



The Advocacy Programme on the Use of Section 54 and 167 of CrPC by the Police Officers



Bangladesh Legal Aid & Services Trust (BLAST)

The Advocacy Programme on the Use of Section 54 and 167 of CrPC by the Police Officers

The Advocacy Programme on the Use of Section 54 and 167 of CrPC by the Police Officers

Prepared by

Advocacy & PIL Cell
Bangladesh Legal Aid and Services Trust (BLAST)
March, 2008, Dhaka

Editing

Soma Islam
Deputy Director, Advocacy & PIL

Shahiduzzaman
Chief reporter, New Age

Cover Design: Sazzadul Islam Nayan
Graphics: Boshumoti Color Creation
Print: Ad Sky

Bangladesh Legal Aid and Services Trust (BLAST)

28/A (141/1 old) Segunbagicha, Dhaka 1000, Bangladesh
Phone: 9349126, 8317185, 9349125, Fax: 9347107.
e-mail: mail@blast.org.bd, Web: www.blast.org.bd

The Advocacy Programme on the Use of Section 54 and 167 of CrPC by the Police Officers

01

1. Introduction:

This study was carried out to follow up on the outcomes of an advocacy programme implemented by the PIL & Advocacy Unit of BLAST on the abuse of power by police officers using Sections 54 and 167 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC) to arrest without warrant and interrogate any arrestee during remand. Pertinently, the advocacy programme was initiated after the honourable High Court Division of the Supreme Court had issued a set of directives on the issues in April 2003 following a Public Interest Litigation (PIL) filed by BLAST and others in November 1998. The directives were warmly welcomed by all civil society groups; and many said that the compliance with the directives is the prime precondition to ensure human liberty and dignity.

BLAST was well convinced that to ensure the compliance with the directives of the High Court Division, the personnel concerned in the law enforcement agencies, magistrates and above all common people should know about the directives. Accordingly, it undertook an advocacy programme on the issue in 2005 and began working within its operational area covering 19 districts. Three years have already elapsed since then. Hence, this study was to understand the degree of success as well as failure of the programme, and the purpose was to review the programme as well as to determine the future course of action.

2. Background:

It was an incident of July 1998. Sahmim Reza Rubel, a university student, died in police custody at the Detective Branch (DB) office in Dhaka on July 23. He was arrested under Section 54 of the CrPC. The unpleasant incident evoked serious public reaction compelling the government to address the issue. The government formed a Judicial Inquiry Commission headed by Justice Habibur Rahman Khan, a former judge of the High Court Division of the Supreme Court, to investigate the incident. After the inquiry, the commission suggested some amendments to Section 54 of the CrPC. But no significant action was taken up and within a few months of submission of the report of the commission more people came to be reported tortured, raped and killed in police custody.

Following the incidents, the Bangladesh Legal Aid and Services Trust (BLAST) along with other organisations and persons concerned filed a writ petition with the High Court Division of the Supreme Court in November 1998 challenging the

Sahmim Reza Rubel, a university student, died in police custody at the Detective Branch (DB) office in Dhaka on July 23. He was arrested under Section 54 of the CrPC. The unpleasant incident evoked serious public reaction compelling the government to address the issue.

arbitrary arrest under Section 54 and remand and torture under Section 167 of the CrPC. On April 7, 2003, the High Court bench comprising Mr. Justice Md. Hamidul Haque and Ms. Justice Salma Masud Chowdhury delivered the verdict on the writ petition issuing a 15-point directive on the government to be followed by the law enforcement agencies in arresting, detaining, remanding and treating suspects. The court also suggested that some changes in the procedural law in relation to Section 54 and 167 should be made with a view to prevent arbitrary arrests and custodial deaths and asked the government to comply with the order immediately.

Unfortunately, not only that the government had taken any steps to comply with the directives within its one year of issuance, but also that in the third and fourth week of April 2004 the government launched a wholesale arrest drive to foil an alleged opposition plot to unseat the government. The national dailies described it in banner headlines as 'mindless,' 'blanket,' 'unprecedented' and 'police juggernaut.' The nature of the mindlessness was such that the police are reported to have arrested people indiscriminately at bus, launch terminals and railway stations. People who had just arrived in the city on private purposes were also not spared. The number of the people arrested was too huge to be accommodated in police stations and jails.

On April 25, 2004, The Daily Star reported that during 18-24 April, the police arrested more than 6,069 persons in Dhaka only and "4,775 of them were arrested under the Dhaka Metropolitan Police (DMP) Ordinance and sentenced without being produced before magistrates, let alone a scope for self-defence." The report continued: "The rest 1,294 were shown arrested in different cases filed earlier with police stations in the capital. But their names were not in the first information reports.... They arrested 612 people under Section 54 of the Criminal Procedure Code...."

Similarly, the daily Sangbad reported on April 26, 2004 referring to DMP data, that 14,428 persons were arrested during April 19 to April 25, 2004. Out of the 7,785 persons arrested by the police, 466 were arrested under Section 54 and 151 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 6,435 under the DMP Ordinance, 668 in specific cases and 166 persons were arrested against warrant. Only five of them were 'listed' criminals, wanted by the police. The daily newspaper also reported in the same issue that the police stations were running, in daylight, a 'trade' of 'mass bribe' on the eve of the 'mass arrest.'

The incidents led BLAST to come forward to do something to end such a despotic situation. This time BLAST realised that mere court orders cannot ensure its own implementation and change in organisational practices; but a large-scale advocacy programme is necessary to build awareness among the police officers, people and civil society. The BLAST Advocacy unit, therefore, initiated an advocacy programme in 2005 to make people conscious of arbitrary arrest under Section 54 and custodial violence under Section 167 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The programme included district-level meetings with police officers, magistrates, civil society members, local elected representatives and other influential people; publishing posters, leaflets, brochures, occasional papers and stickers; arranging seminars and roundtable conferences with experts concerned, government and police high officials and the law ministry.

Undeniably, a well-thought-out working strategy is essential to make such programmes successful. And a viable strategy requires in-depth knowledge and understanding of the situation. Therefore, for more in-depth knowledge and understanding of the situation, BLAST conducted a baseline study in 2005 almost completely based on interviews with the police and the members of the public.

On April 7, 2003, the High Court bench comprising Mr. Justice Md. Hamidul Haque and Ms. Justice Salma Masud Chowdhury delivered the verdict on the writ petition issuing a 15-point directive on the government to be followed by the law enforcement agencies in arresting, detaining, remanding and treating suspects.

The interviews were taken by 13 BLAST unit office staff following a semi-structured questionnaire sent from the researchers at the head office. Some data from informal interviews, conversations and comments at the advocacy meetings conducted by BLAST were also incorporated in the report. This research was conducted in January-February 2005 and covered 13 districts of Bangladesh. The study, no doubt, helped BLAST to map its advocacy strategy at the preliminary stage.

The present research aims to understand the situation as to the use of Section 54 and 167 regarding arrest and remand in custody. To conceive the progress we will compare the present situation with that of 2005 as laid out in the report of the above-mentioned baseline study. For an easy comparison, we are incorporating the relevant parts of the previous report in it as unchanged as possible.

3. Methodology and description of the field:

The 2007 study was conducted by interviews using a semi-structured questionnaire and holding focus group discussions with various stakeholders. One hundred and twenty-nine civil society members, 97 arrested, 17 magistrates and 84 police officers were surveyed.

The focus group discussions were conducted in eight sessions each of which lasted for one to one hour and a half. The researchers from the BLAST head office facilitated the group discussions. Some in-depth interviews and case studies were also carried out. This study covered 12 districts - Chittagong, Comilla, Dinajpur, Jessore, Kushtia, Khulna, Noakhali, Rangpur, Bogra, Rajshahi, Mymensingh and Tangail. The districts are geographically scattered throughout the country. It may thus help us to get an overall view of the situation in the country.

Statistical software SPSS was used to analyse the data. Samples were chosen randomly and conveniently.

4. Directives related to arrest and Section 54:

When the police set out to arrest people on a tip-off, they need to follow certain procedures. There are specific guidelines to abide by. According to the ruling of the High Court bench of Justice Md. Hamidul Haque and Justice Salma Masud Chowdhury, the police officers need to comply with the directives issued in relation to arrest, detention, remand and treatment of suspects.

The directions are as follows:

Directions that the police need to comply with during arrest:

- '1. No police officer shall arrest a person under Section 54 of the Code for the purpose of detaining him under Section 3 of the Special Powers Act, 1974.
- '2. A police officer shall disclose his identity and if demanded shall show his identity card to the person arrested and to the persons present at the time of arrest.
- '3. He shall record the reasons for the arrest and other particulars as mentioned in recommendation A (3) (b) in a separate register till a special diary is prescribed.'

[Recommendation A (3)(b): Immediately after bringing the person arrested to the police station, the police officer shall record the reasons for the arrest including the knowledge which he has about the involvement of the person in a cognisable offence, particulars of the offence, circumstances under which the arrest was made, the source of information and the reasons for believing in the information, description of the place, note the

No police officer shall arrest a person under Section 54 of the Code for the purpose of detaining him under Section 3 of the Special Powers Act, 1974.

date and the time of the arrest, name and address of the persons, if any, present at the time of the arrest in a diary kept in the police station for that purpose.]

- '4. If he finds any marks of injury on the person arrested, he shall record the reasons for such injuries and shall take the person to the nearest hospital or government doctor for treatment and shall obtain a certificate from the attending doctor.
- '5. He shall furnish the reason for arrest to the person arrested within three hours of bringing him in the police station.
- '6. If the person is not arrested from his residence or place of business, he shall inform the arrested relation of the person over phone, if any, or through a messenger within one hour of bringing him in the police station.
- '7. He shall allow the person arrested to consult a lawyer of his choice if he so desires or to meet any of his nearest relation.
- '8. When such person is produced before the nearest magistrate under Section 61, the police officer shall state in his forwarding letter under Section 167(1) of the Code as to why the investigation could not be completed within twenty-four hours why he considers that the accusation or the information against that person is well founded. He shall also transmit copy of the relevant entries in the case diary B.P. Form 38 to the same magistrate.
- '9. If the magistrate is satisfied on consideration of the reasons stated in the forwarding letter as to whether the accusation or the information is well founded and that there are materials in the case diary for detaining the person in custody, the magistrate shall pass an order for further detention in jail. Otherwise, he shall release the person forthwith.
- '10. If the magistrate releases a person on the ground that the accusation or the information against the person produced before him is not well-founded and there are no materials in the case diary against that person, he shall proceed under Section 190(1)(c) of the Code against that police officer who arrested the person without warrant for committing offence under Section 220 of the Penal Code.'

