

Dear Air India Inquiry Commission,

Residing in India, I have just learnt, at this eleventh hour of the procedure to lodge an application to be heard / offered Mandate for the Part -1 and part -2 of the Air India Inquiry.

As a result of the terrible Kanishka Crime, I lost my father Prof Anjani Kumar Sinha, who was 43 yrs old and he left behind a wife, daughter and son (me). I was 19 yrs old then, my sister 16 yrs and our lives were shattered forever on the 23rd June 1985.

I am writing to confirm that I would like standing for all of the mandate of the Commission of Inquiry into the Investigation of the Bombing of the Air India Flight 182. Specifically I would like to participate in presenting my views with respect to the following:

- 1) if there were deficiencies in the assessment by Canadian government officials of the potential threat posed by Sikh terrorism before or after 1985, or in their response to that threat, whether any changes in practice or legislation are required to prevent the recurrence of similar deficiencies in the assessment of terrorist threats in the future;
- 2) if there were problems in the effective cooperation between government departments and agencies, including the Canadian Security Intelligence Service and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, in the investigation of the bombing of Air India Flight 182, either before or after June 23, 1985, whether any changes in practice or legislation are required to prevent the recurrence of similar problems of cooperation in the investigation of terrorism offences in the future;
- 3) the manner in which the Canadian government should address the challenge, as revealed by the investigation and prosecutions in the Air India matter, of establishing a reliable and workable relationship between security intelligence and evidence that can be used in a criminal trial;

4) whether Canada's existing legal framework provides adequate constraints on terrorist financing in, from or through Canada, including constraints on the use or misuse of funds from charitable organization.;

5) whether existing practices or legislation provide adequate protection for witnesses against intimidation in the course of the investigation or prosecution of terrorism cases;

6) whether the unique challenges presented by the prosecution of terrorism cases, as revealed by the prosecutions in the Air India matter, are adequately addressed by existing practices or legislation and, if not, the changes in practice or legislation that are required to address these challenges, including whether there is merit in having terrorism cases heard by a panel of three judges, and;

7) whether further changes in practice or legislation are required to address the specific aviation security breaches associated the with Air India Flight 182 bombing, particularly those relating to the screening of passengers and their baggage.

I would also like to confirm that I am seeking appropriate funding to fully participate in these hearings.

Please guide and help me in the above.

Thanking you,

Regards

Niraj Sinha