

SEEKING EFFECTIVE REMEDIES

PREVENTION OF ARBITRARY  
ARRESTS AND FREEDOM  
FROM TORTURE AND CUSTODIAL  
VIOLENCE



**BANGLADESH LEGAL AID AND SERVICES TRUST (BLAST)**

# PREFACE

Violation of human rights is a major concern throughout the world. Bangladesh scores high in the scale. The members of the law enforcement agencies are often accused of abusing their power and defying human rights. Arbitrary arrest under section 54 of the CrPC and related provisions of Metropolitan Police Ordinances is a regular occurrence in Bangladesh. BLAST undertook several initiatives like advocacy meetings throughout the country, research, roundtable discussion etc to attain a more in-depth knowledge and understanding of the situation. This occasional paper reflects those activities.

The first content of the paper is a research report where an effort has been made to understand the reasons and nature of arbitrary arrest and remand in Bangladesh. The second one is the theme paper presented by Soma Islam in a roundtable arranged by BLAST on 7th April 2005 where the issues of effective remedies of arbitrary arrest and freedom from torture and custodial violence are focused. The third one is the highlights of the discussion in the said roundtable. Finally, there are research tables containing database information on arrest, remand, torture and custodial violence.

It is expected that this paper will depict a clear picture of violation of human rights in the hands of law enforcers, and make us think about the issue for constructive action.

**Taslimur Rahman**  
Executive Director, BLAST



## Arbitrary Arrest and Unreasonable Use of Power of Remand by Police

### Introduction

Infringement of human rights is a major concern throughout the world today. Bangladesh is not an exception. Human rights violations have become endemic and remedies for breaches are almost non-existent. Members of the law enforcement agencies are often accused of abusing their powers and defying human rights. Allegations of torture and extortion of money are also common against them.

With this perspective in mind, BLAST had sought to acquire a more in-depth knowledge and understanding of the situation. It wished to explore why these allegations are made and to scrutinize their validity. Thus an effort has been made in this research paper to understand the reasons and natures of arbitrary arrest and remand in Bangladesh. It is also important to know both the context in which arbitrary arrests, detention and remand of innocent people have flourished and the dynamics between the parties involved; The parties here being the public and the police.

Through this research report, it is hoped that BLAST would be able to make recommendations and conduct advocacy for changes. The report,

based on first hand data, may also help others to understand the situation and create awareness.

### Methodology & Description of the field

This study is almost completely based on interviews with the police and members of the public. These interview were undertaken by thirteen BLAST unit office staff following the semi-structured questionnaire sent from the researchers at the head office. Some data from informal interviews, conversations and comments in the advocacy meetings conducted by BLAST have also been incorporated in the report. Statistical software SPSS has been used to analyze the data. Samples have been chosen randomly and conveniently. Though the sample is not very large, it is expected that it will still be representative of the reality.

This research has covered thirteen districts of Bangladesh. These include Barisal, Chittagong, Comilla, Dhaka, Dinajpur, Faridpur, Jessor, Kushtia, Khulna, Noakhali, Pabna, Rangpur, Sylhet and Tangail. They are geographically spread throughout the country. It may thus help us to get an overall view of the situation in the country.

## Background

On 23 July 1998 a twenty one year old university student died in the office of Detective Branch (DB) under police custody. He was arrested under section 54 of the Criminal Procedure Code (CrPC) and later reportedly tortured to death. It led to serious public outcry that instigated the government to address the issue of custodial violence. The government formed a judicial inquiry commission headed by Justice Habibur Rahman Khan to investigate the matter. The commission suggested some amendments to section 54 of CrPC. However, this failed to change the situation. Within a few months more people were reported to have been tortured, raped and killed in police custody. Following this, Bangladesh Legal Aid and Services Trust (BLAST) along with other concerned persons and organizations filed a Writ Petition in the High Court Division of the Supreme Court challenging the arbitrary arrest as also thesec 54 and respectively remand and torture under sec. 167 of the CrPC. The High Court bench comprising Mr. Justice Md. Hamidul Haque and Ms. Justice Salma Masud Chowdhury issued 15-point directives on 7 April 2003 regarding the arrest, detention, remand and treatment of suspects to be followed by law enforcement agencies. The court also suggested that some changes be made in the procedural law relating to Sec 54 and 167 with a view to preventing arbitrary arrests and custodial deaths and asked the government to comply with the order immediately.

Despite the directives, the government launched a mass arrest drive to foil an alleged opposition plot to unseat the government. In the third and fourth week of April 2004 the national dailies described it in banner headlines as 'mindless',

'blanket', 'unprecedented' and 'police juggernaut'. The nature of mindlessness was such that police were reported to have arrested people indiscriminately from the bus and launch terminals and train stations, people who had just arrived in the city for personal reasons. The numbers of arrestees were so huge that the police stations and jails could not accommodate them.

"The Daily Star" reported on 25 April that from 18 to 24 April police arrested more than 6069 persons in Dhaka only and "4775 of them were arrested under the Dhaka Metropolitan Police (DMP) Ordinance and sentenced (them) without producing 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 report. .... They arrested 612 people under Section 54 of the Criminal Procedure Code....." "The Daily Sangbad" reported on 26 April, referring to DMP data, that a total of 14,428 persons were apprehended during 19 to 25 April 2004. Out of 7,785 persons arrested by the police, 466 were arrested under section 54 & 151; 6,435 were arrested under DMP Ordinance, 668 were in specific cases and 166 persons were arrested against warrant. Only five of them were listed criminals. The daily also reported in the same issue that the police stations are running an open 'business' of receiving 'mass bribe' on the eve of the 'mass arrest' and it was being carried out in broad day light.

## The scenario of arrest

When police set out to apprehend people after a tip off, they have to follow certain procedures. There are specific guidelines to abide by. According to the ruling of High Court bench consisting of Mr. Justice Md. Hamidul Haque

*"The Daily Star" reported on 25 April that from 18 to 24 April police arrested more than 6069 persons in Dhaka only and "4775 of them were arrested under the Dhaka Metropolitan Police (DMP) Ordinance and sentenced (them) without producing 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 report. .... They arrested 612 people under Section 54 of the Criminal Procedure Code...."*

and Ms. Justice Salma Masud Chowdhury, the police officers have to comply with the directives issued regarding detention, remand and treatment of suspects.

The directions are as follows:

Directions that should be complied by police 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 Power 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.



RECORD EFFECTIVE RECORDS: PHYSICIAN OF AMBITIOUS ANALYSIS AND PRELIMINARY POINTS AND FURTHER RELEVANCE

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 arrested person in a diary kept in the police station for that purpose.) 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 cognizable offence, particulars of the offence, circumstances under which arrest was made, the source of information and the reasons for believing the information description of the place, the date and time of arrest, name and address of persons, if any, present at the time of arrest.

4. If he finds any marks of injury on the person arrested, he shall record the reasons for such injury 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 to the police station.

6. If the person is not arrested from his residence or place of business he shall inform a relation of the arrested person if any, over phone, or through a messenger within one hour of bringing him to 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 and 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 with the reasons stated in the forwarding letter regarding the authenticity of the accusation or information, and that there are evidences 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 evidences in the case diary against that person, he shall proceed under section 190(1)(c) of the Code against the 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 directions regarding remand have been cited in the discussion on remand.)

## The way police arrest people

In most cases, police behaviour is very arbitrary. They introduce themselves as police officers and ask the people to come with them as they pick them up. They do not care to show their identity card, do not explain the reasons for arrest and do not even allow them to speak. It is alleged that their behaviour is very indecent, harsh and language is abusive. Victims of police abuse opine that the police inflict inhumane, degrading treatment and torture the arrestee physically. An UP chairman in Tangail reported that



*According to the ruling of the High Court bench consisting of Mr. Justice Md. Hamidul Haque and Ms. Justice Salma Masud Chowdhury, the police officers have to comply with the directives issued in relation to arrest, detention, remand and treatment of suspects*

the 'police picked up a person from the road and wrote in the diary: "While we were patrolling the roads at night this person was suspiciously hanging around and tried to flee when we approached. He should be taken into remand in order to acquire further information from him." Thus they arrest people and extort bribe by torturing during remand. They do not care about apprehending real criminals.'

An additional SP informed us that in a district where he was posted, he found that OCs were arresting many people simply on grounds of suspicion. He found the situation untenable and issued an order not to arrest persons simply on suspicion. Afterwards he noticed that police stations (Thaana) were increasingly arresting people who reportedly made an attempt to escape from the police. He issued another order prohibiting such arrests after chasing. Later a police arrested a notorious dacoit red handed by chasing and the OCs claimed that they could have arrested many more criminals if the order did not bar chasing.



# Research Report

According to the officer, most of those arrests were made to obtain bribes and not to fight crimes. It is also widely believed that police are keen to arrest poor and marginalized people rather than the influential ones (Table-1.a.b.c). They sometimes arrest innocent people to prove their efficiency to the authority, media and public. Besides, they can extort bribe from these persons. Most of the poor, even those from the middle class, fear to engage in cases or legal procedures, because these are complicated, corruption-ridden, cumbersome and very expensive. So, people generally try to end their encounter with police through bribing them.

The police in Bangladesh are also accused of collaborating with the miscreants. It is alleged that the police do not investigate properly, dilute charges and destroy evidence. Instead they take bribe and realize other interests. On 19 March 2004 a satellite TV channel reported that police apprehended some persons with a smuggled Indian-cloth-loaded van and arrested them under section 54 of CrPC. Sometimes, they even falsely implicate innocent people to protect real criminals. In Dhaka city, one police officer arrested an innocent merchant named Shah Alam and produced him before court as a killer named Sundar Babu. The Government prosecutor supported his claim. Ironically, even after claims by the complainant of the case, that the person produced before the court is not the killer Sundar Babu, the court awarded him death penalty. Shah Alam's wife alleged that her husband had refused to pay bribe to the concerned police officer for which, he was maliciously implicated in the case. She also said that the officer and the GP were trying to save notorious criminal Sundar Babu and they framed the case to serve their own vested interests. (The Daily Bhorer Kagoj, 16 March 2003).