The rule was made absolute and the respondents were asked to implement the directions immediately.

(Remaining directives regarding remand in custody are cited in the discussion on remand.)

5. Section 54 or arrest without warrant

5.1. Situation in 2007: Public opinion

5.1.1. Civil society:

A total of 129 persons from civil society were interviewed. In the preliminary talks before going into questionnaire, most civil society members said that police officers do not abide by the directives of the High Court; and they ignore the orders on a regular basis. But when they were approached on specific questions, the responses were different and diverse, that we will see below.

Disclosure of identity

Most of the respondents told that the police do not show their identity cards during arrest and disclose their identity to the people present during arrest. However, 34.1% of the civil society members said that police disclose their

If the person is not arrested from his residence or place of business, he shall inform the arrested relation of the person over phone, if any, or through a messenger within one hour of bringing him in the police station.

identity during arrest. The police, however, said that they had not been provided with identity cards as yet. If they had identity cards with them, there would have been no reason not to disclose their identity.

Informing arrested person about the reason

Generally, it is alleged that the police do not tell the person the reasons for the arrest and do not give any chance to ask about it. However, 15.5% of the respondents said they inform the arrested of the reason for the arrest and 18.9% said they give the people the scope to ask about the reason for the arrest. In response to the question why the police do not tell about the reasons for the arrest or what they say when asked about the reason, responses were as following: (a) the police tell you will know the reason in the P/S or court (11.6%), (b) they do not care to answer (18.6%), (c) they like to show themselves busy (20%), and (d) they give importance to the order of the superiors (0.8%). It is to be noted that 11.6% said that common people are afraid even to ask the police about the reason. However, 37.2% of the respondents did not answer this question, as they did not have any direct experience regarding this situation. (See: Table 1)

Informing the family or relative of the arrested

The vast majority of the civil society members (82.2%) said that the police do not inform the family or relative of the arrested. However, the family members of an arrested person get news of the arrest from sources whatsoever.

Contact with lawyer or relative

Only 44.2% of the civil society members said that the police allow the arrestees to contact lawyers and relatives. Other thought that the police behaved unfriendly to the friends and family of arrested persons.

Police behaviour during and after arrest

Only 4.7% of the civil society members said that the police behaviour was not so bad; 62.8% said the behaviour of police is bad, 6.2% said they pursued money and 22.5% claimed that police behaviour depended on the class position of the arrested. The fact of food deprivation or being kept in unhygienic conditions is also explained as misbehaviour by 3.9% of the respondents. (Table 2)

Police torture after arrest is a widespread allegation; 91.2% of the civil society members said the police torture people after arrest. The natures of torture are (a) physical torture or reprimand (46.5%), (b) physical, mental and economic torture (36.4%), and (c) raping the female detainee (0.8%). However, 5.4% said torture style varies in accordance with the weight of the case. (Table 3)

Production before the court

The majority (73.6%) of the civil society members said that the arrested persons are produced before the court of magistrate within the specified 24 hours. On the other hand, 26.4% of the civil society members differed. (Table 4)

In response to the question as to why the arrested are not produced before court within 24 hours, 3.9% of the respondents explained that if the day of arrest is a holiday, it could not be possible for the police to produce the arrested before court within due time; 20.2% explained that police showed false time of arrest and produced the arrested in court later. On the other hand, 2.3% said the police kept the arrested in police stations and try to extort money. (Table 5).

Arrest under Section 54 of CrPC

Most of the civil society members said arrest under suspicion has not stopped.

Police torture after arrest is a widespread allegation; 91.2% of the civil society members said the police torture people after arrest. The natures of torture are (a) physical torture or reprimand (46.5%), (b) physical, mental and economic torture (36.4%), and (c) raping the female detainee (0.8%). However, 5.4% said torture style varies in accordance with the weight of the case.

Although the police nowadays do not use Section 54 very often, arrest has not been discontinued. Now the police implicate the people in serious charges such as murder, violence against women or robbery after arrest on groundless assumptions if they fail to gratify them with money. Of the civil society members, 93% per cent said the police torture the arrest to extort money receive undue facilities. They gave a horrific description of tortures: 12.4% said the police could do anything to extract statement - pouring hot water on body (25.6%) and physical assault and electric shock (10.1%) are other types of torture. A good 31% of the civil society members said the police do not torture the arrested if they are bribed. (Table 6)

So although the number of arrest under Section 54 of the CrPC has dropped to the bottom, arbitrary arrest under suspicion has not been stopped. Instead, ironically, the sufferings and harassment of the ordinary people have increased as they are being falsely implicated in cases related to heinous crimes.

5.1.2. Arrested Persons:

A total of 97 arrested were interviewed. They were arrested in various times in the previous five years. The majority of them (47.4%), however, were arrested in the last 6 months and 12.4% in the previous 7-12 months, and 19.6% the previous 1-2 years. (Table 7)

Disclosure of police identity

Of the arrested, 39.2% said that the police disclosed their identity during arrest and the rest gave negative answers. Only 24.7% of them were arrested against complaint or in cases filed before the arrest.

Giving the reasons for arrest

Of the arrest, 32% said that the police told them the reasons for the arrest and 46.4% admitted that the police gave them chance to ask about the reasons for the arrest. Of others, 53.6%, not given the chance to ask about the reasons, said they were deprived of the right because the police said that they (arrested) would know the reason after going to the police station or court, or because the police did not even cared to answer or the person was afraid of asking such questions.

About the mandatory provision of law that the police need to inform the family or relatives of the arrested persons about the arrest, 63.9% of the arrested said that the police did not inform their relatives or the family. On the other hand, 35.1% of the arrested said their families were informed by the police. (Table 8)

In cases when the police informed the families, they did it mostly within an hour (54.5%). They inform the families by messenger (44.8%) or over mobile phone (17.2%).

Scope to contact lawyers

In response to the question whether the arrested were given the scope to contact lawyers and relatives, 61.9% said they wanted to communicate with lawyers and relatives after arrest but only 32% of them were allowed to do so. (Table 9)

Police behaviour during and after arrest

Although almost all the arrested said they had been maltreated by the police in some way after the arrest, in response to the question about police behaviour 43.3% responded that police behaviour was not so bad. On the other hand, 39.2% of the arrested complained of manhandling and reprimanding and 9.3% of physical torture. The fact of food deprivation or being kept in unhygienic

About the mandatory provision of law that the police need to inform the family or relatives of the arrested persons about the arrest, 63.9% of the arrested said that the police did not inform their relatives or the family.

conditions is also explained as misbehaviour by some respondents (1.0%). (Table 10)

Of the 97 arrested, 43.3% complained that they had been tortured after the arrest (Table 11). Asked about the type of torture, 40.2% of them complained of physical torture, and 2.1% of physical, mental and financial torture. Of them, 57.7%, however, did not answer this question (Table 12).

Production before court

Of the arrested surveyed, 74% said they were produced before court within 24 hours of arrest.

The remaining 26% of the respondents produced before the court after 24 hours were asked about the reasons for the late production. Of them, 93.8% said they did not know the reasons, 2.1% said that the police kept them to extort money, 3.1% said the police showed false time of arrest and told the court that they were produced within 24 hours, but actually it was delayed. However, 1% of them said that the arrest was made on a holiday, which caused the late production. (Table 13).

Undue advantage taken by police

The arrested were asked whether they were tortured or pressured for money or other undue advantages. Of the arrested, 42.3% said they were either tortured or pressured. When asked whether they knew that the police could not arrest anyone without specific reasons, 41.2% responded that they did not know.

5.1.3. Situation in 2004 -2005

The researchers interviewed 49 people, arrested earlier, on the circumstances of their arrest. Among the 49 people, 22 (44%) said that the police had indeed introduced themselves or disclosed their identity during the arrest. Most arrests were made at night or in the morning and only one of them had a case filed against him before the arrest. The remaining 48 (98%) were arrested for the first time; 47 (95.9%) did not know the reason for the arrest; 79.6% (39 person) had no chance even to ask about the grounds of arrest. Asked why they could not inquire about the cause of arrest, 9 (18.4%) said that they were brought to the police station at once and had little chance to ask, 7 ((14.3%) were afraid to ask, 13 (26.5%) were not allowed to ask. Besides, 6 (12.2%) alleged that the police did not answer their questions, 2 (4.1%) were told by the police that the grounds would be explained after going to the police station, while 12 (24.5%) did not answer.

In most cases, the police did not inform the guardians, relatives, or friends of the arrested of the arrest. Thirty-nine persons (79.6%) said that the police did not send any message on their arrest to their families and friends. The remaining 10 (20.4%), two of whom were arrested at home, said that their kin were informed. The information was conveyed by a local boy, a messenger or over telephone.

Thirty-five of the arrested (71.4%) alleged that they had wanted to communicate with their families or with a lawyer, but police did not allow them. Twenty-five of them (51%) were deprived of the right to be defended by a lawyer as guaranteed under Article 33 of the Constitution.

They also gave graphic description of police behaviour during and after arrest. Eight of them (16%) alleged that they were beaten, nine (18%) reprimanded, 14 (28%) suffered indecent behaviour and seven (14%) were subjected to severe physical torture. Some complained that the police forced them to admit the accusation against them, kicked them with boots, used abusive language, tortured after blind-folding, tied with chair and beaten with stick on shoulder,

Of the 97 arrested, 43.3% complained that they had been tortured after the arrest (Table 11). Asked about the type of torture, 40.2% of them complained of physical torture, and 2.1% of physical, mental and financial torture.

knee and under the palms of the feet.

