly and implicitly to obtain counsel. One of the several rights guaranteed to prisoners of war under Geneva Convention III is the right to legal representation.²⁷ Similarly, one of the due process rights granted to civilians protected by Geneva Convention IV is the right "to be helped by a qualified advocate or counsel of their choosing, who shall be able to visit them freely and shall have access to the necessary facilities for preparing the defence."²⁸

The minimum standard set out in Article 75(4) provides simply for an accused: "...to be informed without delay of the particulars of the offence alleged against him and shall afford the accused before and during his trial all necessary rights and means of defense." The ICRC Commentary on Additional Protocol 1 points out that the right to communicate with a 'competent defence lawyer' must be construed as essential means. The 'all required rights and defence methods' provision specifically applies 'before the trial and at...trial,' which should be construed as being one of the key protections of misuse and arbitrariness, in accordance with human-rights legislation, as stated below, including access to counsel from early detention stages.

VIII. RIGHTS REGARDING INTERROGATION

The International Humanitarian Law establishes certain standards that control and rigorously limit the information that Prisoners of War must divulge to a Detaining Power. Prisoners of War are only need to disclose their name, date of birth, rank, and serial number, according to Geneva Convention III. Moreover, in order to gather intelligence from prisoners of war, no 'kind of compulsion' can be employed.²⁹

²⁵ Article 82-8 and 99-107 Geneva Convention III

²⁶ Article 130 Geneva Convention IV

²⁷ Article 84 Geneva Convention III

²⁸ Article 72 Geneva Convention IV

²⁹ Article 17 Geneva Convention III

IX. INDEFINITE DETENTION- REPATRIATION

Another reason why granting Prisoners of War status appears to have been deemed excessively crucial is the repatriation requirements. 'Prisoners of War shall be discharged and repatriated without delay after the cessation of active hostilities.'³⁰

This privilege does not, however, apply to persons charged with a crime waiting for trial or to persons convicted and serving sentences, where Geneva Convention III provides for a specific exception to the repatriation responsibility.³¹ As a result, there is nothing preventing any state from pursuing criminal charges against those who commit crimes.

One commenter summarised the issue by saying, "If the hostages are Prisoners of War, they must eventually be returned...the Taleban warriors may be too dangerous ever to be released which commits the US to imprison them permanently."³² Concerns about obtaining Prisoners of War status could be masking an underlying assumption that if Geneva Convention III does not apply, there is no legal structure in place to constrain the power to imprison forever.

Whether or not Geneva Convention III applies, it is unavoidable that hostilities will end at some time, and that reasons "connected to the conflict" that could justify imprisonment under International Humanitarian Law will likewise end. The remaining question is whether there is any alternative justification for detention that is consistent with International Humanitarian Law and IHRL. In most circumstances, such justification comes when a person is accused of committing a criminal offence and charged with it.

X. INDIA VIS-A-VIS PAKISTAN - CASE STUDY

(A) The Case of Dharam Pal Singh

The Pakistani Government declined to accept requests from the High Commission of the India in Federal Republic of Islamabad to certify the illegal imprisonment of Havaldar Dharam Pal Singh, claimed by his wife Pal Kaur in a Pakistani jail. The Minister for external affairs said the Government of Pakistan refused consultative access to the prisoner of war and has not answered India's request to affirm Dharam Pal Singh's imprisonment. The Minister for foreign affairs stated in an affidavit filed with the Punjab and Haryana High Court in 2017.

Two letters were issued to the government of Pakistan by the Indian High Commission on 7 and 25 June 2017. The issue was clear during the hearing of a civil lawsuit against the wife of

³⁰ Article 118 Geneva Convention III

³¹ Article 119 Geneva Convention III

³² M. Dorf, 'What is an Unlawful Combatant and Why Does it Matter?' Find Law Forum, 23 January 2002(at <http://www.cnn.com/2002/LAW/01/columns/fl.dorf.combatants.>)

Havaladar Dharam Pal Singh, Pal Kaur, who hails to the Lehra Dhurkot village, Bathinda, Punjab. The wife of the war prisoner had petitioned the court to order the Indian government to file a lawsuit with the International Court of Justice for Havaladar Dharam Pal Singh's return. "The Government of India, Ministry of External Affairs, has filed an affidavit of Shubham Singh, its Under Secretary, stating that there has been no response from Pakistan so far to the letters written by the High Commission of India in Islamabad, seeking confirmation on Havaladar Dharam Pal Singh's detention and to provide Consular access to him," said H C Arora, counsel for the petitioner. An affidavit presented by Satish Kumar of Ferozepur indicated that Dharam Pal Singh was alive and incarcerated in Kot Lakhpat Rai Jail, Lahore, popularly known as Central Jail Lahore, according to the lawyer for petitioner Pal Kaur. In his affidavit, Satish Kumar stated that he was a prisoner at the same facility from 1974 to 1976.