## Public Experience on Arrest

The researchers questioned 49 people, who were arrested earlier, about the circumstances of their arrest. Among all these people, 22 (44%) said that police had indeed introduced themselves or disclosed their identity during arrest (Table- 2). Most of the arrests were made at night or in the morning and only one of them had a prior case before the arrest (Table-3). The remaining 48 (98%) were arrested for the first time; 47 (95%) did not know the reason for the arrest (Table-4); 79% of them (39 person) had no chance even to ask about the grounds of arrest (Table-5). A total of 27 persons explained why they could not inquire about the cause of arrest. 9 said that they were brought to the police station and had little chance to ask; 7 were afraid to ask; 6 alleged that police did not answer their questions; 14 stated that they were not allowed to ask and 2 of them informed that police said they

would explain after going to the police station (Table-6).

In most cases, police do not inform the guardians or relatives or friends of the arrested person about the arrest. 39 (79%) persons said that police did not send any message about their arrest to their families and friends (Table-7). The remaining 10 said that their kin were informed. The information was conveyed by a local boy, a messenger or over the phone (Table-8).

The arrested accused that police did not allow them to communicate with their families or with a lawyer. 35 (71%) persons wanted to communicate either with families or with the lawyers (Table-9). 25 (51%) were deprived of the right to be defended by a lawyer as guaranteed under article 33 of the Constitution. (Table-10).

They also gave graphic description of police behaviour during and after arrest. Eight (16%) alleged that they were beaten; nine (18%) were reprimanded; fourteen (28%) suffered indecent behaviour and seven (14%) persons were subjected to severe physical torture. Some complained that 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, knee and under the palms of the feet (Table-11).

Torture after arrest is also a common phenomenon. Almost half of the informants said they were tortured after arrest (Table-12). They were beaten, forced to admit the allegation, slapped, kicked and beaten with stuff. Police also inflicted mental, physical torture, inhuman behaviour on them, tore their shirts, hurt their fingers seriously 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 serious charges like murder, arms-smuggling and terrorism unless they gave money (Table-13). Seventeen persons (34.7%) claimed that police tried to extort bribe from them (Table-14); Taka 1000 were demanded from ten people; six were physically tortured for the purpose (Table-15).

**Police Opinion on arrest:** Forty-seven police officers, who were interviewed, provided their answers on arrest. Their answers showed that most of the people arrested were illiterate. Very few people above the levels of SSC education were arrested (Table-1.a). The scenario is also consistent with regard to their financial background. Poor people are arrested very frequently (Table-1.b). The police officers categorically said that unemployed, vagabonds, day-labourers, rickshaw-pullers and peasants are frequently arrested (Table-1.c).



# Research Report

RECORDING EFFECTIVE JURISDICTION: PREVENTION OF ARBITRARY ARRESTS AND FREEDOM FROM TORTURE AND CUSTODIAL VIOLENCE

## Procedure maintained by police regarding arrest

According to the procedure, the police have to rote the reasons for arrest immediately after bringing the arrestee to the police station. A police officer has to write down the 'reasons for the arrest including the knowledge which he has about the involvement of the person in a



*The High Court directed police officers to frame charges against the arrested person within three hours after bringing him/her to the police station. Respondent officers said they have to frame charges in accordance with the specific section (15 res), within 24 hours (3 res), within lowest possible time (6 res), within 15 days (3 res), according to the accusation (5 res), highest 3 months and 2 hours (2 res)*

cognizable offence, particulars of the offence, circumstances under which the arrest was made, the source of information and the reasons for believing the information, description of the place. He has to note the date and time of arrest, name and address of the persons, if any, present at the time of arrest in a diary kept in the police station for that purpose'. When the officers were asked about these, they answered that they have to put personal information of the arrestees such as name, address, age, sex, occupation, etc (27 res), nature and description of the crime (23 res), nature or behaviour of arrestee (17 res), relevant sections of the code and seriousness of the offence and prior criminal record, if any (Table-16).

The High Court directed police officers to frame charges against the arrested person within three hours after bringing him/her to the police station. Respondent officers said they have to frame charges in accordance with the specific section (15 res), within 24 hours (3 res), within lowest possible time (6 res), within 15 days (3 res), according to the accusation (5 res), highest 3 months and 2 hours (2 res) (Table-17).

Thirty-four (72%) officers said that they do inform the relatives, friends or family of an arrested person (Table-18). They informed them by sending messengers (2 res) such as persons familiar with them or neighbours; sending chowkidars (3 res), or dafadars (4 res); over phone (19 res) and by whatever means possible (15 res) (Table-19).

The officers provide medical care if the person arrested is injured or ill during apprehension. They provide first aid (23 res), send them to local Thana complex hospital (26 res) for treatment. They also said that immediate treatment is provided in accordance with the illness; though some said minimum measures are taken (Table-20).

All the police officers who were interviewed said that they produce the arrested person before a magistrate within 24 hours of arrest (Table-21). They appeared to be very keen to follow this rule. This is supported by the answers of the arrestees as well (Table-22). Fifteen of them said that there are also exceptions to the rule; producing before magistrate may be delayed for distance (5 res), communication (7 res) and transport (4 res) problems. They also mentioned that it may be delayed for investigation and as a result of external influence even (Table-23).

It may be assumed from these answers that many of the police officers have no clear knowledge about the procedures that must be

followed while arresting someone. Reasons for unawareness include lack of proper training or information about the up-to-date changes of laws and court decisions. It is quite possible that they do not go through the official orders seriously. Some officers said that they knew some directions had been sent to their station but they had not yet managed to go through them.

## Arrest under CrPC Section 54

Police officers informed the researchers that arrests under section 54 of Criminal Procedure Code are still going on. Incidence of such arrests varies from one to hundred per month for a police station. Only two respondents said that no arrests were made under section 54 (Table-24). They mentioned various reasons for their arrests, such as murder (13 res), terrorist activities (20 res), involvement with cognizable offence, suspicious behaviour; attempt to avoid police or escape, involvement with cognizable offence without specific complainant, loitering in the deep of night, people who cannot give a good reason for his/her presence. Some said that they arrest under 54 according to the reasons stated in section 54 (Table-25).

They admitted that from time to time arrests under Section 54 fluctuate sharply. The reasons for such rise and fall are diverse, as well as interesting. They explained that during special police operations arrest under section 54 increases (24 res). Prior to the programme of political parties, during political unrest and in winter and summer, this kind of arrest rises. In the winter, roads and paths remain dry and movement become easier. This is also the time of paddy harvest and fishing. So, harvest and fishing-related dispute turn into clashes and the law and order situation worsen.



# Research Report

In summer extremist groups intensify their activities and arrests on suspicion rise. Few other additional reasons were cited. Arrest under section 54 mount (Table-26) due to various reasons; for geographical reasons, when law and order situation deteriorate, at night (criminals move frequently at night), during political changes, at the time of ceremonies when poor people are more prone to crime and if criminal activities rise in the locality,

It is noteworthy that one would expect arrest of fugitives during special police operations. However, during such time most of the arrests are made on

**majority of the officers (37 res 78%) believe that mass-arrest improves law and order situation (Table-33) because, then notorious criminals are arrested, people become frightened and commit fewer crimes, potential criminals and fugitives are caught, criminals are caught red-handed, outlaws become depressed and commit less crime and rogues who are found to thrive before political programmes under the shelter of the god-fathers are repressed during mass-arrests (Table- 34).**

suspicion. A police officer tried to rationalize it by saying that: 'if the arrests rise, notorious criminals fear to move and, operate freely, because they might be caught As a result, law and order situation improves.' It seems that the police are eager to delay and sustain a problem, rather than solving it.

## Abuse of Section- 54

More than half of the police officers (24 res; 51%) interviewed said that there is ample scope for abuse of section 54 of CrPC (Table-27). Twenty-six (55%) confirmed that it is abused (Table-28). When asked to categorize the rate of abuse, twenty (42%) said it is seldom abused; eight said 'sometimes', two said 'often' and thirteen believed that it is never abused (Table-29). According to them, it is misused because of

influence-peddling of powerful political leaders (11 res), manipulation by local influential persons (11 res) and ignorance of people about the law (Table-30). Social situation and absence of complains are also responsible for abuse (or use) of the section. However, some officers said, due to improvement of law and order situation and increasing consciousness, arrests under section 54 and its exploitation is declining (Table-30).

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

Forty four percent officers (21 res) acknowledged that mass-arrests

under section 54 go up during special police operations persuaded by high political leaders and government officials (Table-31). They cited other reasons for the increase in the number of such arrests; these include during political unrest, following order of the government and administration; during massive political programmes of the opposition party; during volatile situations; at the time of national emergency; before and during hartal / strike, even with the rise of crime mass-arrest increase (Table-32).

Majority of the officers (37 res 78%) believe that mass-arrest improves law and order situation (Table-33) because, then notorious criminals are arrested, people become frightened and commit fewer crimes, potential

criminals and fugitives are caught, criminals are caught red-handed, outlaws become depressed and commit less crime and rogues who are found to thrive before political programmes under the shelter of the god-fathers are repressed during mass-arrests (Table- 34).

## High court Order on Sec. 54 and Police

Police officers working in different police stations in various districts of the country are not well informed about the high court directions on section 54 of CrPC. Among all respondents, 35 (74.5%) said that the directions have been sent to the police station (Table-35). Thirty three of them said they knew about the content of the direction (Table-36).