Torture after arrest is also a common phenomenon. Almost a half of the arrested said they were tortured after arrest. They were beaten, forced to admit allegations, slapped, kicked and beaten with stuff. The police also inflicted mental, physical torture, inhuman behaviour on them, had torn their shirts, seriously hurt their fingers by squeezing them with pliers. Others said police forced them to admit guilt. They were promised to be set free after admission. Some others were threatened to be implicated falsely with charges as serious as murder, arms smuggling and terrorism unless they gave money. Seventeen persons (34.7%) claimed that the police tried to extort money from them; Taka 1,000 were demanded from 10 people; six were physically tortured for the purpose.

5.2. Situation in 2007: police officers

Forty-eight police officers were interviewed. They said they could not produce their identity cards as they were not provided with such cards. They said they disclosed their identity to the arrested at the time of arrest. Identity cards are being given to some police staff and they now show the cards at the time of arrest, said the police officials.

Production before the court

Regarding producing the arrested before magistrate within 24 hours, they said that they are always cautious about maintaining this rule and only 7.1% of the police officials said that very few exceptions occurred (Table 14, 15). They explained that the exception occurs when a person is arrested on a holiday (Table 16).

Registering the allegation against arrestee

Police officers were asked that within which period the charge against the arrested is written down or furnished in the register kept at the station; 89.3% of them said allegations against the arrested are noted down in the register within one hour of bringing the person in the police station. According to 93% of the officials, it is completed within three hours (Table 17). Asked what types of information are recorded in the diary, the police officers said that usually they write down the name, address and previous crime record or case history.

Informing the family or relatives

According to 91.7% police officers, they inform the family or relatives of the arrested (Table 18). And in 69% of the cases, they inform the family or relatives over mobile. Sometimes messengers (4.8%) or village policemen (14.3%) are also employed to inform the relatives (Table 19).

Medical treatment of arrestee

Almost all of the police officers said that if the arrested are found ill or injured during arrest they are immediately sent to hospital.

How many arrests under s. 54

Arrest under Section 54 has declined drastically. The police now arrest a very few people under Section 54 (Table 20). In response to the question why arrests are made under Section 54, most police officers said they make arrest under Section 54 in accordance with nine clauses specified in the section.

Others specifically mentioned that suspicious loitering; bad company and suspicion of involvement or probable involvement with theft are reasons for arrest under Section 54. Sometimes they also the arrests under Section 54 when guardians bring their derailed or drug addicted wards to put in custody for a certain period.

Arrest under Section 54 has declined drastically. The police now arrest a very few people under Section 54 (Table 20). In response to the question why arrests are made under Section 54, most police officers said they make arrest under Section 54 in accordance with nine clauses specified in the section.

Others specifically mentioned that suspicious loitering; bad company and suspicion of involvement or probable involvement with theft are reasons for arrest under Section 54. Sometimes they also the arrests under Section 54 when guardians bring their derailed or drug addicted wards to put in custody for a certain period.

When sec 54 arrest increases

As for when the number of arrests under Section 54 increases, 57.1% of the police officials surveyed said that it was not possible for them to mention the time, 26.2% said that arrests under Section 54 were made always more or less and 15.5% said such arrests increased during political unrest. However, 1.2% said the number of such arrests increases as government changes (Table 21). Asked whether the number of such arrests increases during political movement or due to influence by high government officers or personal benefit, 8.3% police officers avoided answering the question. A majority of them (70.2%) responded negatively, while 21.4% admitted such increases for reasons mentioned (Table 22). About the prevalence of such influence, up to 61.1% said such influence existed almost all the time, but 22.2% said such happenings seldom happened (Table 23).

About High Court directives

Only 53.6% officers said that the High Court directives on Section 54 were sent to the police stations officially (Table 24).

Of the police officials interviewed, 66.7% claimed informed of the directives, 29.85% said they did not know of the directives and 3.6% remained silent about it (Table 25).

The police officers, who claimed to be informed of the directives, were asked about the contents of the directives. Most of them avoided answering or explaining the directives; and the response of some officer was not very convincing (Table 26).

5.2.1. Police officers on arrest under Section 54: 2004-2005

In the 2005 study, 49 police officials were interviewed. They were asked about the information regarding a person arrested under Section 54 written in the register kept at the police station. When the officers were asked, they said that they need to note personal information of the arrested such as name, address, age, sex, occupation, etc (55%), nature and description of the crime (47%), nature or behaviour of arrested (35%), relevant sections of the code and weight of the offence and criminal records, if any.

The High Court directed police officers to record the charges against the arrested within three hours after taking them to the police station. Of the police officials, surveyed in the 2005 study, 32% said that they had to record the charges in accordance with the specific section, 6.4% within 24 hours, 12.7% within the lowest possible time, 6.4% within 15 days, 10.6% according to the accusation and one of them said it was the highest 3 months.

Thirty-four (72%) of the officers said that they did inform the relatives, friends or family of the arrested. They informed them by sending messengers (4.2%) such as persons familiar with them or neighbours, sending chowkidars (6.4%), sending dafadars (8.5%), over telephone (40.4%) and by whatever means possible (32%).

The officers provided medical care if the person arrested was injured or ill during arrest. They had provided them with first aid (23 respondents) and sent them to local upazila health complex (26 respondents) for treatment. They also

said that immediate treatment had been provided in accordance with the degree of illness, although some said minimum measures were taken.

All of the police officers interviewed said that they produced the arrested person before a magistrate within 24 hours of arrest. They appeared to be very keen to follow this rule. This is supported by the answers of the arrested as well. Fifteen of the 47 police officials said that there were also exceptions to the rule. According to the police officials, delayed production before magistrate may be caused by different problems including distance (5 respondents), communications (7 respondents) and transport (4 respondents). They also mentioned that the delay might have occurred for investigation and even of external influence.

Police officers working in different police stations in districts are not well informed of the high court directives on Section 54. Among the 47 police officials interviewed, 35 (74.5%) said that the directives had been sent to the police station and 33 (70%) said they knew of the content of the direction.

When asked about the contents of the directives, they said that no one should be arrested without a reason (20 respondents); Section 54 should not be abused (1 respondent); police officers should disclose his identity before arresting anyone (1 respondent); the arrested should be allowed to meet his lawyer (10 respondents); person arrested under Section 54 should not be detained under the Special Powers Act 1974 (1 respondent); investigation must be completed as soon as possible (3 respondents); reason for arrest must be put down on the police station diary within three hours of arrest (2 respondents); relatives should be informed promptly (2 respondents); no one should be harassed (1 respondent) and if the arrested is injured during arrest police will note it down and provide treatment immediately (2 respondents). Thirteen of the 47 police officers did not answer.

These replies show that their knowledge of the directives is not very clear. It seems that they know partially or vaguely. It might have happened that the copies of the directives were not made available to them or they were not informed thoroughly.

More than a half of the police officers interviewed (24 respondents, 51%) said that there is an ample scope for the abuse of Section 54. Twenty-six (55%) confirmed that it was abused. When asked to categorise the rate of abuse, 20 (42%) said it is seldom abused; eight said 'sometimes,' two said 'often' and 13 believed that it was never abused. According to the police officials, who confirmed the abuse of the section, it is misused because of influence of powerful political leaders (11 respondents), manipulation by local influential persons (11 respondents) and ignorance of people about the law (1 respondent). Social situation and absence of complainant are also responsible for the abuse (or use) of the section. However, some officers said that due to improvement in law and order and increased consciousness, arrests under Section 54 and its exploitation were on the decline.

All the police officers, except for one, said that the people arrested under Section 54 were not detained under the Special Powers Act 1974.

Forty-four per cent of the officers (21 respondents) acknowledged that mass arrests under Section 54 go up during special police operations persuaded by high political leaders and government officials. They cited other reasons for the increase in the number of such arrests - during political unrest (13 respondents), at the order of the government and administration (2 respondents), during massive political programmes of the opposition party (1 respondents) and during volatile situations (2 respondents).

Forty-four per cent of the officers acknowledged that mass arrests under Section 54 go up during special police operations persuaded by high political leaders and government officials.

Majority of the officers (37 respondents, 78%) believe that mass arrest improves law and order.

5.3. Magistrate, 2007:

A total of 17 magistrates were interviewed in 12 districts in the 2007 study. The first question was how many cases under Section 54 they received in courts a month. No magistrate could furnish the actual figure. They were answering instantly without records in hand. Two (11.8%) magistrates said it was about 5 cases, 2 (11.8%) about 10 cases, 2 (11.8%) 20 cases, 3 (17.6%) 50 cases. However, 8 (47.1%) magistrates did not mention any number (Table 27).

Why arrest under Section 54

Political occurrence has been shown a good cause for the arrest under Section 54 by 11 (64.7%) magistrates. Two magistrates (11.8%) did not specify any reason, while 4 (23.5) did not answer (Table 28). And the number of such arrests increases because of deterioration in law and order according to 6 (35.3 %) magistrates, because of political occurrence and disturbance according to 2 (11.8%) magistrates, while the rest 9 (52.9 %) did not answer (Table 29).

From Section 54 to Special Powers Act

One of the directives in the BLAST case was not to put any person, arrested under Section 54, on a preventive detention under the Special Powers Act. However, anomaly is not rare, admitted each of the 17 magistrates. In the last six months, 10 (58.8%) magistrate's courts each remanded in detention under the Special Powers Act at least one person arrested under Section 54 (Table 30).

Arrest and law and order situation

At the fag end of the BNP-led alliance government (2001-2006), some incidents of mass arrest took place across the country. Regarding this we asked the magistrates that whether such blanket arrests contributed to the improvement of law and order. In response, 6 (35.3) magistrates said positively while 2 (11.8%) responded negatively; and 9 (52.9%) magistrates avoided responding the question (Table 31). Asked how the blanket arrest contributed to improving law and order, 15 (88.2%) magistrates said usually criminals were arrested which contributed to improving law and order (Table 32).

