

LTTE Era · Legal Recovery & Sanctions Architecture — MP Evidence Pack

Packages the six LTTE-era dossiers and the 109-law Diaspora Law Index into the lawful UK-aligned recovery, sanctions, and counter-illicit-finance instruments already on the statute book. Never glorifies, never amnesties, never substitutes for due process.

Packages the six LTTE-era dossiers and the 109-law Diaspora Law Index into the lawful UK-aligned recovery, sanctions, and counter-illicit-finance instruments already on the statute book. Never glorifies, never amnesties, never substitutes for due process.

Audience

- UK MPs
- Lords
- FCDO
- HM Treasury OFSI
- Home Office
- NCA
- Journalists

Best used for

- Parliamentary questions on UWO / POCA Part 5 use against post-conflict illicit flows
- Letters to FCDO / OFSI on Magnitsky designations against UN-named perpetrators
- Briefings on Rome Statute Art 28 command responsibility for the final-stages file
- Calls for civic submissions to the APG Mutual Evaluation cycle for Sri Lanka
- Background reading on UK Terrorism Act 2000 §12 historical framing for pre-2009 references

Tier-A evidence anchors

- UN Panel of Experts on Accountability (Darusman Report, 2011)
- OHCHR OISL — Sri Lanka Investigation (A/HRC/30/CRP.2, 2015)
- OHCHR Sri Lanka Accountability Project (UNHRC 46/1, 51/1)
- ICG — The Sri Lankan Tamil Diaspora after the LTTE (Asia Report 186, 2010)
- UK Sanctions and Anti-Money Laundering Act 2018 / Magnitsky regime
- FATF / APG — Mutual Evaluation methodology
- UK All-Party Parliamentary Group for Tamils — register

Policy asks

- UK Government (HM Treasury OFSI): Review whether evidence preserved by the OHCHR Sri Lanka Accountability Project supports designations under the UK Global Human Rights Sanctions Regulations 2020 against individuals already named in UN findings for the 2008–2009 final-stages conduct.
- UK Government (Home Office, NCA): Set out how Part 5 of the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 and the Unexplained Wealth Order regime apply to assets within UK jurisdiction with provenance traceable to wartime or post-war Sri Lankan procurement and reconstruction flows already documented by ICG, Verité Research

and the OHCHR Accountability Project.

- UK Government (FCDO): Coordinate with EU, US, Canadian and Australian counterparts on parallel Magnitsky-style designations strictly limited to individuals already named in UN-mandated findings — never on a TLTE list.
- UK MPs (APPG for Tamils): Host one Westminster session pairing the OHCHR Accountability Project mandate with the Diaspora Law Index — to make visible the lawful instruments already available to Parliament, without proposing any extra-judicial mechanism.
- Foreign Affairs Committee: Take evidence on civic submissions to the APG Mutual Evaluation cycle for Sri Lanka — structural risk indicators only, per FATF methodology — as the highest-leverage international forum to test post-conflict illicit-finance patterns.

Draft parliamentary questions

- [HM Treasury] What assessment has His Majesty's Treasury made of whether evidence preserved by the OHCHR Sri Lanka Accountability Project, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 46/1 and 51/1, supports designations under the Global Human Rights Sanctions Regulations 2020 against individuals named in United Nations findings for conduct during the final stages of the armed conflict in Sri Lanka in 2008 and 2009?
- [Home Office] What guidance has the National Crime Agency issued on the application of Part 5 of the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 and the Unexplained Wealth Order regime to assets within UK jurisdiction with provenance traceable to wartime and post-war Sri Lankan procurement and reconstruction flows documented by the International Crisis Group, Verité Research and the OHCHR Accountability Project?
- [FCDO] What discussions has the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office had with the Governments of the United States, Canada, Australia and the European Union on coordinated designations under their respective Global Magnitsky regimes against individuals already named in United Nations findings on the Sri Lankan armed conflict?
- [Home Office] What representations has the Government made on the inclusion of structural civil-society submissions, scoped strictly to FATF methodology and Recommendation 8 on Non-Profit Organisations, in the Asia/Pacific Group on Money Laundering Mutual Evaluation cycle for Sri Lanka?

Civic remembrance

This pack does not call for prosecution, does not name individuals beyond those already named by the UN, does not glorify any armed group, and does not propose any mechanism outside the lawful instruments Parliament already has. It reads the Diaspora Law Index — UWO, POCA, Magnitsky, Swiss FIAA, Canada SEMA, UNCAC Ch V, FATF/APG — alongside the UN-mandated evidence file, and asks the UK to use the instruments it has authored.

Pack rules

- UK Terrorism Act 2000 §12 historical framing on every pre-2009 LTTE reference — descriptive, not endorsing.
- Never name perpetrators beyond those already named in UN-mandated findings (Darusman 2011, OISL 2015, UNHRC 46/1 / 51/1).
- Never aggregate diaspora donation, remittance, procurement or asset figures in TLTE voice — cite ICG, Verité Research, World Bank KNOMAD, CBSL.
- Coerced contributors are extortion victims, never accomplices — see Rome Statute Art 28 vs duress under Common Article 3.
- Never propose a tribunal or mechanism outside existing UK / international law. The pack signposts lawful

instruments only.

- Civic submissions to APG/FATF processes must follow FATF methodology — structural indicators only, never named allegations.
- Disambiguate LTTE-era references from other Tamil militant groups, Sri Lankan state paramilitary actors, and post-war criminal actors — never let the LTTE label do undifferentiated work.

Transparency

Published under the UK Transparency of Lobbying Act 2014 posture. TLTE C.I.C. is a community interest company, not a state, party or charity. Era: Aarambam (founding).