When asked about the contents of the directions, they replied that no one should be arrested without a reason (20 res); Section 54 should not be abused (1 res); police officer should disclose his identity before arresting anyone (1 res); arrested person should be allowed to meet his lawyer (10 res); person arrested under Sec 54 should not be detained under Special Powers Act, 1974 (1 res); investigation must be completed as soon as possible (3 res); reason for arrest must be put down on the PS diary within 3 hours of arrest (2 res); relatives should be informed promptly (2 res); no one should be harassed (1 res) and if the arrested person is injured during arrest, police will note it down and provide treatment immediately (2 res). Thirteen of them did not answer (Table-37).

These replies show that their knowledge on the directions is not very clear. It seems that they know partially or vaguely. The case might be copies of the direction were not made available to them or they were not informed thoroughly.



## Remand

The High Court bench also issued directions on Section 167 of CrPC that allows the police to take a prisoner into custody to question him for gathering information and solving the case. At the same time the rights of the arrested person are ensured and his physical and mental safety is safeguarded by the directives.

These 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

*most of the police officers who were interviewed consider remand as an important tool for fighting against crime and punishing the bad guys.*

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. If the Magistrate authorizes 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 directions immediately.

Let us now look at the practical situation- what happens in the name of remand?

### People who were remanded:

Nine of the respondents, out of forty six, were remanded (Table-38). They stated that police misbehaved (2 res), they were beaten (6 res), slapped, given

electric shock, beaten under the palm of the feet while hanging from the roof and some constables kicked them together and indiscriminately (1 res) and tried to get admission from them coercively (3 res). Some said that police behaved generously and one said he was not questioned at all, because remand was unnecessary (Table-39). None mentioned that their relative or lawyer were present during remand. Most of the respondents ignored the question; many of them were not taken to remand at all (Table-40). They said that police did not give any scope for communicating with the relatives or lawyers, nor did they inform anyone. One described his remand as unnecessary and said that the police did not interrogate him. Even Some others noted that they were not informed about the provisions (Table- 41)

### Police view about Remand

Most of the police officers who were interviewed consider remand as an important tool for fighting against crime and punishing the bad guys. Twenty two (more than 46 percent) of them believe that it helps substantially to get admission from the accused; thirteen of them noted it is indispensable; nine told it helps little and only one said it is not helpful at all. (Table-42). They explained that remand is necessary to delve into the facts of a case (43 res), to recover illegal arms (4 res), to recover stolen goods (2 res), and to arrest fugitives (6 res). They described different techniques that are applied for extracting information from the suspects. They conduct series of careful interrogation sessions (34 res), put mental pressure (5 res), use psychological interrogation techniques (2 res), and flag questions depending on the nature of the accused (2 res) (Table-43), repeatedly ask different questions on the incident and sometimes use threats and beatings too.



# Research Report

Only eight of the officers said that relatives or lawyers of the remanded remained present during the interrogation under remand (Table-44). Others clarified that due to shortage of time (4 res), due to providing of false identity by the person arrested (5 res), as a result of lawyer not been appointed by the arrestee (2 res), for preventing the scope of information leakage (5 res); for not having the facilities or provisions (2 res); as no one comes (2 res), to avoid manipulation (6 res), due to ignorance (1 res) and owing to the reluctance of the arrestee to provide information and to be interrogated before others (2 res), they take prisoners into remand without the presence of any relative or lawyer (Table-45).

Officers said they perform series of careful interrogation sessions (34 res), put mental pressure (5 res), use various techniques (7 res), conduct psychological interrogation (2 res), ask different questions on the incident, threat and beat (Table-46)

Thirty five officers claimed that they knew about the High Court order on remand (Table-47). Eight stated that interrogation should be held in a glass-partitioned room so that relatives or lawyer of the detainee can see him/her during the session but can not hear the proceedings; eighteen officers said detainees should be tortured physically; two said GD of the case should be produced before magistrate. Other answers were: can not say now the provisions of the section should not be abused, have not studied yet etc. (Table-48)

## People's perception about police activity

People's perception about police and their activities reaffirms the belief that people's confidence in the police as protector and custodian of people's rights has

declared significantly. When the arrested persons were asked: 'Why do police arrest, can they arrest genuine criminals?' They answered as follows: police arrest innocent people (15 res.), they can not arrest real rogues (18 res.), they arrest arbitrarily (4 res.), arrest innocent people for extorting money (7 res.), (Table-49), do not arrest criminals due to vested interests, arrest following vindictive instructions of political leaders, etc.

The negative attitude of the people against the police is clearly visible. These attitudes have developed through long experience. They said that behaviour of the police with people is discriminatory depending on the status and influence (4 res.), do not behave well, rather indecently they behave (33 res.), can do anything for money, behave like beasts (4 res.), do not treat people like human (5 res), always act on behalf of the ruling party. Interestingly many said that the police behave as police normally do, which is not a very complimentary statement (Table-50).

The public expect good (25 res.), friendly (18 res.), humane behaviour from police that will protect human rights and secure justice to all. People also expect that police will suppress crime (6 res.), apprehend real miscreants and put them to trial (20 res.), arrest thieves and bandits, capture killers and bring them to book (Table-51). They expect that police will carry on their duties, disregarding all political and personal vested interests, will not torture people for money, will investigate sincerely before arrest and will work neutrally and modestly with high moral (Table-52).

## Working Environment of the Police:

The police were asked how freely

and independently they were able to carry out their duties without any pressure, persuasion and manipulation. The officers answered that they generally work in a positive environment, though there were some unpleasant answers as well. Twenty three officers said that they can operate freely; seventeen can work more or less independently; one claimed administrative pressure from time to time and three said sometimes they cannot work freely at all (Table-53). Most of the police officers (20 res) claimed that they do not face any high level political or governmental pressure to accomplish their duties. Ten of them felt little pressure; five noted that sometimes they have to endure political pressure; four admitted administrative pressure and six of them came across tremendous pressure (Table-54).

Apart from, these data from Questionnaire interviews, police officers informed the researchers that they work in a very stressful and tough situation. OC of Gaffargaon Thana of Mymensingh district informed that he has to maintain law and order among four and a half lacs of people with only twenty six police under his command. He is provided with a Jeep and fuel that is insufficient even for attending four meetings per month in the Mymensingh district headquarters.

According to the officers, they have very little scope for leave or vacation; occasionally they have to work for more than fifteen hours every day of the week. They are not adequately compensated, there is no benefit for risking lives; logistics are poor, and yet they are over burdened trying to protocol for ministers, as also removing dogs and cattle from the roads. Nevertheless, they are always denounced and made scapegoats for negligence of duty, crime and corruption.



## Conclusion

The picture arising from the opinions provided by the public and the police is not very encouraging and hopeful. There is profound mistrust and scepticism among the people about the activities of police. They have lots of allegation as well. Moreover, people of Bangladesh are commonly ignorant about their rights and legal provisions that can provide redress for the violations of their rights. They also fear to ask police for the protection of their rights. Arbitrary behaviour of police is the prime cause for this negative attitude. Lack of monitoring and accountability and unrestricted power drive them to indulge in reckless behaviour.

Absence of cooperation, coordination and presence of malice as well disturbing dynamics hinders the smooth relation between police and the public. To improve the situation training and motivational programmes and refresher courses could be introduced for the police officers. They should be sensitized to behave well with people, as well as be monitored and punished for their misbehaviour. On the other hand, raising mass awareness is equally necessary for enabling people to enforce their rights. They have to be made aware of the importance of cooperating with the police and be compassionate to them and understand the sufferings of the police and system in which they operate.

Without collaborative efforts from all quarters, this immense problem cannot be solved. However, the first step should be taken by the government and the police themselves. They should initiate necessary reforms within the institutions and meet the existing challenges through developing better relationship with the people thereby restoring their confidence in the law enforcement agencies.



[Acknowledgement: Mr. Samsul Bari, Ms. Soma Islam & Mr. Salahuddin deserve the credit for rigorous editing of the report. Unit office staffs have worked a lot for conducting the interviews. All other Members of PIL & Advocacy cell- Sazzadul Islam, Robiul Islam, Asrafull Alam, Sukarna Abdullah & Shadeka Jahan- have contributed much to develop questionnaires, organize data and analyse them.]

## Seeking Effective Remedies

# Prevention of Arbitrary Arrests and Freedom from Torture and Custodial Violence

Soma Islam

Deputy Director, PIL & Advocacy Cell

I. Protection of the fundamental rights of individuals is the central edifice on which the concept of democracy is based. All instruments and mechanics of a democratic system of government are meant to protect these rights. These rights cannot be curtailed, abridged or compromised except in accordance with law. This unique feature of democracy has made it the most widely accepted system of government in the world. However, the very foundation of a democracy is shattered and frustrated if the basic rights of its people cannot be protected or enforced through legal means. In that case, democracy loses its worth and becomes a theoretical burden.

On recognition of the above, the framers of our Constitution took utmost care and gave maximum emphasis on the constitutional provisions guaranteeing protection and enforcement of fundamental human rights of its people. As a result, our Constitution is considered as one of the finest in the existing democracies across the globe.

The Constitution in its Part - III categorically and emphatically enshrined the fundamental rights of the people. Any law, rule, order, ordinance or any act that is inconsistent, or in conflict, with fundamental rights are ultra vires,

hence unenforceable (Art. 26). However, considering human proneness to abuse freedom and ingenuity to misuse legal protection, the Constitution has provided for checks and balances where applicable (i.e. reasonable restrictions imposed by law on the enforcement of certain fundamental rights). At the same time, considering the necessity of some discretionary power needed by the government to protect public interests and maintain law and order it has provided for few circumstances when certain fundamental rights can be temporarily taken away by the government only in accordance with law (Articles 33 (3) (b), 47, 47A, for example). This little scope has allowed enactment of several abusive laws, ordinances and orders vesting unbridled discretionary power to the law enforcement agencies against the spirit of the Constitution.