Production before court

As for production of arrested before the court of the magistrates, all of the 17 magistrates said that they were produced within 24 hours of the arrest as per legal requirement (Table 33). Asked about any exception, 8 (47.1%) magistrates said that there was no exception, while 7 (41.2%) magistrates admitted the fact of exception and the rest 2 (11.8%) did not answer the question (Table 34). However, all 7 magistrates, who admitted the fact of exception, said that they had asked the police official concerned to explain the cause of such exceptions (Table 35).

Furnishing charge against arrestee

Asked within which period charges are furnished against the arrested after bringing them to police station, 2 (11.8%) of the magistrates responded that it was made immediately, 2 (11.8%) said within one hour, while 13 (76.5%) did not give specific answer to this question saying that they were not directly related with this job. They know that everything was done as per legal provisions (Table 36).

Recording information in thana diary

The magistrates were asked what bits of information on the arrested are recorded in the thana diary. Eleven (64.7%) magistrates avoided the question

saying that it did not relate to their area. However, 6 (35%) magistrates informed that generally name, address and previous crime records or case information were written down in thana diary (Table 37). Asked whether the thana diary was rightly maintained. 13 (64.7%) magistrates said that it is not their concern and the matter related to the police station. However, 4 (23.8%) responded that it was rightly maintained (Table 38). The 4 magistrates were again asked how they were sure that the diary was rightly maintained. Only 2 (11.8% of the total 17) magistrates said that they were sure of it by examining the FIR. The rest avoided the question (Table 39).

Informing the family or relatives

In answering the question whether the family or relatives of the arrested are informed by the police, only 2 magistrates (11.8%) responded positively. The rest 15 (88.2%) magistrates said that they were not the right persons to answer the question and the police officials could be asked (Table 40).

When the arrested are sick

Magistrates were asked about steps being taken if the arrested fell sick. Most of the magistrates (11 or 64.%) promptly responded that the arrested were taken to physician or admitted to hospital, 2 magistrates (11.8%) said that it was a matter of police, the rest 4 (23.5%) avoided responding the question (Table 41). The magistrates who said that the arrested fallen sick were taken to doctor or hospital were again asked how they became sure of this. In response, only 4 magistrates (23.5%) said that the police informed them of this. The rest 13 (76.5%) magistrates either bypassed or could not respond convincingly (Table 42).

Asked if no such treatment arrangement was made for a man arrested, fallen sick or injured, 4 (23.5%) magistrates said that they directed the district police superintendent or appropriate authorities to make such arrangement. The rest 13 (76.5%) magistrates either bypassed or could not respond convincingly (Table 43).

About the High Court directives

About the High Court directives relating to Section 54 and 167 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the magistrates were asked whether the directives had been sent to them officially. Only 4 magistrates (23.5%) said that they had received it and they had been informed of it, 5 (29.4%) said they had not received it. The rest 8 (47.1%) magistrates, however, said they did not have any copy of the directives in their magistracy for which they could not say whether it was officially sent to their offices (Table 44 and 45).

6. Directives on Section 167 or remand:

The High Court bench also issued directives on the application of Section 167 of the Code of Criminal Procedure that allows the police to take the persons detained in custody to interrogate them in the case.

The directives are as follows:

Procedure about remand:

11. If the magistrate passes an order for further detention in jail, the investigating officer shall interrogate the accused if necessary for the purpose of investigation in a room in the jail till the room as mentioned in recommendation B(2) (b) is constructed.
12. In the application for taking the accused in police custody for interrogation, the investigating officer shall state reasons as mentioned in recommendation B(2) (c).

- 13
13. If the magistrate authorises detention in police custody he shall follow the recommendation contained in recommendation B(2) (c) (d) and B(3) (b) (c) (d).
 14. The police officer of the police station who arrests a person under section 54 or the investigating officer who takes a person in police custody or the jailor of the jail, as the case may be, shall at once inform the nearest magistrate as recommended in recommendation B(3) (e) of the death of any person who dies in custody.
 15. A magistrate shall inquire into the death of a person in police custody or in jail as recommended and recommendation C(1) immediately after receiving information of such death."

The rule was made absolute with the directions to implement the directives immediately.

7. Remand or Section 167

7.1. Situation in 2007: public opinion

7.1.1. Civil society:

As we have earlier discussed that according to the High Court directives in the BLAST case, the police cannot torture the arrested during interrogation on remand and the interrogation on remand should be in a specified way in a specified place - a room in jail with one glass-made transparent wall. And during the interrogation on remand, any relative or lawyer of the arrested person may be present outside the especially built room, so that it is observed what is happening during remand. Actually, what is the scenario so far on remand? One hundred and twenty-nine members of civil society were asked about where the interrogation on remand took place. A high majority of them, 103 (79.8%) said the interrogation of an accused on remand in police custody takes place in the concerned police station, 17.1% said it takes place wherever the police like and only 2.3% civil society member said it takes place at jail gate. Almost all of them were doubtful whether a single remand case was dealt with in accordance with the High Court directives (Table 46).

The civil society members were next asked whether any relative or a lawyer could be present during interrogation of a person detained and remanded in custody by the police. Almost all the interviewees responded in such language that they never heard such incident happened earlier. The response indirectly conveys that no relative or lawyer remains present during interrogation on remand. These civil society members think that there are some clear reasons behind the non-compliance of the directives. Asked about the reasons for torturing the arrested remanded in custody, 36.4% said for extracting information, 13.2% said just for extorting money from the detained for not torturing heavily, 12.4% said the police do what they wish for lack of monitoring and accountability, 14% said the police were simply not interested in going by the rules as it does not make any difference in their personal performance in service, while 24% did not answer the question (Table 47).

7.1.2. People remanded in custody:

Eighteen persons, remanded in police custody for interrogation, were asked how the police behaved with them during their custodial periods. Of them, 5.55% said the police tortured them by pouring hot water on body, 11.11% alleged physical torture by the police, 16.66% said that the police beat them by hanging, applying electric shock and burning with cigarette, 5.55% said the police did whatever necessary for extracting information. Besides, 16.66% claimed that the

police behaved decently with them, 11.11% did not reply, while 5.55% said the police do not torture if bribed (Table 48).

Although according to the rule and the High Court directives, the interrogation should be held in a room in the jail in presence of the relatives and lawyer of the arrested, all of the people remanded in police custody said that they were interrogated in the police station and in all the cases no lawyers or relatives were present during interrogation.

7.1.3. Situation in 2004-2005:

People remanded:

In the 2005 study, 49 people, earlier arrested under Section 54 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, were surveyed. Of them, nine (18.4%) were remanded in police custody for interrogation, three (6.1%) did not answer the question and the rest said they were not remanded in police custody.

The nine remanded in police custody were asked how the police behaved them. Two of them said they were beaten by the police. Two said the police beat and misbehaved with them and tried to force admission from them coercively of committing the alleged offences. One was slapped, given electric shock, beaten under the palm of the feet after being hung from the roof and kicked by several constables together and indiscriminately. One said the police beat him and tried to force admission from him coercively of committing the alleged offences. Two of the nine persons, however, said the police interrogated them generously, while the rest one said he was not questioned at all, because the remand was unnecessary.

No one was found who said that his relative or lawyer were present during interrogation and remand. Asked why no relatives and lawyers were present during their interrogation, of the nine remanded in police custody, two said they did not know the provision for interrogation in the presence of relatives and lawyers. One said the police did not give the scope to communicate with the relatives or lawyers. Two said they did not inform anyone; one said he was not interrogated and the rest three did not answer the question.

7.2. Situation in 2007: Section 167 - police officer

Usefulness of remand for extracting information

A total of 84 police officers were asked about the usefulness of remanding the arrested in police custody under Section 167 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for extracting information or curbing crimes. In response, 56% of the police officers said it is moderately helpful and 14.3% partially helpful. On the other hand, 22.6% police officers think it is indispensable for extracting information from the crime suspects. However, only 1.2% police officer thinks it is not helpful at all, and 6% did not answer the question. The officers who think remand is in some way helpful were again questioned why and how Section 167 is useful; 52.4% police officers simply said it is very helpful to get secret information. The other police officers explained that interrogation under remand help to get confessions (1.2%), elicit information from cunning criminals (10.7%), getting clues to serious crimes (15.5%), identify unidentified criminals (6%) etc (Table 49).

Asked why Section 167 that details the provision of remanding any person in police custody for interrogation is useful, 1.2% of the police officers said it helps in getting confession and rapid disposal of the case. Majority of them (1.2%) said it is helpful for getting secret information, 10.7% said it is useful for getting information from cunning criminals and 15.5% said solitary interrogation helps

getting clue of serious crime, 6% to identify the criminals, (Table 50).

Techniques used in remand

The police officers were asked about the techniques they use in interrogating the arrested on remand. The majority of the officers (69%) said they use the techniques of questioning intellectually, while 26.2% police officers admitted that they use torture and threat for extracting information from the persons remanded in custody. However, these officers mentioned that people remanded in custody for interrogation on ordinary charges are never tortured; 4.8% of the police officers, however, did not answer this question (Table 51).

They also mentioned although the place of interrogation of any person on remand is determined by law, there is no such glass-rooms in any police station in the country as directed by the High Court. So they need to interrogate the persons remanded in custody either at the jail gate or in the police station.

Awareness of High Court directives on remand

The police officers were asked whether they were informed of the High Court directives on remand. More than a half of the police officers (52.4 %) said that they were informed of the directives. On the other hand, 35 (41.7%) police officers admitted that they did not know the directives. However, 5.9% avoided answering the question (Table 52).

Presence of relative or lawyers during interrogation

One of the directives is that during interrogation of any person on remand, any of his relations or lawyers of their choice will be present there. The directive was not complied with. Asked why they do not comply with the directive, surprisingly, 52.4% police officers said that there was no such rule to allow any relatives or lawyers of the person remanded in custody to be present during interrogation. At least 13.1% of the police officers said no relatives or lawyers of any person remanded are allowed to be present during interrogation of the person for the sake of proper investigation. A good portion of them (34.5%) did not answer this question (Table 53).