In 1971, the Pakistan Army apprehended Pal Singh. Pal Kaur told the court in her Civil Writ Petition that her husband fought in the 1971 War on the Bangladeshi border against Pakistan and was seized by Pakistani forces. When he was reported missing on fifth December, 1971, the Indian government and the Indian army treated him as a martyr. Dharam Pal Singh's death was also mourned by then-Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, who wrote a letter to Pal Kaur to express her condolences.

The petitioner told the court further that her husband is not a martyr and was jailed in Kot Lakhpat Rai Jail in Pakistan. Between 19 July 1974 and 19 July 1976, another prisoner of war, Satish Kumar from Ferozepur, informed her that Dharam Pal Singh was alive. Satish Kumar also signed an affidavit in order to support his claim. Pal Kaur had requested Dharam Pal Singh's repatriation based on the conditions of the Simla Pact, citing the Kulbhusan Jadhav case. Because his body was not retrieved, Hav Dharam Pal Singh (No. 3346846) of the 4 Sikh Regiment, who fought at the Bangladesh Border conflict of 1971 against Pakistan was not cremated. His name was not on the list of soldiers missing, which surprised him.

The petitioner further informed the court that Dharam Pal Singh was not an remote instance, and that during the 1971 conflict, a lot of missing troops were declared martyrs.

The case of Major Ashok Suri exemplifies this point perfectly. Initially, it was reported that he was killed in action on December 5, 1971, but his father received four telegrams claiming otherwise, and Radio Pakistan said he was still alive. His family received two letters that handwriting specialists confirmed were written by him after personal inquiries seem to confirm it. Suri was alive in the mid-70s, according to Satinder Lambah, a junior diplomat in Pakistan who ultimately became the high commissioner. Amnesty International, on the other hand,

agreed unofficially. Despite this, it took the government more than three years to change his status from killed to missing-in-action. We might have gotten him back if it had done so earlier. Pakistan, on the other hand, felt no obligation to return him as long as India insisted he was dead. Pushing a subject that elicits almost little public sympathy in an audience that believes consent has no place in the marital bed requires bravery.

Five reasons as to why these 83 troops are languishing in Pakistani prisons. First, in 1972, when Prisoners of War were swapped, the Indian administration was more concerned with assuring Pakistani acceptance of Bangladesh. As a result, it failed to ensure that all Indian Prisoners of War were properly returned. This was not high on the priority list. Second, unlike Israel, India does not exchange a disproportionate number of enemy Prisoners of War for a smaller number of its own. India rejected Pakistan's proposal for a one-for-three swap. Third, India opposes taking the case to the International Court of Justice or involving third parties because it is bound by a bilateral agreement with Pakistan that was signed in 1972 in Shimla..³³

If these three explanations represent Indian administrations' warped attitudes, there are two more that point to Pakistani malice. To begin with, Pakistan most likely kept a few Indian Prisoners of War as bargaining chips in the event that its own officers were punished for war crimes after the 1971 war. Those trials were never held, but the Prisoners of War who remained in captivity were forgotten. Their bad mental and physical condition, probably as a result of years of torture and injuries, made it impossible for Pakistan to admit their presence and return them.

The second argument, which has something to do with Pakistan, is extremely intriguing. There is a suspicion that other Prisoners of War, such as Lance Naik Jaspal Singh, were moved to West Asian countries like Oman to hide the shame of holding Indian Prisoners of War years after the war ended. They were out of mind once they were out of sight.

However, thinking twice before jumping to unfavourable conclusions about our next-door neighbor, likewise, the inverse is correct. They claim 18 of their soldiers are being held captive in India. There are times when India and Pakistan's regimes resemble one another uncannily.