Constitutionally, the country is a people's republic. However, it has been run by democratically elected governments, martial law administrators and the relatively recent system of caretaker government. Irrespective of the political identity, all successive governments (save the caretaker governments) had passed, experimented and used repressive laws, regulations, ordinances etc. in the pretext of protecting public interests and ensuring public

safety. In reality, those laws have often been used unscrupulously and indiscriminately on the people overlooking or disregarding the safeguards guaranteed by the Constitution to the people. Those laws and their applications have drawn flaks from the civil society and rights activists. Quite often ruling parties use repressive laws to suppress and thwart activities of political opposition. Consequently, political parties while in opposition also criticise application of those laws and have demonstrated commitment to repeal the same if elected (the Special Powers Act, 1974, for example). However, once elected to power the same deliberately choose not to do away with the draconian Act for its use as a lethal tool to detain political rivals.

While repressive laws have been subject of endless discussions, in recent years, civil society, rights groups and media have shown serious concern about the arbitrary use of Section 54 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Cr.P.C), Sections 86 and 100 of Dhaka Metropolitan Police Ordinance, and similar provisions under Chittagong, Khulna and Rajshahi Metropolitan Police Ordinances. The said provisions of laws have vested unfettered and unbridled power with the police to arrest a person without warrant.

1. According to the Constitution of Bangladesh fundamental rights of the people include, among others, equality before law, rights not to be discriminated on the grounds of religion, race, caste, sex or place of birth, equality of opportunity in public employment, equal protection of law, right to life and personal liberty, rights not to be arrested or detained arbitrarily, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, freedom of association, freedom of thought and conscience and of speech, and right to property.

2. The Special Powers Act, 1974, Metropolitan Police Ordinances, The Public Safety Act, 2000 (now repealed), Speedy Trial Act, 2002.

Article 32 of the Constitution succinctly provides that nobody should be deprived of the most cherished and indefeasible right to life and personal liberty save in accordance with law. However, Section 54 of the Cr. P.C allows enough room for the police to curtail personal liberty of people in violation of Article 32. Sensing that police may abuse the power against the spirit of Article 32, the framers of the Constitution incorporated Article 33, which guarantees certain safeguards in respect to arrest and detention. The safeguards broadly are rights to be informed of the grounds for arrest, consult and be defended by a legal practitioner, and the requirement of producing the arrestee before the nearest Magistrate within 24 hours of arrest. Non-applicability of the above provisions in case of preventive detention (Article 33(1) (d)) was incorporated through Second Constitutional Amendment Act, 1973. Before the Second Amendment there was no scope for preventive detention. Inclusion of Article 33 (d) provided the legal basis for all preventive detention laws to come into force. Despite further Constitutional safeguards (clauses (4) (5) of Art.33), these laws have been routinely abused by the police.

Abuse of power by police does not end at just arresting a person without warrant on the basis of suspicion, or in the pretext of preventive detention. It serves as a license for seeking remand or sending the arrestee into the custody of police for interrogation through a detention order made by the Magistrate under Section 167 of the Cr. P.C, or Section 3 of the Special Power Act, 1974. Although law permits remand of arrestees in police custody for certain period, particularly when investigation

cannot be completed within 24 hours, in most of the cases police tend to resort to physical torture and cruelty ostensibly for the purpose of eliciting information or extracting confession from the arrestee in violation of Article 35 of the Constitution.

Following disturbing and depressing reports by the media and public outcry on increasing police abuses and custodial violence in Bangladesh which included the death of Rubel, Shima Chowdhury and Arun Chakroborti, BLAST along with other rights organisations brought a writ petition before the Supreme Court of Bangladesh, the ultimate custodian and protector of people's rights, and integrity of the Constitution. Subsequently, on April 7, 2003, a Division Bench of the High Court in *Blast vs. Bangladesh* (55 DLR 363) provided clear guidelines in the form of fifteen directives on arrest, detention, remand and treatment of suspects to be followed by law enforcement agencies and magistrates. Again, in *Saifuzzaman vs. State* (56DLR 342) the Supreme Court issued certain guidelines to be followed by the government, magistrates and police with respect to arbitrary arrest, detention, investigation and treatment of suspects.

BLAST has taken holistic initiatives of creating awareness among the judges, magistrates, police officers, lawyers, and media, elected public representatives and rights activists about the directives and guidelines of the Supreme Court with respect to arrest, remand, detention and interrogation of suspects by the police. To this end, it has already organised advocacy meetings through its unit offices in 18 districts. The



*Abuse of power by police does not end at just arresting a person without warrant on the basis of suspicion, or in the pretext of preventive detention. It serves as a license for seeking remand or sending the arrestee into the custody of police for interrogation through a detention order made by the Magistrate under Section 167 of the Cr. P.C. or Section 3 of the Special Power Act, 1974*

meetings were followed by researches, though in limited scope, in 18 districts to understand the pattern and nature of arbitrary arrests and remand in police custody.

As the title suggests, this paper aims to deal with people's rights not be arrested or detained arbitrarily and to ensure freedom from torture and violence in police custody as guaranteed by the Constitution. The paper will also precisely disseminate the outcomes of researches conducted by BLAST on arbitrary arrests and custodial violence. In addition, while discussing the subject, data collected through a research study by Odhikar (2004), an NGO, will also be reproduced.

## II.

### Arbitrary Arrests

Arbitrary arrests have become synonymous with Section 54 of the Cr. P.C and Police Ordinances under the four metropolitan cities, namely, Dhaka, Chittagong, Rajshahi and Khulna. Section 54 of the Cr. P.C dates back to the colonial era and deemed to have been invented by the British rulers as a decisive weapon to deal with unruly natives, particularly during the time when political situation was

*The liberty given to the police to arrest people without warrant under Section 54 of the Cr. P.C and Metropolitan Police Ordinances are almost similar except that Section 54 is applicable throughout the country and the latter are not applicable beyond the respective metropolitan areas.*



getting increasingly volatile. This Section enabled the police to arrest any person any time on any pretext in the name of maintaining law and order. British rulers had gone long ago, so did the West Pakistani regime but Section 54 sustained. Its ghost has occupied our shoulders with firmer grips even after we became independent. Successive governments reared it with care and invented more arbitrary laws and ordinances to be supplemented by it. The

respective governments, from time to time, have also created and used various special forces, often through executive orders, in the pretext of improving deteriorated law and order situations and vested them with more arbitrary powers including legal immunity. Activities of all special police forces (from Rakkhi Bahini to today's Rapid Action Battalion) have been criticised by the people for severe human rights violations record.

The liberty given to the police to arrest people without warrant under Section 54 of the Cr. P.C and Metropolitan Police Ordinances are almost similar except that Section 54 is applicable throughout the country and the latter are not applicable beyond the respective metropolitan areas.

Generally, arrests without warrant take place in two ways, namely, (a) routine arrests, and (b) mass arrests during political turmoil. The research conducted by Odhikar suggests that during the one year period from September 2003 to August 2004 a total of 91,106 arrests were made in Dhaka metropolitan area alone. Out of these arrests, 58,728 were made under different Sections of Dhaka Metropolitan Police Ordinance and 5,774 under Section 54 of the Cr. P.C. The "Daily Sangbad" reported on 26 April 2004, referring to DMP data, that a total of 14,428 persons were apprehended during 19 to 25 April 2004 following political unrest. According to data provided by the unit office of BLAST at Chittgong, before a party meeting called by the opposition held on 3 October 2004 about 232 persons were arrested under Chittagong Metropolitan Police Ordinance in three days and produced before the court. All of them were found guilty and fined Tk 300-500 each or in default were sentenced to 7-15 days

imprisonment. The number of arrestees released from the police station was unknown.

In most of the arrests without warrant, arrestees are not produced before the court. They are released from the police station. According to data provided by BLAST's unit office at Bogra, a total of 226 persons were arrested in June and July 2004 under Section 54 of the Cr. P.C, out of which only 23 were produced before the court. The rest were released from the police stations. During the year 2004, a total of 855 people were arrested under Section 54 and produced before the court in Sylhet out of whom 820 were subsequently released for want of evidence against them. The same situation prevailed during the year 2004 in Jessore where out of 650 people arrested under Section 54 and produced before the court 509 were released. As per data provided by the Rangpur unit office of BLAST, a total of 383 people were arrested under Section 54 in Rangpur from January to November 2004.

The Khulna office of BLAST noted that during 20 September to 2 October 2004, in the wake of rising agitation against the government by the opposition party workers, 160 people were produced before the court after being arrested under different provisions of the Khulna Metropolitan Police Ordinance. Besides, another 70 people were produced before the court after being arrested under Section 54 during the same time. Similarly, 49 people were produced before the court after being arrested under Section 54 in Rajshahi during the same time.

The grounds for arrest without warrant under Cr. P.C and Metropolitan Police Ordinances are shown below:

## Section 54 of the Cr. P. C

Under Section 54 of the Cr. P.C any police officer may, without an order from a Magistrate or a warrant arrest a person who:

- a. is concerned in any cognizable offence or against whom a complaint has been lodged or credible information received or reasonable suspicion exists of his being so concerned;
- b. possesses any implement of house-breaking (onus is on him to prove otherwise);
- c. is a proclaimed offender;
- d. is suspected of having stolen property in his possession;
- e. obstructs a police-officer in performing his duty or who has escaped or attempts to escape from awful custody;
- f. is suspected of being deserter

***In BLAST and others vs. Bangladesh (55 DLR 363) the honourable Judges of the High Court Division of the Supreme Court categorised four conditions under the first item of Section 54 of the Cr. P.C which enable a police officer to arrest a person without warrant***

from the armed forces;

g. is concerned in or against whom a complaint has been lodged or credible information received or reasonable suspicion exists of his being so concerned in any act committed at any place out of the country, which if committed in the country would have been punishable offence and for which he is subject to extradition or under the Fugitive Offender Act, 1881 is liable to be

apprehended in custody;

h. is a released convict committing a breach of any rule made by magistrate under Section 565 (3) of the Cr. P.C; or

i. is subject to arrest following a requisition received from another police officer.