Although by way of talking, some police officers said if they allow lawyers or relatives to be present during interrogation of a person on remand, no such factual evidence in favour of the claim could be gathered.

7.2.1. Situation in 2004-2005

Police view on remand:

In the 2005 study, 47 police officers were interviewed. Most of them considered remand as an important tool to fight against crime and punish the criminals. Of the police officials interviewed, 27.7% considered it indispensable, 46.8% believed it helped substantially to get confession from the accused, 19.8% thought it helped little. Besides, 2.1% said it was not helpful at all, while 4.3% avoided answering the question.

Asked how remand helps in fighting against crime, 43 of the police officials said it was necessary to dig into the facts of a case, 4 said it was to recover illegal arms, 2 said it was to recover stolen goods and 6 said to arrest fugitives.

They described different techniques applied to extract information from the suspects. Of them, 34 said they conduct series of careful interrogation sessions, five put mental pressure, two psychological interrogation techniques, two threats, and two said they put questions depending on the nature of the accused, while two avoided the query. They also repeatedly asked questions on the incident and sometimes use threats and beating too, explained the police officials.

Only eight of the officers said that relatives or lawyers of the accused remanded into custody were present during interrogation. Others clarified that due to shortage of time (4 respondents); for providing false identity by the person arrested (5 respondents); for not appointing a lawyer by the arrested (2 respondents); for preventing the scope of information leakage (5 respondents); for not having the facilities or provisions (2 respondents); as no one comes (2 respondents); to avoid manipulation (6 respondents); for ignorance (1 respondent) and owing to the reluctance of the arrested to provide information and to be interrogated before others (2 respondents), they take prisoners in custody without the presence of any relative or lawyer.

Officers said they performed a series of careful interrogation sessions (34 respondents), put mental pressure (5 respondents), use various techniques (7 respondents), conduct psychological interrogation (2 respondents), and ask different questions on the incident, threat and beat.

Thirty-five officers claimed that they knew about the High Court order on remand (Table 47). Eight said that interrogation should be held in a glass-partitioned room so that relatives or lawyer of the detained can see them during the session but cannot hear the proceedings; eighteen officers said the detained should be tortured physically; two said general diaries of the case should be produced before magistrate. Other answers were: cannot say now; the provisions of the section should not be abused, have not studied yet, etc.

7.3. Magistrate: 2007

Usefulness of remand for extracting information

All the 17 magistrates were asked about the usefulness of remand under Section 167 for extracting information or for curbing crimes. In response, 6 (35.3%) magistrates said it was somewhat helpful, another 6 (35.3%) magistrates said it is moderately helpful. However, 5 (29.4%) magistrates stressed the necessity for remand saying it was indispensable (Table 54).

The magistrates were further asked why and how the provision for remand is useful. Of them, two said it helps in getting confession and rapid disposal of the case, six said it is necessary for getting information from cunning criminals, two said solitary interrogation helps in getting clues to serious crime and two said it helps to identify unidentified criminals, while five avoided the question (Table 55).

Techniques used in remand

Asked about the techniques used in interrogating persons remanded in custody, 11 magistrates (64.7%) did not answer the question convincingly, rather avoided answering. Only 4 (23.3%) magistrates said intellectual questioning is the way, 2 (11.8%) magistrates admitted tortures and threat are used in many cases (Table 56).

Presence of relative or lawyers during remand

As to the High Court directives to allow relative or lawyer of the person remanded in police custody to be present during interrogation of the person, the magistrates were asked whether they allow such presence of relative or lawyer. Surprisingly 15 (88.2%) magistrate responded in the negative, while the rest two (11.8%) magistrates did not answer (Table 57).

Asked why, 9 (52.9%) magistrates did not respond, 6 (35.3%) magistrates said there was no such rule to allow, and the rest 2 (11.8%) said the presence of relative or lawyer was not allowed for the sake of proper investigation, as such presence may hamper investigation (Table 58).

Presence of relative or lawyers during remand

As to the High Court directives to allow relative or lawyer of the person remanded in police custody to be present during interrogation of the person, the magistrates were asked whether they allow such presence of relative or lawyer. Surprisingly 15 (88.2%) magistrate responded in the negative, while the rest two (11.8%) magistrates did not answer (Table 57).

Asked why, 9 (52.9%) magistrates did not respond, 6 (35.3%) magistrates said there was no such rule to allow, and the rest 2 (11.8%) said the presence of relative or lawyer was not allowed for the sake of proper investigation, as such presence may hamper investigation (Table 58).

About tortures in remand

The magistrates were asked about the allegations of torture of the arrested during interrogation in custody. In response, 8 (47.1%) of the magistrates denied such allegations. On the other hand, 3 (17.6%) magistrates admitted that sometimes some incidents of torture had happened, 4 (23.5%) magistrates said that they were not aware of such torture in their jurisdiction and the rest 2 (11.8%) magistrates did not say anything about this (Table 59). The three magistrates, who admitted that sometimes the detained are tortured, were asked what steps they took in case of such torture. In response, two of them said that in such case they sent the person to hospital and advised the police superintendent concerned to punish the police officer responsible for the torture (Table 60).

In the same way, the eight magistrates, who denied any torture during interrogation in custody, were further asked how they became sure that the persons remanded was not tortured during interrogation. Six (35.3%) magistrates said that they confirmed it asking the person remanded in custody and recording their statements under Section 164 of the Code of Criminal Procedure after the completion of the period of the remand. Two (11.8%) magistrates said they could understand by observing the physical condition of the person remanded (Table 61).

Submitting medical certificate by Police

According to the High Court directives, persons, remanded in police custody for interrogation, must be examined before they are taken in custody and after the completion of the remand. And medical certificates describing their physical conditions both before and after the remand shall be submitted before the court. Asked whether the police submits such medical certificates, all the 17 (100%) magistrates said the police normally never submit such medical certificates (Table 62).

Awareness of the High Court directives on remand

All the 17 magistrates were asked whether they were informed of the High Court directives on remand. Of them, 10 (58.8 %) said that they were informed of the directives, 4 (23.5%) admitted that they were not well aware of the directives and no answer was obtained from the rest 3 (17.6%) magistrates (Table 63).

Political or other pressure

One of the questions to magistrates was how was the undue pressure from the political or departmental high-ups in the service. Of the 17 magistrates, 12 (70.6%) responded that there was no such pressure. They were further asked whether they were actually without any pressure. Then some magistrates explained that after Fakruddin Ahmed's caretaker government had come to power,

there was no such pressure. However, 5 (29.4%) magistrates refused to answer this question (Table 64).

8. Opinion in the group discussions:

Disclosure of police identity

One of the questions in our questionnaire was whether the police disclose their identity at the time of arrest. There were two options for answering: yes or no. Most of the people surveyed responded in the negative, that is, the police do not disclose their identity at that time.

The same question was put before the participants in the focus group discussions and the participants were asked to explain the actual situation regarding this. The discussants said that actually they do not find any change in police behaviour in this respect. It is the same as it was earlier. Police officers never bother to show identity cards as they think their uniforms are their identity and they do not need to disclose or show their identity.

However, police officers claimed that they were yet to get their identity cards. If a police officer has an identity card, there is no reason he would not show it to prove his identity.

Participants in the discussions argued the uniforms could not be the identity these days when criminal activities are frequently done by miscreants in the uniforms of the police or the Rapid Action Battalion. So, one cannot arrest someone without showing or disclosing his identity just because he is dressed in police uniform.

Some other opined that disclosure of police identity is necessary not because some people are doing criminal activities by wearing police uniforms, but because it is a courtesy, it is a matter of showing respect to human rights of the person being arrested under suspicion. While arresting under Section 54, the police must understand that he is arresting a suspected person, not a proven criminal. That is why police behaviour during the arrest under Section 54 must be gentle and they must disclose their identity on their own accord before being asked by the person to be arrested. But most policemen do not show minimum respect to the human rights of a person to be arrested.

Participants are requested to explain what roles the persons to be arrested usually play when police officers do not disclose their identity. In response, they said that common people even do not dare to inquire about the reasons behind the arrest, let alone ask the identity of the police officer.

Is it that people are unconscious? People do not know what are their rights during and after arrest? Most of the participants disagree with it. Because of campaigns by BLAST and some other human rights organisations, common people are now much more conscious. They know their rights and police duties. But when a police does violate law, people do not dare to tell anything. In this respect, as there is no independent forum to report on police misbehaviour and non-compliance with law, common people feel helpless.

Compliance with High Court guidelines to follow after arrest

As per the Supreme Court directives, the police will convey the news of the arrest to the family of the arrested within an hour of the arrest, if arrest is made outside the house or office. The police will record necessary information on the arrested in the diary kept in the police station within 3 hours of arrest. And the police will produce the arrested person before court within 24 hours. Participants were invited to discuss the degree of compliance with these directives.

Most of the participants are of the opinion none of these directives were appropriately complied with. Only the part of the directives that speaks about informing the relatives of the arrested is complied with to a good extent. In this respect the participants, who were arrested under Section 54 earlier on different occasions, admitted that their friends and family were informed within short time, meaning around an hour. But it is the fact that the police do not always inform the family. Sometimes interested lawyers or local people who were present at the time of arrest informed the family. In a word, the news of arrest in most of the cases reaches to the family and relatives of the arrested in some ways. By way of the Supreme Court directive, this compliance is maintained.

However, the participants provided different types of information as to recording information on the suspected arrested by the police within 3 hours of the arrest. Most civil society members aggrievedly said that Section 54 is actually a moneymaking device for the police. In majority cases, the police do not arrest people because of suspicion, but because of their whim or necessity of some extra income. They arrest people, keep them in police van or take in police custody. If these arrested people can in any way meet the police demand, which is in most cases money, they get released. Otherwise, tortures come down on them and new cases are made. These new cases may be of any type from mugging and theft to killing. Sometimes such people arrested implicated in old cases filed with the police. This trend of implication in different types of cases - new or old - has been established as restrictions have been imposed on Section 54 arrests.