Considering the families on both sides of the conflict who have been affected, they may be told that their relatives are dead only to find out that they are alive, or that they are missing in action only to find out that they are prisoners, or that they are classified as alive only to win

³³ SC seeks current status of 1971 Prisoners of Wars languishing in Pakistan jails, *The Hindu*, APRIL 20, 2016, <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/sc-seeks-current-status-of-1971-prisoners-of-wars-languishing-in-pakistan-jails/article6611905.ece>, (accessed on 22 May, 2021)

posthumous accolades for heroism. They've suffered for decades as a result of their governments' unwillingness to establish the truth, while troops who fought for their country have been forgotten by their fellow citizens. "For your tomorrow, we gave our today," the Kohima War Memorial states. "For our today, we denied you a tomorrow," might be a better epitaph in this case. In the backdrop of India's efforts to free former naval officer Kulbhushan Jadhav, who is serving a life sentence in Pakistan, relatives of Indians who were imprisoned by the neighbouring country during the 1971 war have urged that efforts be made to learn about their predicament as well. According to Dr Simmi Waraich, a member of the Missing Defence Personnel Relatives Association (MDPRA), the union government has made no attempt to institutionalise the hunt for soldiers thought to be detained as prisoners of war in Pakistan. "Jadhav's case has caused the government to act quickly because of the public focus," said Dr. Waraich, whose father, is also believed to be a PoW in Pakistan. "It is commendable that the government is making every effort to reunite him with his family, but the same should be done for the 1971 POWs so that the truth about their fate can be revealed," she said.³⁴

Another case of Flight Lieutenant K Nachiketa, a 26-year-old fighter pilot, was assigned to strike Pakistani installations in Kargil at heights above 17,000 feet during the 1999 Kargil War. Pakistani security forces apprehended him.

Nachiketa was on the wing with a MiG-27 fighter bomber when it caught fire during in-flight operations, crashed, and landed in Pakistan occupied Kashmir. Nachiketa was detained by Pakistan for 8 days as a prisoner of war. He revealed how he was tortured physically and mentally by Pakistani forces after his return. Nachiketa remarked in an interview that "The torment was particularly gruesome. There comes a moment when you think, "Death is simpler," but thankfully for me, the third-degree component, which is the last portion, did not begin for me."

While the other Indian defence soldiers seized by Pakistani armed forces in the course of the Kargil conflict did not survive, India has been subjected to a flagrant violation of the Geneva Conventions. Captain Saurabh Kalia and five other Indian soldiers — Naresh Singh, Bhanwar Lal Bagaria, Bhika Ram, Sepoys Arjun Ram, and Moola Ram— were tormented in Pakistan's captivity in another case. After 15 days, their disfigured bodies were handed over to India.

Wing Commander Varthaman's case, on the other hand, appears to have benefited from India's

³⁴ Man Aman Singh Chinna, (2017), Missing 54 PoWs: Families of Indian soldiers captured by Pakistan in 1971 war demand more govt efforts to trace kin, *The Indian Express*, available at <https://indianexpress.com/article/india/missing-54-pows-families-of-indian-soldiers-captured-by-pakistan-in-1971-war-demand-more-govt-efforts-to-trace-kin/> , April 21 (accessed on 22 May, 2021)

worldwide strategic position. As international pressure mounted on Pakistan, the country's attitude toward Varthaman shifted. In the aftermath of the incident in Kashmir's Pulwama on 14 February that killed 40 CRPF soldiers, the USA, the British and Saudi Arabia have engaged with Pakistani authorities, apart from Indian diplomatic efforts to intensify pressure.

On March 1, Abhinandan Varthaman crossed the Wagah border and returned to India. His captors in Pakistan denied the Wing Commander of sleep, suffocated him, and even lashed him. Varthaman was forced to stand for lengthy periods of time and was subjected to loud music to aggravate his pain. Varthaman resisted Pakistani officers' attempts to get information from him on the frequencies used by the Indian Air Force to relay signals, the deployment of fighter jets, and logistics arrangements.³⁵

XI. CONCLUSION

Over the years, the International Committee has worked relentlessly to guarantee that persons are better protected by the repercussions of conflict under international law; successive humanitarian agreements have been developed and adapted to current circumstances, or new ones have been formed. A series of draughty conventions developed during the period between the two world wars, most noticeable being the Convention on the Treatment of Prisoners of War signed in Summer 1929, were the Committee's main achievements at the time. The Convention underwent a number of alterations, culminating in the Geneva Convention on the Treatment of War Prisoners Of August 12, 1949 that we now have.

It is believed that prisoners of war would be home away from home in the hands of the detaining power, if all states comply with the criteria of this Convention.

³⁵ Sudhi Ranjan Sen(2020), Sleep deprived, choked, beaten up: How IAF pilot Abhinandan held off Pak grilling, *Hindustan Times*, April 21, available at <https://www.hindustantimes.com/india-news/iaf-pilot-abhinandan-varthaman-held-off-pakistan-grilling-for-crucial-24-hrs/story-8051123IQg9L21962wPQOI.html> (Accessed on 22 May, 2021)