## Metropolitan Police Ordinances

Under the four Metropolitan Police Ordinances, police can arrest a person without warrant, if he is found between sunset and sunrise in the following conditions:

- a. equipped with dangerous instruments without satisfactory excuse;
- b. with face covered or otherwise disguised without satisfactory excuse;

c. being present in any dwelling house or other building, or on board any vessel, boat or vehicle without satisfactory reason;

d. lying or loitering in any street or other places without satisfactory reason;

e. having in possession implement of house breaking without satisfactory reason.

III.

## The scopes for abuse of power by police during arrest

All arrests under or without warrant deprive a person of his fundamental right to life and liberty as guaranteed by Article 32 of the Constitution. Given that in applicable cases arrest of a person is necessary for the administration of criminal justice, or maintain law and order, his rights to life and liberty can be curtailed only to the extent permissible by law and not otherwise. However, in no cases an arrest can be made without lawful authority. The exception is that Section 54 of Cr. P.C and Metropolitan Ordinances have left enough room for the police to make whimsical and illegal arrests. In such cases, the validity of the arrests can be adjudged only after the arrestee is produced before a competent magistrate and proper investigation is conducted. Until then the police is free to book anybody at their discretion. While the law provides for punishment of the concerned police officer for arresting a person illegally, the stark reality is that instances of such punishment hardly exist. This makes things easier for the police to arrest a person capriciously and remain unaccountable for the same.

In *BLAST and others vs. Bangladesh (55 DLR 363)* the honourable Judges of the High Court Division of the Supreme Court categorised four conditions under the first item of Section 54 of the Cr. P.C which enable a police officer to arrest a person without warrant:

(a) any person who has been concerned in any cognisable offence;

(b) against whom a reasonable complaint has been made;

(c) credible information has been received; and

(d) against whom a reasonable suspicion exists of his having been so concerned in any cognisable offence.

According to the honourable Judges "the word 'concerned' used in first condition is a vague word, which gives unhindered power to a police officer to arrest any person stating that the person arrested by him is concerned in a cognisable offence." "[T]o safeguard the life and liberty of the citizen and to limit the power of the police, ... the word 'concerned' is to be substituted by any other appropriate word or words" the Judges continued. The Judges also opined that only interpretation of the words will not be sufficient. The provision shall be amended to incorporate safeguards in it. They were of the view that "there should be some restrictions so that police officers will be bound to exercise the power within some limits."

In the same decision, the Judges also considered the terms "reasonable" and "credible" used in the Section. As regards 'reasonable suspicion' the Judges opined that suspicion should be followed by reasonable thinking not mere guessing. According to them "[A] police officer can exercise the power (of arrest) if he has definite knowledge of the existence of some facts and such knowledge shall be the basis of arrest without warrant." In short, police should not use the power of arrest only because they are vested with such power; rather, they should have reasonable justifications before using that power. To ensure this, the concerned police officer will be required to be satisfied about the genuineness and bona fide of the complaint or the information received. The Judges stressed that "[I]f a person is arrested on the

basis of credible information, nature of the information, source of information must be disclosed by the police officer and also the reason why he believed the information."

Finally, the Judges made some recommendations to be incorporated in relevant sections of the Cr. P.C, Penal Code, Evidence Act and the Police Act. The Judges also issued 15 directions with immediate effect to be followed by the law enforcement agencies with respect to arrest, detention and interrogation of a suspect. Subsequently, in Saifuzzaman vs. Bangladesh (56 DLR 2004) the Supreme Court again pronounced certain guidelines to be followed by police and magistrates regarding arrest and remand of a suspect. For the purpose of discussion, the Supreme Court directions and guidelines have been presented in this paper in three groups i.e. those relating to arrest without warrant, and others to remand and custody.

## Arrest without warrant

The following directions and guidelines may be related to arrest without warrant:

**1. Disclosure of identity, and identity card, if demanded by the person arrested and the persons present, during the arrest and informing relatives or friends of the arrestee about the arrest within one hour of bringing him to the police station** (directives 2 and 6 in BLAST and others vs. Bangladesh and guideline (ii) in Saifuzzaman vs State. Notably, in the latter case the time requirement has been relaxed for up to six hours from arrest):

Most of the socio-legal surveys have established that police do not disclose identity to the arrested persons. The plain-clothed police, in particular, hardly show their identity cards

to the arrestees. Neither do they bother to inform the relatives of the arrestee about the arrest. This creates confusion as to the arrest of a person by police. It often also denies the arrestees and his relatives the opportunity to take initiatives for his release or prefer a writ of habeas corpus in applicable cases. As shown in the attached research report, 44% of the respondents stated that police disclosed their identity and according to 79% of the respondents police did not inform their relatives of the arrests. However, in contrast, 72% of the police officers interviewed said that they informed the relatives, friends or family of arrested persons through various means including village watchmen, messengers or telephone.

**2. Furnishing reasons for arrest to the arrestee within three hours of bringing him to the police station and allowing him to consult a lawyer of his choice or meet his relations** (directives 5 and 7 in BLAST and others vs. Bangladesh):

Article 33 of the Constitution mandates that every arrestee shall be informed about the reasons of his arrest, as soon as may be, and be allowed to consult and defended by a legal practitioner of his choice. In Madhu Limaye v. State (AIR 1969 Punj 506), it was held that failure to inform the arrestee of the reason of arrest render the arrest unlawful and entitle the arrestee to be released. 95% respondents to BLAST's research did not know the reason for the arrest and 79% of them had no chance even to ask about the grounds of arrest. The respondents alleged that police did not allow them to communicate with their families or with a lawyer. 71% of them wanted to communicate either with families or with the lawyers and 51% were deprived of this right.



3. Recordation of the reasons for arrest and other particulars including the knowledge about the involvement of the person in a cognizable offence, particulars of the offence, circumstances under which arrest was made, the source of information and the reasons for believing the information, date and time of arrest, name and address of the persons, if any, present at the time of arrest and getting it signed by the arrestee (directive 3 in BLAST and others vs. Bangladesh and guidelines (i) and (iii) Saifuzzaman vs. State):

Section 172 of the Cr. P.C and Regulation 263 of the Police Act require the police officer to maintain a case diary to record time of receiving information, and beginning and closure of investigation related to arrests and searches. A police officer also has to note the place(s) visited by him pursuant to the investigation and write a statement of the circumstances ascertained through his investigation. Regulation 264 of the Police Act provides for the procedure to maintain the case diary (B.P form no. 38).

The honourable Judges in BLAST and others vs. Bangladesh observed that "if copy of the entries of this diary is produced before the Magistrate and if there are materials before the Magistrate to decide whether the accusation against the person or the information against the person is well founded, he can decide the question whether the person shall be released at once or shall be detained further." The Judges concluded that though the legal requirements are not fulfilled, the Magistrate as a routine matter passes order on the forwarding letter of the police officer either for detaining the

person for further period in jail or police custody. In both BLAST and others vs. Bangladesh and Saifuzzaman vs. State the Supreme Court of Bangladesh stressed on the maintenance of case diary by police and arrest memo detailing everything related to the arrest.

Earlier, the matter was considered in D. K. Basu vs. State of West Bengal (1997) 1 SCC and the Supreme Court of India issued a directive as follows:

"[T]he police officer carrying out the arrest of the arrestee shall prepare a memo of arrest at the time of the arrest and such memo shall be attested by at least one witness, who may either be a member of the family of the arrestee or a respectable person of the locality from where the arrest is made. It shall also be counter-signed by the arrestee and shall contain the time and date of arrest."

#### IV.

#### Remand in police custody:

The term 'remand' does not exist in Section 167 of Cr. P.C. However, under the Section, the concerned magistrate can send an arrested person to jail or police custody in specified circumstances. Therefore, getting back the arrestee from magistrate to the police has long been termed as remand by police as well as magistrates. Although the main purpose of detention in police custody is to conduct investigation, as most of the researches suggest, police to elicit information or extract confessions resort to physical and mental torture, which sometimes lead to death or physical deformity of the detainee. This kind of behaviour of the police is in violation of the provisions of Article 35 of the Constitution,

Article 5 of United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, as well as Article 7 of International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

In both BLAST and others vs. Bangladesh and Saifuzzaman vs. State, the subject of torture was considered and the Judges issued directives and guidelines with a view to prevent such heinous practices by the police. For the convenience of discussion the relevant directives and guidelines are briefly described below:

**1. Not to arrest a person under section 54 of the Cr. P. C to detain under Special Powers Act, 1974 and the magistrate shall not make an order of detention in that case** (directive 1 in BLAST and others vs. Bangladesh and guideline (x) Saifuzzaman vs. State):

In BLAST and others vs. Bangladesh the petitioners ably established that police officers often arrest people without warrant under Section 54 of the Cr. P. C and seek remand under Special Powers Act, 1974. Lacking the necessary knowledge, magistrates often grant detention of arrestees in such cases. Clearly, arrest under Special Powers Act is preventive in nature. A person is arrested under this Act not for his involvement in any offence; rather to prevent him from getting engaged with any prejudicial activity (BLAST and others vs. Bangladesh). Therefore, in this case the Supreme Court decided that

"police officer cannot arrest a person under section 54 of the Code with a view to detain him under section 3 of the Special Powers Act, 1974. Such arrest is neither lawful nor permissible under section 54."

Odhikar Report 2004, survey by BLAST during 2004 are the most recent ones.