In the same line, the participants, who earlier faced arrest under Section 54, narrated their experiences which show that in most cases this was not done. In most cases, the arrested are kept in police custody for hours without recording anything about the arrest or without informing anything about the reasons of the arrest. Some of the people arrested admitted that they had been implicated in false or old cases.

Regarding the production of the arrested before magistrate's court within 24 hours of the arrest, similar allegation came from civil society members and the arrested. They said in many cases the arrested persons were not produced before court within 24 hours of the arrest although the police show in their documents that it has been done. The police make their documents about arrest in such a way that they can easily show that the arrested have been arrested within 24 hours before production in court. As it is not easy to detect the exact time of the arrest and verify whether a person arrested has been produced in court in due time, the police do this job according to their will. The civil society members are of the opinion that here is a loophole in the existing law. If there were such a rule that whenever the police would arrest someone, they would leave a note on a piece of paper writing the time of the arrest, then it would be used to verify the time of the arrest and production before court.

We, the researchers, could not present any police officer in any of the sessions of our focus group discussion to defend the allegations made by civil society and the people arrested. The research was conducted just after a month the caretaker government of Dr. Fakhruddin Ahmed had assumed office. At that time, the police administration was too busy to join such a long discussion session. However, when the researchers went to the police stations for interviews, the allegations were discussed with them.

The police officer brushed aside the allegations and said in majority cases recording information in the diary at the police station was completed within 3 hours. They also said they always produced the arrested before magistrate within

24 hours of the arrest, except for some allowed and justifiable causes.

- Likewise, the magistrates told that usually police produces the arrested before court within 24 hours and if exception occurs, they ask explanations from the police officer.

Cautions while granting remand

It is admitted that in majority of remand cases the person under remand is inhumanly tortured during interrogation by the police. And it should not be expected that the deep-rooted misbehaviour and colonial attitude of police will go overnight. However, it is thought that one of the ways to decrease the human rights violation of an arrested person is to take utmost care and caution by the magistrates while granting remand. But how much caution they actually take while granting remand?

The civil society members think that magistrates do not take sufficient cautions. They grant remand as their routine work without going into the fact of the case, sometimes even without judging the merit of the case. It has become common that police will ask for 7 days' remand, magistrate will grant 3 days' remand; again police will ask for 3 days' remand and the magistrate will grant 1 day's remand. Refusal to grant remand is rare compared with granting the remand.

The claim of civil society is somewhat conceived to be true as the claim corroborates to what the participants earlier arrested and put under remand said. These people frankly narrated the harrowing tales of their life under remand. Many of them were arrested without any cause under Section 54, but when the police asked for remand to interrogate them, magistrate granted remand where the police inhumanly treated them.

As no magistrate could join the discussion sessions, the researchers approached their offices, and brought allegations to their notice. The magistrates said all of them take sufficient care in granting remand. A magistrate always tries to grant an appeal of remand after examining the merit of a case. But things must be judged taking the overall situation into account. There is a shortage of magistrates in the country. In a single sitting, a magistrate needs to deal with a numbers of cases. On the one hand, we demand speedy justice and, on the other hand, we demand special care for every case and it requires more time. If a magistrate is to examine each and every point of a case and scrutinise all the documents given, a magistrate would not be able to dispose of two or three cases a day. Then, there would be piles of case files on the table of each magistrate. So, for careful conduction and disposal of cases calls for the employment of a huge number of magistrates as soon as possible; no positive results are, otherwise, possible.

While asked about the granting of remand by magistrate in simple criminal cases. Magistrates said they do not know any accused personally; they do not bear any ill intention against anyone. So there is no basis of such allegations. Magistrates act on the document produced before him by the police and the parties. If police implicate any innocent person in any serious crime and produce the person before court without necessary documents showing him implicated with a serious crime and then appeal for remand, magistrates become obliged to grant a remand. Because as long as the man is not proved innocent in the course trial, it is not possible for magistrates to assume the innocence of the said man. Here, magistrates have little to do. Of course, experienced magistrates many times just by observing the accused and checking the document can understand the veracity of the cases, and act accordingly.

Medical test before and after remand

Though a few magistrates and police officers admitted the case of torture during interrogation under remand, it is an undeniable fact. To prevent such torture and inhuman treatment at the time of remand, the Supreme Court directives said that before and after every remand medical checkups of the person with remand shall be made and the reports of the checkups shall be produced before the magistrate court. The magistrates will verify, by himself or with the help of a doctor, both the reports and make sure that no torture happened during remand. And if the magistrate finds it otherwise, he will take appropriate measure.

About this, civil society almost in a single voice told that so far no such practice has been established. No such medical checkups are made before and after remand. The arrested and remanded persons corroborated with this.

We approached the police officers and magistrates for their opinions. Surprisingly, majority of the police officer as well as magistrates said they do not know about such rule or law and they have not received any guidance or training regarding this from higher authority. The police officers said whenever the persons arrested or remanded person fall sick, they take them to hospital and physicians for treatment, but they are not so guided to conduct medical check-up before and after remand. The magistrates also admitted that they have not received any guideline from higher authority. Also some police officers and magistrates admitted that from BLAST advocacy meeting and from their personal sources they had learnt about such obligations for medical checkups. But as no lawyers ever claimed for such check-up and as there was no guidance from higher authority, they did not do it.

Interrogation in glass built transparent room

The Supreme Court was not satisfied by only giving out directions for medical checkups before and after remand and submitting reports before court. It has clearly directed that interrogation during remand will take place in a room at least one of the walls of which is made of glass so that what is happening inside the room can be seen from outside. And any relative or lawyer with permission from court may also be present outside the interrogation room to see what is happening inside. Thus the Supreme Court directives endeavour to eliminate all the scopes for physical torture on people under remand. But below is the actual scenario.

Civil society members said that they found not a single case of such remand and interrogation in a room with at least one wall of glass. The persons who faced remand said that no lawyer is allowed to be present during remand, let alone close relatives.

While police officers were asked about this, they said that there was nothing ridiculous than this to ask the police to comply with this directive that interrogation under remand be conducted in a glass-walled room at the police station. There is not a single police station in Bangladesh where there is a room of such types. This is a matter of decision of higher authority and the government. Not a single police station can build such a room without any decision from higher authority. When the government will arrange for such rooms, the police must abide by the directive. The attitude or statement of the magistrates regarding this is an echo of what the police officers said.

As to the presence of a relative or a lawyer of remanded person during

interrogation under remand, the police officers are of the opinion that if it is allowed under the existing system, the aim of interrogation or remand will fail. If rooms are built at police stations as per Supreme Court directives, such presence of a relative or a lawyer may be possible.

Magistrates were asked whether they had earlier allowed presence of any relative or a lawyer in any case. Majority of the magistrates responded in the negative. Some magistrates said that they had not found a single precedence as to this. They said if they are so directed, they will allow the presence of remanded person's relative or lawyers.

9. Findings and recommendation:

A straight analysis of the study reveals that by the advocacy activities of BLAST, the awareness level of the common people as well as of the police is gradually increasing. During the focus group discussion and questionnaire survey, civil society members, common people - some people like shopkeepers, small businessmen, day labourers and rickshaw pullers - responded so spontaneously to the queries regarding arrest and remand, which astonished the researcher in some cases. These people admitted that they had acquired the legal knowledge from BLAST. Some police officers and magistrates happily said that they had personally tried to comply with the High Court directives regarding arrest and remand. In this respect, they acknowledged that different BLAST advocacy meetings have made them aware of their duties and responsibilities as to arrest and remand. Some police officers said that BLAST posters on arrest and remand messages in simple language was a tremendous help for them.

In spite of the considerable awareness among civil society members and common people and positive changes in some police officers as well as magistrates, the prime aim of BLAST advocacy activities could not be achieved; common people could not be saved from being illegally arrested, remanded and tortured. Everyday a large number of people face harassment, illegal arrest and torture by police.

It is true that the majority portion of police and magistrates are still unaware of the High Court directives as to arrest and remand. But it is also observed that the police officers and magistrates, who have been made aware by BLAST of all these directives, are not so sincere and willing to comply with these directives. Again, some police officers and magistrates, who were eager to comply with the directives, said for some special reasons, compliance with the directives is not possible.

Through our study, it has become clear that police and magistrates are the catalysts for making any positive changes in the areas of arrest and remand. But the police officers and magistrates will never play their roles unless they are so guided and logistically supported by the government.

Hence, following are some recommendations that may be helpful to prevent arbitrary arrest, torture and custodial violence, to change police behaviour and to enhance police-public relations.

- * The government should take initiatives for high-level advocacy the change the behaviour and attitude of the police, and such advocacy should be started from the level of the inspector general downwards.
- * The accountability of police officers should be ensured to bring about change in their behaviour.

- * The police should be allowed to act independent of political influence and the use of police for political purposes must be stopped.
- * Local watchdog civil society groups should be formed to monitor police conduct.
- * Motivational programmes should be taken up immediately to change the attitudes of the members of the police.

Appendix 1

Tables used in the report

Table 1: Why do not the police explain reasons?

	Frequency	Percent
Will know at the police station / in court	15	11.6
Don't care to answer	24	18.6
Police like to show themselves busy	26	20.2
Police give importance to orders of superiors	1	.8
Common people afraid to ask about it	15	11.6
No response	48	37.2
Total	129	100.0

Table 2: How is the police behaviour with the arrested during and after arrest?

	Frequency	Percent
Manhandling/ reprimanding	31	24.0
Bad behaviour	45	34.9
Not bad, but money demanded	8	6.2
Food deprivation / keeping in unhygienic place	5	3.9
Behaviour depends on class of the arrested	29	22.5
Not so bad	6	4.7
No response	5	3.9
Total	129	100.0

Table 3: What types of tortures are done?

	Frequency	Percent
Physical torture / reprimand	60	46.5
Physical, mental and economic torture	47	36.4
According to the weight of case	7	5.4
Raping the females detained	1	.8
No response	14	10.9
Total	129	100.0

Table 4: When did the police produce the arrested before court?