2. Police officer to incorporate reasons in his forwarding letter as to why investigation could not be completed within 24 hours of arrest of a person and why he considers that the accusation or the information against the person is well founded along with transmitting a copy of the case diary (directive 8 in BLAST and others vs. Bangladesh):

According to Section 61 of the Cr. P.C, police cannot detain a person arrested under Section 54 for more than 24 hours unless an order thereof has been made by a competent magistrate. Article 33 of the Constitution makes it mandatory for a police officer to comply to such requirement. The main objective of this provision is to ensure that a judicial mind is applied with respect to the legality of the arrests or detention made without warrant.

Section 61 of the Cr. P. C. requires that police shall complete investigation with respect to an arrest without warrant within the permitted time limit of 24 hours. In certain circumstances investigation may not be completed within 24 hours. Section 167 (1) provides that a person arrested without warrant shall be produced before the magistrate (a) if the investigation cannot be completed within 24 hours and (b) if there are grounds for believing that the accusation or information received against the person is well founded. Fulfilment of this requirement will enable the magistrate to decide upon the legality of the detention.

**3. To take an arrested person to the nearest hospital or government doctor for treatment if the police officer finds or discovers any marks of injury on him** (directive 4 in BLAST and others vs. Bangladesh):

The objective of this directive is to ensure that marks of injury, if any, found in the body of the accused persons are noted in the case diary so that the injury sustained before arrest cannot be alleged to have been inflicted in police custody. At the same time, it will also prevent the police to claim that such injuries were sustained before arrest. In *D.K. Basu vs. State of West Bengal*, the Supreme Court of India directed that if the arrestee requests so, he shall be examined at the time of his arrest, and injuries, if any detected shall be recorded in the "Inspection Memo". Such Inspection Memo shall be signed both by the arrestee and the concerned police officer and its copy shall be provided to the arrestee for record.

**4. To make detention order only if the magistrate is satisfied with the reasons stated in the forwarding letter of the police officer. Otherwise to release the person** (directive 9 in BLAST and others vs. Bangladesh). To release the accused on

taking a bond if the case diary, as prescribed, is not produced (guideline (vii) in *Saifuzzaman vs. state*):

As discussed earlier, the police officer is required to state reasons in its forwarding letter seeking detention of a person arrested under Section 54 so that a magistrate can apply judicial mind before granting or rejecting the prayer for detention. The forwarding letter shall be attached with the case diary. If the case diary does not include the required entries, the magistrate shall forthwith release the arrestee. If the magistrate is satisfied with the reasoning and the entries of the case diary he shall order detention of the accused after recording the reasons (Section 167 (3) and (4) of the Cr. P.C). Irrespective of the explicit provisions under Section 167, in most of the remand cases magistrates hardly apply judicial mind or record reasons for detention. On the other hand, the "Magistrate ... passes a parrot like order authorising detention in police custody" (*Blast and others vs. Bangladesh*).

## V.

### Torture and Custodial violence

In criminal jurisprudence the wider interpretation of the term 'custodial violence' may include all kinds of physical and mental torture inflicted upon, or inhuman or degrading treatment given to, a person in police custody. It also includes death and torture in police lock-ups. In the absence of a specific definition given to it in law, but considering the spirit of Article 35 of the Constitution of Bangladesh, custodial violence may be divided into two categories (a) torture and cruel punishment; and (b) inhuman or degrading treatment. Again, our law books lack definition of the term torture and cruel punishment. However, in Article 1 of the Convention against Torture and Other, Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment 1984, to which Bangladesh is a signatory, torture has been broadly defined as act of a public official, or other person acting with the consent, instigation or acquiescence of a public official by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental is intentionally inflicted on a person for the purposes of obtaining information or confession or punishing him for an act he has committed or suspected of having committed. On the other hand, inhuman and degrading treatment may be construed to include any act that affects a person's fundamental rights to life and liberty i.e. right to food, sanitation, medical care, humane behaviour, recreation, skill development etc.

◆ *D.K. Basu vs. State of West Bengal*, 1997, 1 SCC.

Allegedly, in Bangladesh, people are subjected to torture as a substitute for police investigations other than a number reasons which include harassing and implicating innocent people through fabrication of cases, extortion and bribery, saving influential people and godfathers of criminal activities, extracting statements that would ensure real perpetrators to go scot-free, for maintaining law and order as well as seeking revenge and settling the score by the rich and powerful. Violence in police custody varies from calling names, slapping, kicking, beating, sexual harassment and rape to most heinous instances like death. Keeping people in lock-up like animals, providing inadequate or no food or drink, keeping men, women, children together are also inhuman practices existing in police custody.

While any kind of torture is unacceptable to the civilized people, recent rise in death of people in police custody or during investigation has shocked every conscious being. In particular, extra-judicial killing of accused persons in crossfire has become a hot topic of discussion and is being strongly condemned by the civil society, rights groups and media. According to news paper reports a total of 256 suspects were killed in cross-fire since the inception of Rapid Action Battalion (RAB). Notably, all instances of crossfire killing did not happen during investigation by RAB. Police killed a large number of people in crossfire during investigation as well. Whether death of a person in crossfire (during investigation) should be held as custodial death is yet to be determined. In recent public meetings the government has assured of due investigation and enquiry of each of crossfire death case. In addition to the recent phenomenon of crossfire a total of 10 suspects died in police custody in the first three months of 2005 (the Daily Star report in April 2005).

Our Constitution emphatically prohibits any kind of torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading punishment or treatment on a detainee. Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment 1984, to which Bangladesh is signatory also prohibits any kind of torture or degrading treatment of an arrested person.

While considering torture in police custody, the Supreme Court of India observed that torture is "committed under the shield of uniform and authority in the four walls of a police station or lock-up, the victim being totally helpless" (D. K. Basu vs. State of West Bengal). In the same judgment the Judges also stated "custodial torture is a naked violation of human dignity and degradation which destroys, to a very large extent, the

individual personality. It is a calculated assault on human dignity and whenever human dignity is wounded, civilisation takes a step backward." Eventually, the Supreme Court of India held that any form of torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment would fall within the inhibition of the constitutional provisions as to right to life and liberty of a person whenever it occurs during investigation, interrogation or otherwise.

The Constitution of Bangladesh expressly prohibits torture and other forms of cruel and degrading treatment under Article 35 (5). Several provisions of the Cr. P.C call for judicial scrutiny by magistrates in the event of granting detentions and remand with a view to reducing if not eliminating custodial torture. Causing hurt to a person in order to extract confession, wrongful confinement voluntarily, causing grievous hurt, rape and murder are punishable offences under the Bangladesh Penal Code. Also, Article 35 provides that a person shall not be compelled to be a witness against himself and Section 25 of the Evidence Act provides that an arrested person should not be coerced and intimidated to answer self-incriminating questions.

Despite relevant safeguards available under the Constitution, international conventions and procedural laws, the instances of torture in police custody have significantly increased in recent years. According to the survey report prepared by BLAST, nine out of 46 respondents confirmed that they were taken to remand. Their count of torture in police custody included misbehavior, beating, slapping, and electric shock, beating on the feet, beating with the arrestee hung from the roof, indiscriminately kicking several arrestees together, and coercing to elicit information and extract confession. Some respondents however said that police behaved generously and one said he was not questioned at all, because the remand was unnecessary. None was found saying that his relative or lawyer were present during remand. Supreme Court's directives and guidelines relating to torture and custodial violence are described below:

**1. The investigating officer to interrogate the accused for the purpose of investigation in a room in the jail specially made for that purpose with glass wall and grill in one side within the view but not hearing of a close relation or lawyer of the arrestee. In the application for taking the accused in police custody for interrogation, the investigating officer to state grounds for taking the accused to the custody (directives 11 and 12 in BLAST and others vs. Bangladesh):**



The above directives are meant to ensure that police refrain from torturing an arrestee in the custody for eliciting information or extracting confession. If the interrogation chamber is transparent, any abuse to an arrestee will be detected by senior police officers as well as the relative and the lawyer of the arrestee, if present.

The Supreme Court has also directed the investigation officer to state grounds for taking the accused to the custody. If the grounds for remand stated are not satisfactory to the magistrate, the accused should be released forthwith instead of being sent to the custody.

**2. Magistrate to proceed against the concerned police officer as per Section 190 (1)(c) of the Cr. P.C for committing offence under Section 220 of the Penal Code if the grounds for remand stated in the forwarding letter of the police is not satisfactory or if there are no materials in the case diary (directive 10 in BLAST and other vs. Bangladesh):**

With a view to minimising and discouraging common practice of police to arrest people without warrant and seek remand, the Supreme Court in BLAST and others vs. Bangladesh issued the above directive. The directive requires a magistrate to take cognisance of an offence committed by the concerned police officer as per Section 220 of the Penal Code if he does not maintain the case diary properly and the reasoning for arrests as well as seeking remand of the suspect stated in his forwarding letter or arrest memo are not satisfactory to the magistrate.

Section 220 of the Penal Code enables the magistrate to invoke a sentence of imprisonment up to seven years or fine or both to a person who with the legal authority to send people for trial, for confinement or keeping persons in confinement does so in contrary to law and with the knowledge of such violation. In BLAST and others vs. Bangladesh the Judges stressed on the maintenance by police proper case diary and provide adequate reasoning for arrest of a person without warrant or for seeking remand. Non-compliance of these requirements will be treated as committal of offence by the concerned police officer under Section 220 of the Penal Code.

**3. To comply with recommendations B(2)(c)(d) and B(3)(b)(c)(d) should the magistrate authorise detention of an accused (directive 13 BLAST and others vs. Bangladesh):**

Recommendations B(2)(c) and (d) of the Supreme Court in BLAST and others vs. Bangladesh require a magistrate to be satisfied with the reasons of arrest and remand stated in the case diary and forwarding

letter of the police and to ensure that the accused was accorded an opportunity to consult a lawyer of his choice. The magistrate also needs to hear the accused before passing remand order, which shall not exceed three days.

Recommendations B(3)(b)(c)(d) are related to medical examination of the accused on remand as well as proceedings against torture in police custody. The directives require that before taking a person to remand, he shall be examined by a designated doctor or medical board constituted for the purpose. In D.K. Basu vs. State of West Bengal, Indian Supreme Court required that a trained doctor should examine the person on remand once every 48 hours.

The accused on remand is required to be produced before the relevant magistrate before the expiry of the remand period. If the accused alleged of any torture in police custody, the magistrate is directed to send the accused to the same doctor or medical board for further examination. If the medical examination confirms infliction of torture on the accused in police custody the magistrate has to take action against the investigation officer under 330 of the Penal Code. This Section deals with causing voluntary hurt to extort confession or compel restoration. Under this Section, the magistrate can sentence the concerned police officer up to 7 years of imprisonment or fine or both.

Instances of actions taken by magistrates under 330 of the Penal Code are extremely rare. Absence of specific guidelines is alleged to be responsible for such inaction by the magistrates. The implementation of the directives and guidelines in BLAST and others vs. Bangladesh and Saifuzzaman vs. State hopefully should be able to narrow the gap.

**3. To inform the concerned magistrate of the death of a person in police custody and the magistrate to enquire into the matter (directives 14 and 15 in BLAST and others vs. Bangladesh):**

Any kind of death in police custody is unexpected and unwarranted. Police are meant to protect people's life, not to kill them. While death may happen naturally or following injury sustained before arrest, the most unacceptable death in police custody is one which results from torture. In D. K. Basu vs. State of West Bengal, the Indian Supreme Court observed that custodial death is one of the worst crimes in a civilised society governed by the rule of law. In the same judgement the court held "[I]f the functionaries of the government becomes law-breakers, it is bound to breed contempt for law and would encourage lawlessness ... leading to anarchism."

◆ (1993) 2 SCC, p. 767 ◆ AIR (2000) p.3421

In *BLAST and others vs. Bangladesh*, the Supreme Court considered the issue of granting compensation to a victim of torture in police custody and the nearest relatives of a person who died in police custody. The Judges were of the opinion that "compensation may be given by this Court when it is found that confinement is not legal and death resulted due to failure of the State to protect the life." The Court however, did not award compensation in this case on the grounds that the subject matter of the case was pending before the competent court.

Article 9 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights states that "anyone who has been the victim of unlawful arrest or detention shall have an enforceable right to compensation." The right to compensation has not been expressly guaranteed under the Constitution of India. However, this right has evolved through a number of judicial pronouncements by the Supreme Court of India which has held that in the event of failure by the State to protect the most cherished and indefeasible right to life and personal liberty of its citizen, it shall be liable to award compensation to redress the wrong. In *D. K. Basu's case* the Supreme Court held that "monetary compensation for redressal by the court finding the infringement of the indefeasible right to life of the citizen is the only effective remedy to apply balm to the wounds of the deceased victim who may have been the bread winner of the family (1997 (1) SCC, p. 421)."

In *Nilabati Behera vs. State of Orissa* the Supreme Court held that "there is a great responsibility on the police or prison authorities to ensure that the citizen in its custody is not deprived of his right to life ... the duty of care on the part of the State is strict and admits of no exceptions. The wrongdoer is accountable and the State is responsible if the person in custody of the police is deprived of his life except according to the procedure established by law." In this case, the Supreme Court awarded compensation amounting Rs 150,000 in the form of damages to the mother of the deceased who died in police custody. In *Ajab Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh* the Court ordered the State of UP to pay a sum of Rs. 500,000 as compensation within three months to the parents of the deceased died in judicial custody.

The directive requires the concerned police officer to inform the magistrate immediately about the death of any person in custody. After receipt of such information the magistrate is required to proceed for a judicial inquiry into such death.

◆ (1997)1 SCC, p.434

VI.

## Concluding Remarks

Arbitrary arrest and custodial violence is not peculiar to Bangladesh. It is a global problem and has become a serious concern for all civilised people. Resorting to torture and inhuman and degrading treatment to the arrestees for the purpose of eliciting information or extracting confession or simply out of revenge and vengeance is often found in the behaviour of the police of United States, allegedly the most effective democracy in the world. Recent examples of prisoners' abuse in Abu Gharib jail of Iraq and detainees of Guantanamo jail have drawn sheer condemnation from all corners of the world. However, the matter was brought before the court and the culprits are facing trial and disciplinary actions. In a system of government that is transparent and accountable, violation of human rights of the people cannot continue unabated. If it does, then that nation cannot claim to be civilised.

Undoubtedly, the police are under a legal duty and have legitimate right to arrest and interrogate the offenders. However, in exercising this legal right police have to be aware that law does not permit the use of torture, cruel and inhuman treatment on an arrestee during interrogation and investigation of an offence. Section 119 of the Police Act also provides that "an officer will be judged not by his percentage of success in the investigation and prosecution of offences ... but by his display of method and intelligence in detection."

In *D. K. Basu's case* the Supreme Court of India noted the following:

"[P]olice have to perform a difficult and delicate task particularly in view of the deteriorating law and order situation, communal riots, political turmoil, student unrest, terrorist activities and among others the increasing number of underworld and armed gangs and criminals. Many hardcore criminals like extremists, terrorists, drug peddlers, smugglers who have originated gangs, have taken strong roots in the society. It is being said in certain quarters that with more and more liberalisation and enforcement of fundamental rights, it would lead to difficulties in the detection of crimes committed by such categories of hardened criminals by soft peddling interrogation."



The Court also mentioned, referring to the feeling of certain quarter, that "if we lay too much of emphasis on protection of their fundamental rights and human rights, such criminals may go scot-free without exposing any element of iota of criminality with the result, the crime would go unpunished and in the ultimate analysis the society will suffer." In consideration of this reality, the Court stressed upon the adoption of a balanced approach to meet the ends of justice.

Police cannot be licensed to resort to criminal activities to curb crimes. In D. K. Basu's case the Court was of the view that "[S]tate terrorism is no answer to combat terrorism. State terrorism would only provide legitimacy to terrorism." Therefore, the Court suggests that the State must "ensure that various agencies deployed by it for combating terrorism act within the bounds of law and not become law unto themselves."

Acting within the bounds of law and applying a balanced approach is easier said than done. All the directives and guidelines issued by the Supreme Court of Bangladesh in BLAST and others vs. Bangladesh and Saifuzzaman vs. State are meant to strike the said balance. However, only judicial directions, how meticulously they are made, are not enough to meet this challenge. As we mentioned earlier, it will require an all-out effort by all concerned and well-thought out plan drawn and carried out to translate the Supreme Court's directions and guidelines into reality. Now the paper will aim to advance few suggestions to that effect:

## Recommendations:

The paper categorises suggestions in three groups, namely actions to be taken immediately, mid-term activities and long-term activities to be undertaken

### 1. Immediate actions to be undertaken:

a. Changing the mindset of the government and police: Recently, in the wake of criticism by the media and rights groups about the activities of RAB, Cheeta, Kobra etc., the elite police forces, government ministers appeared to have endorsed the death of criminals in cross-fire and lamenting that no violation of human rights is involved in case of cross-fire. These kinds of remarks by government ministers or high police officials would only act as license to cross-fire and encourage police to kill criminals extra-judicially. This kind of approach is regrettable. Police cannot be licensed to kill even a killer. The solemn duty and responsibility of the police is to bring the culprits to justice and ensure that criminals receive the punishment as prescribed by law. Both the police and State will be accountable for any lapses in performing this duty. Unless and until the government realises this and acts accordingly, there is no hope that the situation will improve.

b. Dissemination of Supreme Court directions and guidelines as directed by the Court: In BLAST and others vs. Bangladesh, the Court required the government to implement the recommendations within six months. In Saifuzaman vs. State, the Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs has been asked to circulate and get the guidelines to every police station for compliance within three months. At the same time, the Court directed the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate to circulate the relevant guidelines to the magistrates for compliance within three months. The Ministry of Home Affairs and Chief Metropolitan Magistrates are not only mandated to circulate the guidelines but also to ensure that those are being complied with by the respective police officers and magistrates properly.

c. Arranging training for police and magistrates: In D. K. Basu's case the Supreme Court of India stressed on the training and orientation of police as to maintenance of human rights of the people not to violate them. The Court held that attention is required to be paid "to properly develop culture, training and orientation of the police force consistent with basic human values. ... The police needs to be infused with basic human values and made sensitive to the constitutional ethos."

In the same judgment, the Court also blamed trial courts and High Courts for exhibition of "a total lack of sensitivity and a 'could not care less' attitude in appreciating the evidence on the record and thereby condoning the barbarous third-degree methods which are still being used at some police stations, despite being illegal." The court continued that "the exaggerated adherence to and insistence upon the establishment of proof beyond every reasonable doubt, by the prosecution, ignoring the ground realities, the fact-situations and the peculiar circumstances of a given case, ... often results in miscarriage of justice and makes the justice delivery system a suspect. In the ultimate analysis the society suffers and a criminal gets encouraged."

The Court suggested the lower courts to "have a change in their outlook and attitude, particularly in cases involving custodial crimes and they should exhibit more sensitivity and adopt a realistic rather than narrow technical approach." To achieve the above, the magistrates of trial courts need to be properly trained as to acceptance of evidence and examination of case diary, letter of forwarding, medical examination reports etc. prescribed by the Supreme Court.

d. Providing police with necessary technology and logistics: There is no denying the fact that our police lack up-to-date technology for conducting investigations; whereas the criminals have occupied latest technology to conceal their crime record. In developed countries police have been armed with better technologies than the criminals. Use of cutting edge technologies such as DNA test, pathological test etc. makes investigation easier. In our country, getting a medical report of a suspect is often a very difficult job. In addition, our police also lack logistic support such as vehicles, mobile phones, IT support which are essential to tap modern day criminals. Instead, they are using the age old method of investigation, 'make the horse speak' by beating up. In the absence of necessary technological and logistic support, police may be constrained to resort to torture in police custody to prove a case.

e. Conducting a base-line research: So far, only few researches and surveys on arbitrary arrests, remand and custodial violence have been conducted by rights organisations, donors and media on piecemeal basis. Therefore, conducting a base-line research on arbitrary arrests, remand and custodial violence as well as people's perception and observation to these has become a pressing need of time. In the absence of an objective and comprehensive base-line study, the misgivings and misunderstandings of the government, police could not be dispersed. The research will discover the problems as well as suggest the changes needed to be undertaken. Government may take help from the rights organisations and media in this regard.