	Frequency	Percent
Within 24 hours	95	73.6
After 24 hours	34	26.4
Total	129	100.0

Table 5: If after 24 hour, why?

	Frequency	Percent
For bribe	3	2.3
The day is a holiday	5	3.9
Showing false time of arrest	26	20.2
No answer	95	73.6
Total	129	100.0

Table 6: What types of torture police do?

	Frequency	Percent
Whatever they want / need to extract confession	16	12.4
Pouring hot water on body	33	25.6
Physical assault and electric shock	13	10.1
No torture, if bribed	40	31.0
According to the nature of crime	1	.8
No response	26	20.2
Total	129	100.0

Table 7: When were you arrested?

	Frequency	Percent
1-6 month	46	47.4
7-12 months	12	12.4
1-2 years	19	19.6
2-3 years	9	9.3
3-4 years	3	3.1
4-5 years	2	2.1
>5 years	5	5.2
No Answer	1	1.0
Total	97	100.0

Table 8: Did the police inform your family/
relative of the arrest?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	34	35.1
No	62	63.9
No response	1	1.0
Total	97	100.0

Table 9: Did the police give the scope to contact with
lawyer and relatives?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	31	32.0
No	60	61.9
No response	6	6.2
Total	97	100.0

Table 10: How was police behaviour with
you during and after arrest?

	Frequency	Percent
Manhandling/ reprimanding	38	39.2
Bad behaviour	1	1.0
Not bad, but money demanded	2	2.1
Food deprivation/ keeping in unhygienic place	1	1.0
Not so bad	42	43.3
Physical assault/torture	9	9.3
No response	4	4.1
Total	97	100.0

Table 11: Did the police torture after arrest?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	42	43.3
No	55	56.7
Total	97	100.0

Table 12: What types of torture did they do on you?

	Frequency	Percent
Physical torture/reprimand	39	40.2
Physical, mental and economic torture	2	2.1
No Response	56	57.7
Total	97	100.0

Table 13: If produced before magistrate after 24 hour, why?

	Frequency	Percent
No Answer	91	93.8
To extort bribe	2	2.1
The day was a holiday	1	1.0
Showing false time of arrest	3	3.1
Total	97	100.0

Table 14: When do you produce the arrested before court?

	Frequency	Percent
Within 24 hours	83	98.8
Missing system	1	1.2
Total	84	100.0

Table 15: Does any exception occur in producing the arrested before court within 24 hours?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	6	7.1
No	75	89.3
No response	3	3.6
Total	84	100.0

Table 16: If exceptions happen, why?

	Frequency	Percent
For extorting bribe	2	2.4
The day is a holiday	5	6.0
No response	77	91.7
Total	84	100.0

Table 17: When are the charges written down/furnished after bringing an arrested to the police station?

	Frequency	Percent
1 hour	75	89.3
2 hours	1	1.2
3 hours	2	2.4
6 hours	2	2.4
8 hours	3	3.6
No response	1	1.2
Total	84	100.0

Table 18: Are the relatives informed after taking a person in the police station?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	77	91.7
No	6	7.1
No response	1	1.2
Total	84	100.0

Table 19: How they are informed

	Frequency	Percent
Mobile phone	58	69.0
By messenger	4	4.8
Chawkidar/village police	12	14.3
No response	10	11.9
Total	84	100.0

Table 20: How many arrests occurred under Section 54 in your thana in last 6 months?

	Frequency	Percent
0	4	4.8
1	6	7.1
2	13	15.5
3	12	14.3
4	3	3.6
5	14	16.7
6	3	3.6
7	7	8.3
8	1	1.2
10	2	2.4
12	2	2.4
15	3	3.6
20	1	1.2
25	2	2.4
30	2	2.4
40	1	1.2
80	2	2.4
No response	6	7.1
Total	84	100.0

Table 21: When does the number of arrest under Section 54 increase?

	Frequency	Percent
Political occurrence	13	15.5
Government change	1	1.2
Not specific	48	57.1
Always	22	26.2
Total	84	100.0

Table 22: Does this kind of arrest increase during political activities/influenced by higher government officials/ for personal benefit?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	18	21.4
No	59	70.2
No response	7	8.3
Total	84	100.0

Table 23: How is the prevalence of such influence?

	Frequency	Percent
Always	2	11.1
Very often	1	5.6
Often	11	61.1
Seldom	4	22.2
Total	18	100.0

Table 24: Were the High Court directives on Section 54 sent to your thana officially?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	45	53.6
No	38	45.2
No response	1	1.2
Total	84	100.0

Table 25: Are you informed of it?

	Frequency	Percent
Know	56	66.7
Don't know	25	29.8
No response	3	3.6
Total	84	100.0

Table 26: What are the directives?

	Frequency	Percent
Minimising use of Section 54	11	13.1
In possession of stealing equipment or involved in crime	3	3.6
No one should be arrested without specific reason	25	29.8
According to the BLAST publicised directives	2	2.4
No response	43	51.2
Total	84	100.0

Table 27: How many Section 54 cases do come to your court a month?

	Frequency	Percent
5 cases	2	11.8
10 cases	2	11.8
20 cases	2	11.8
50 cases	3	17.6
No answer	8	47.1
Total	17	100.0

Table 28: Why are they arrested under Section 54?

	Frequency	Percent
Political occurrence	11	64.7
Not specific	2	11.8
No answer	4	23.5
Total	17	100.0

Table 29: When does the number of Section 54 arrest increase?

	Frequency	Percent
If law and order deteriorates	6	35.3
Political occurrence	2	11.8
No answer	9	52.9
Total	17	100.0

Table 30: How many people were detained in your court under Special Powers Act after arrest under Section 54?

	Frequency	Percent
1	10	58.8
2	5	29.4
3	2	11.8
Total	17	100.0

Table 31: Do blanket arrests contribute to law and order improvement?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Yes	6	35.3
	No	2	11.8
	Total	8	47.1
Missing	No answer	9	52.9
Total		17	100.0

Table 32: How does it contribute?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Usually criminals are arrested	15	88.2
	Bad people are arrested	2	11.8
Total		17	100.0

Table 33: Within which period are the arrested produced before court?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	24	17	100.0

Table 34: Does any exception occur?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Yes	7	41.2
	No	8	47.1
	Total	15	88.2
Missing	No answer	2	11.8
	Total	17	100.0

Table 35: If exceptions occur, what measures are taken?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Ask clarification	7	41.2
Missing	No answer	10	58.8
	Total	17	100.0

Table 36: Within which period is the charge furnished after bringing a person to the police station?

	Frequency	Percent
At once	2	11.8
1 hours	2	11.8
No answer	13	76.5
Total	17	100.0

Table 37: Which information on the arrested is recorded in the diary?

	Frequency	Percent
name, address, previous crime record or case	6	35.3
No answer	11	64.7
Total	17	100.0

Table 38: Is it always maintained properly?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	4	23.5
Matter of police station	13	76.5
Total	17	100.0

Table 39: How were you sure that the diary was rightly maintained?

	Frequency	Percent
Examining the FIR	2	11.8
No answer	15	88.2
Total	17	100.0

Table 40: Are the relatives informed after taking a person to the police station?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	2	11.8
No answer	15	88.2
Total	17	100.0

Table 41: What steps are taken if arrested person is sick?

	Frequency	Percent
Sent to hospital immediately	11	64.7
Matter of police	2	11.8
No answer	4	23.5
Total	17	100.0

Table 42: How do the magistrates become certain of the treatment of the arrested?

	Frequency	Percent
Police informs	4	23.5
No answer	13	76.5
Total	17	100.0

Table 43: What if no treatment is arranged?

	Frequency	Percent
Valid Police super or other appropriate body directed	4	23.5
No answer	13	76.5
Total	17	100.0

Table 44; Have the Section 54-related directives been sent to you officially?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Yes	4	23.5
	No	5	29.4
	No answer	8	47.1
	Total	17	100.0

Table 45: Are you informed of it?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Known	4	23.5
	Don't know	5	29.4
	Total	9	52.9
Missing	No answer	8	47.1
	Total	17	100.0

Table 46: Where did the interrogation take place during remand?

	Frequency	Percent
Jail gate	3	2.3
Police station	103	79.8
Wherever police like	22	17.1
No response	1	.8
Total	129	100.0

Table 47: Why relative or lawyer is not allowed during remand?

	Frequency	Percent
For extorting money	17	13.2
In interest of investigation	47	36.4
For lack of monitoring and accountability	16	12.4
Do not abide by rules	18	14.0
No response	31	24.0
Total	129	100.0

Table 48: How do the police interrogate during remand?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Whatever necessary for extracting information	1	5.55
	Torture, pouring hot water on body	1	5.55
	Physical torture	2	11.11
	No torture, if bribed	2	11.11
	Beating by hanging, electric shock, burning with cigarette	3	16.66
	8	1	5.55
	9	3	16.66
	Decent behaviour	3	16.66
	No response	2	11.11
	Total	18	100.00

Table 49: How useful is Sec 167 for collecting information or curbing crime?

	Frequency	Percent
Not at all	1	1.2
Partially helpful	12	14.3
Moderately helpful	47	56.0
Indispensable	19	22.6
No response	5	6.0
Total	84	100.0

Table 50: Why is Section 167 useful?

	Frequency	Percent
For getting confession/rapid disposal of the case	1	1.2
Necessary for getting information from cunning criminals	9	10.7
Solitary interrogation helps in getting clue of serious crime	13	15.5
Identification of unidentified criminals	5	6.0
For getting secret information	44	52.4
Missing System	12	14.3
Total	84	100.0

Table 51: Which techniques are used in the remand?

	Frequency	Percent
Torture, threat,	22	26.2
Through questioning	58	69.0
No response	4	4.8
Total	84	100.0

Table 52: Are you informed of the High Court directives regarding Section 167?

	Frequency	Percent
Know	44	52.4
Don't know	35	41.7
No response	5	5.9
Total	84	100.0

Table 53: Why do you not allow the presence of lawyer or relative during remand?

	Frequency	Percent
No answer	29	34.5
No such rule	44	52.4
For the sake of investigation	11	13.1
Total	84	100.0

Table 54: How useful is Section 167 for collecting information or curbing crime?

	Frequency	Percent
Somewhat helpful	6	35.3
Moderately helpful	6	35.3
Indispensable	5	29.4
Total	17	100.0

Table 55: Why is Section 167 useful?

	Frequency	Percent
For getting confession/rapid disposal of the case	2	11.8
Necessary for getting information from cunning criminals	6	35.3
Solitary interrogation helps getting clue of serious crime	2	11.8
Identification of unidentified criminals	2	11.8
No response	5	29.4
Total	17	100.0

39

Table 56: Which techniques are used in the remand?

	Frequency	Percent
Torture, threat	2	11.8
Through questioning	4	23.5
No answer	11	64.7
Total	17	100.0

Table 57: Is the lawyer or relative of the arrested present during interrogation on police remand?

	Frequency	Percent
No	15	88.2
No response	2	11.8
Total	17	100.0

Table 58: Why do not they remain present during remand?

	Frequency	Percent
No answer	9	52.9
No such rule	6	35.3
For the sake of investigation	2	11.8
Total	17	100.0

Table 59: Is the arrested person tortured during interrogation in remand?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	3	17.6
No	8	47.1
Don't know	4	23.5
No response	2	11.8
Total	17	100.0

Table 60: What steps are taken if tortured?

	Frequency	Percent
Sent to hospital, SP advised to punish duty police	2	11.8
No answer	15	88.2
Total	17	100.0

Table 61: how do you become certain of no torture in remand?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Asking Sec 164	6	35.3
	See condition of body	2	11.8
	Total	8	47.1
	No answer	9	52.9
	Total	17	100.0

Table 62: Do the police submit medical certificate before and after a person is taken into their custody on remand?

	Frequency	Percent
No	17	100.0

Table 63: Are you informed of High Court directives on remand?

	Frequency	Percent
Know	10	58.8
Don't know	4	23.5
Total	14	82.4
No answer	3	17.6
Total	17	100.0

Table 64: How is the undue political/
high official pressure on the service?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	no such pressure	12	70.6
	No answer	5	29.4
	Total	17	100.0

Focus Group Discussion

Points to discuss

1. Do the police disclose their identity at the time of arrest?
2. As per Supreme Court directives, the police will convey the news of arrest to the family of the arrested if arrest made outside the house. The police will record necessary information on the arrested in the diary kept in the police station within 3 hours of the arrest and produce the arrested person before court within 24 hours. What is the degree of compliance with these directives?
3. How much caution magistrates take in granting remand of a person arrested?
4. Whether medical check-ups are made before and after remand?
5. Whether interrogation under remand is conducted in a room as directed in BLAST case, all, and arrested person lawyers is allowed to present there?

The end

ইউনিট অফিস সমূহের ঠিকানা:

ঢাকা ইউনিট ৫১/১২ জনসন রোড (৩য় তলা) আজাদ সিনেমা হলের পার্শ্ব ঢাকা-১১০০, ফোন: ০২-৭১৭২১৯২ ই-মেইল: blastdu@bttb.net.bd	চট্টগ্রাম ইউনিট জেলা পরিষদ ভবন, কোর্ট রোড চট্টগ্রাম, ফোন: ০৩১-৬৩০৫৭৮ ই-মেইল: blastctg@bttb.net.bd	রাজশাহী ইউনিট বার এসোসিয়েশন, নতুন ভবনের ২য় তলা (পূর্ব পার্শ্ব) রাজশাহী কোর্ট রাজশাহী, ফোন: ০৭২১-৮১১৫৩৩ ই-মেইল: blastru@bttb.net.bd
বরিশাল ইউনিট বার এসোসিয়েশন ভবন (২য় তলা) বরিশাল ফোন: ০৪৩১-৬২৮০৫ ই-মেইল: blastbsl@bttb.net.bd	খুলনা ইউনিট বার এসোসিয়েশন ভবন (৩য় তলা) কোর্ট রোড, খুলনা ফোন: ০৪১-৮১২৭০২ ই-মেইল: legal8@bttb.net.bd	সিলেট ইউনিট বার এসোসিয়েশন, ভবন (৩য় তলা) সিলেট ফোন: ০৮২১-৮১৩৩০১ ই-মেইল: sylunit@bttb.net.bd
ময়মনসিংহ ইউনিট বার এসোসিয়েশন ভবন (২য় তলা) ময়মনসিংহ ফোন: ০৯১-৬৪১৯৭ ই-মেইল: blastmu@bttb.net.bd	নোয়াখালী ইউনিট বার এসোসিয়েশন ভবন (২য় তলা) নোয়াখালী ফোন: ০৩২১-৬১৬৬৩ ই-মেইল: blastnoa@bttb.net.bd	যশোর ইউনিট বার এসোসিয়েশন ভবন-১ (২য় তলা) যশোর ফোন: ০৪২১-৬৭৬৭৪ ই-মেইল: blast@bttb.net.bd
রংপুর ইউনিট মমতাজ ভবন (সেটেলমেন্ট অফিসের উত্তর-পূর্ব পার্শ্ব) কাচারী বাজার, রংপুর, ফোন: ০৫২১-৬১০৬২ ই-মেইল: blastran@bttb.net.bd	কুমিল্লা ইউনিট বার এসোসিয়েশন ভবন (নিচ তলা) কুমিল্লা, ফোন: ০৮১-৬৬৯৪৪ ই-মেইল: cordina@bttb.net.bd	বগুড়া ইউনিট খাজা বাড়ী (জেলা পরিষদ ভবনের পেছনে) বগুড়া, ফোন: ০৫১-৬১৮৫০ ই-মেইল: blastbog@bttb.net.bd
পটুয়াখালী ইউনিট বার এসোসিয়েশন ভবন (২য় তলা) পটুয়াখালী ফোন: ০৪৪১-৬৪০৯৪ ই-মেইল: blastpkh@bttb.net.bd	পাবনা ইউনিট বার এসোসিয়েশন ভবন (২য় তলা) পাবনা ফোন: ০৭৩১-৬৬৪৫০ ই-মেইল: legalaid@bttb.net.bd	টাঙ্গাইল ইউনিট ৭৮৯ রোকেয়া মঞ্জিল সদর হাসপাতাল রোড, সাবালিয়া টাঙ্গাইল, ফোন: ০৯২১-৬২২০৭ ই-মেইল: blasttgl@bttb.net.bd
কুষ্টিয়া ইউনিট বার এসোসিয়েশন ভবন কুষ্টিয়া ফোন: ০৭১-৫৩০৮৩ ই-মেইল: blastkst@bttb.net.bd	ফরিদপুর ইউনিট ফরিদপুর কোর্ট মসজিদ হাউজ (২য় তলা) আবদ-আল্লাহ জহিরউদ্দিন সড়ক কোর্ট প্রাঙ্গণ ফরিদপুর, ফোন: ০৬৩১-৬৫৭৬৬ ই-মেইল: blastfu@bttb.net.bd	দিনাজপুর ইউনিট ঈদগা বস্তি (প্রধান ডাকঘর থেকে দক্ষিণে) ক্লাইভিউ (নিচ তলা), দিনাজপুর-৫২০০ ফোন: ০৫৩১-৬৫২৭৯ ই-মেইল: blastdju@bttb.net.bd
রাজশাহী ইউনিট নিউ কোর্ট রোড, চম্পকনগর ক্ষেত্র (২য় তলা), বনরূপা কোতোয়ালী, রাজশাহী, ফোন: ০৩৫১-৬৩৫০৯ ই-মেইল: blastprt@bttb.net.bd		

লিগ্যাল এইড ক্লিনিকসমূহ

গোপীবাগ লিগ্যাল এইড ক্লিনিক ৮৯/৩-১, (৮ম গলি), গোপীবাগ বিশ্ব রোডের পার্শ্ব, ঢাকা, ফোন: ০২-৭৫২২৭৭৬ ই-মেইল: blastgc@aitlbd.net	মোহাম্মদপুর লিগ্যাল এইড ক্লিনিক বাড়ী নং-৩০ (২য় তলা), রোড নং ৭, ব্লক-খ পি.সি. কালচার হাউজিং সোসাইটি, মোহাম্মদপুর ঢাকা, ফোন: ০২-৯১২৭৯২২	মিরপুর লিগ্যাল এইড ক্লিনিক বাড়ী নং-৪৫, লেন-১, সেকশন-১১, ব্লক-বি মিরপুর, ঢাকা, ফোন: ০২-৯০১২৮৫৩ ই-মেইল: blastmc@aitlbd.net
চট্টগ্রাম লিগ্যাল এইড ক্লিনিক ২৫৭/এ, বায়েজীদ বোস্তামী রোড (মেয়র গলির সম্মুখে), ষোল শহর, ২নং রেল গেইট পাঁচলাইশ, চট্টগ্রাম। ফোন: ০৬০৭৪৩০৯৮৬৮	রাজশাহী লিগ্যাল এইড ক্লিনিক মাস্টার পাড়া, কাটাখালী মতিহার রাজশাহী-৬২১২, ফোন: ০৭২১-৭৫১৫১৮ ই-মেইল: blastlcr@bttb.net.bd	

শ্রমিকদের আইনগত সহায়তা এবং প্রশিক্ষণ কেন্দ্র

নারায়ণগঞ্জ অফিস ৮/১ নিউ চাষাড়া, জামতলা, হাজী আবদুর রহমান সড়ক, নারায়ণগঞ্জ ফোন: ০২-৯৭৫১৭৭৭, মোবাইল: ০১৭১৬-০৪১৩৬৭	মিরপুর অফিস ২/২, পল্লবী (সিটি ক্লাবের উল্টো দিকে), মিরপুর সাড়ে এগারো, ঢাকা মোবাইল: ০১৭১৫-৩৯০১২৭
---	---