## 2. Mid-term activities to be undertaken:

a. Amending laws as directed by the Supreme Court: The government needs to take initiatives to amend the laws to reflect the Supreme Court directives and guidelines. Despite the fact as to whether procedural law can be amended following decision of the High Court exercising writ jurisdiction, it is better for the government to realise the need to make necessary amendments in the age-old laws taking the ground realities into account.

b. Forming a national committee: With a view to ensuring transparency and accountability of the police, a national committee with representations from civil society, registered rights groups, professionals and journalists need to be constituted to monitor police activities and implementation of the Supreme Court directions. Sub-committees at district and Upazilla level also need to be formed. The members of these committees should be allowed to visit police stations and examine custodial records.

c. Designing an implementation strategy in consultation with all stakeholders and rights groups: As mentioned earlier, implementation of the directives is easier said than done. In the absence of a well thought-out strategy and planning with inputs from all concerned, implementation of Supreme Court directions and guidelines will be near impossible.

d. Pursuing awareness campaigns by the government, media and NGOs: Government agencies, rights groups, electronic and print media need to come forward to raise awareness of the people about basic human rights and

required police behaviour to be accorded to the arrestees as well as general public. The awareness materials should be produced in simple and non-technical languages and expressions so that people can easily understand the same. Fundamental rights of the people need to be included in the school texts and the teachers should be trained accordingly.

e. Establishing a legal aid clinic in few police stations on pilot basis: The Constitution and the Cr. P.C require that an arrestee shall not be deprived of consulting and being defended by a lawyer of his choice. Unfortunately, there is hardly any opportunity for consulting a lawyer by an arrestee, especially in rural areas, due to non-availability of lawyers, or lack of awareness or resources. BLAST's research reveals that most of the arrested persons under Section 54 of the Cr. P.C and Metropolitan Ordinances are poor, indigent and helpless people. These people are not aware of their constitutional rights to consult and being defended by a lawyer, neither do they have the necessary resources to hire a lawyer. To mitigate this real problem, the government may establish, or allow the NGOs to establish, legal aid clinics within the compound or vicinity of the police stations. These legal aid clinics will assist the poor and indigent people in the enforcement of their constitutional rights. Supervision and monitoring by lawyers would also ensure transparency in police behaviour. Initially, few police stations may be included under the legal aid programme on a pilot basis. If it achieves the expected goals the same may be replicated throughout the country.



### 3. Long-term activities to be undertaken:

a. Separating law enforcement activities from investigation: During BLAST's researches, police officers gave account of their ordeal. They said that they are overburdened with various works - they are maintaining law and order in one hand and prosecuting offenders on the other. This makes their investigation all the more onerous. In addition, they have very little scope for leave or vacation; occasionally they have to work for more than fifteen hours, seven days a week. They are not adequately compensated and there is no benefit for risking lives. Quite often they are overburdened with the duties of maintaining protocol for ministers, to remove stray dogs and cattle from the roads. Despite all of the above, they are always denounced and made scapegoats for negligence of duty, crime and corruption. The observation of police officers cannot be overlooked. Police also need to be provided with the assurance of living a dignified life. Unless proper incentives, opportunities and benefits are given, the motivation for performing in accordance with law cannot be expected. The recent police reform project undertaken by the government with assistance from UNDP and DFID is a welcome approach. In the long run steps need to be taken to separate law enforcement activities of police from that of prosecution.

b. Initiating prisons run by private entities, particularly for juvenile, women and other inmates convicted of petty crimes: Prisons run by private entities is quite well-known. In many countries, private prison systems have been adopted. Given that government lacks necessary resources to develop modern prison infrastructure, private sector may be encouraged to run prisons, particularly for juvenile, women

and other inmates convicted of petty crimes. Government can regulate the performance of those privately run prisons.

c. Restoring people's trust in police: Police is one of the most important public institutions of any nation. We cannot think of peaceful sustenance without an efficient and responsible police force. It is not necessary that every person will always need assistance of police in his day to day life. However, in the absence of police a total anarchy will let loose upon us. We have witnessed the instances of looting during the fall of Saddam regime in Iraq. In the absence of law enforcement agencies, the looters just ran berserk on people's property. Therefore, police, directly or indirectly, is part and parcel of our life and their contribution in maintaining law and order cannot be overlooked and ignored.

that they are public servants and accountable to the public. They are meant to ensure public security within the limits prescribed by law. Realising the necessity of interaction between police and people, the Police Act requires police to work with people's representatives and community police during investigation. If the community assists police, the investigation of crimes would be effective and efficient resulting in the overall improvement of law and order situation.

d. Judiciary and administration need to be free from corruption: Likewise police, lower courts and government administration are also blamed of corruption. Police cannot continue with corrupt practices alone unless the judiciary and administration abet such practice. Government needs to look into the matter seriously

*“Police should not be used for political motives: The Government should refrain from using the police for the achievement of political motives. If the government continues to do so, it will be unable to regulate police; on the other hand, will become dependent on them and people will continue to suffer at the hands of their protector.”*

We can just take personal comfort by blaming police for their misdeed. However, the problem is not remedied in doing so. We need to acknowledge the positive role played by police to ensure safety and security for all of us. The civil society, people's representatives, rights groups and media need to come forward to scrutinise police activities and extend support where applicable.

There is no room for the police as well to segregate themselves from the people. They have to realise

because if corruption in judiciary and administration remains intact, police cannot be expected to become fair and transparent.

e. Police should not be used for political motives: The Government should refrain from using the police for the achievement of political motives. If the government continues to do so, it will be unable to regulate police; on the other hand, will become dependent on them and people will continue to suffer at the hands of their protector.

SEEKING EFFECTIVE REMEDIES: PROTECTION OF ARMY/NAVY AIR/RAIL AND POLICE/INR FROM GOVERNMENT AND JUDICIAL VIOLENCE





## Report on

# Seeking Effective Remedies: Prevention of Arbitrary Arrests and Freedom from Torture and Custodial Violence

### Introduction:

Arbitrary arrests under section 54 of Cr.P.C and the other related Metropolitan Police Ordinances have become a regular occurrence in Bangladesh. Pursuant to a writ filed by Bangladesh Legal Aid and Services Trust (BLAST) challenging persistent abuse of powers by law-enforcement agencies in 1998 (BLAST v. Bangladesh reported in 55 DLR page-363) and got specific recommendations and 15 point directions from the High Court Division of Bangladesh. The High Court Division of the Supreme Court of Bangladesh issued a fifteen point directives to be complied with by the police as well as the magistrates. Hon'ble Justice Hamidul Haq and Justice Salma Masud Chowdhury delivered the judgment.

With a view to disseminating the directives issued by the High Court Division and raising awareness of the police, lawyers, lower judiciary, NGO and UP representatives and the people at large, on safeguards as to arrest, detention and treatment of suspects, BLAST through its unit offices in eighteen districts held advocacy meetings. Besides, it also undertook research on the nature, pattern and causes of arrests under Sec 54 and the four Metropolitan Police Ordinances by the police and other elite forces.

The findings of the research study were disseminated by BLAST in a national roundtable entitled "Seeking Effective Remedies: Prevention of Arbitrary Arrests and Freedom from Torture and Custodial Violence" held on 7th April 2005 in CIRDAP Auditorium. Soma Islam, Assistant Director, PIL and Advocacy presented the keynote paper while the roundtable was moderated by Dr. Shamsul Bari, Executive Director of BLAST.

The roundtable commenced with a note of welcome by Dr. Shamsul Bari in which he emphasized on the implementation of the directives passed by the High Court Division of the Supreme Court in *BLAST and Others vs. Bangladesh* (55 DLR 363) and *Saifuzzaman vs. State* (56 DLR 342) through which the Hon'ble Court has issued a fifteen point guidelines as to arbitrary arrest, detention and treatment of suspects to be complied with by law enforcement agencies. Persistent abuse of power by the elite forces of the law enforcement agencies including erosion of fundamental human rights guaranteed under the Constitution of Bangladesh through extra-judicial killings, crossfire, encounters and custodial deaths by the RAB, Cheeta and Cobra was also addressed in the roundtable discussion.

The meeting was attended by Barrister Moudud Ahmed, Hon'ble Minister for Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs, Abdul Motin Khosru, former Law Minister, Justice Habibur Rahman, Barrister Rokonuddin Mahmud, Advocate Nizamul Huq Nasim, Alena Khan, Dr. Shadeen Malik, Advocate Khan Saifur Rahman and many other distinguished lawyers, rights activists, civil society members and NGO representatives.

The purpose of this roundtable was to discuss and pursue the following objectives, which include amongst others-

- 1) To ensure that fundamental human rights of the arrestee are protected and incidents of violations by law enforcement agencies are reported;
- 2) To ensure accountability of law enforcement agencies ;
- 3) To ensure effective implementation of the directives issued by the High Court Division of the Supreme Court relating to arrest, detention and treatment of suspects by the police and the magistrates; and
- 4) To sensitize the police and the judiciary on fundamental human rights issues especially in the context of arbitrary arrests, rights of an arrestee and freedom from torture and custodial violence.

## Presentation by Soma Islam:

Soma Islam, Assistant Director of PIL & Advocacy Cell of BLAST discussed the different provisions relating to arbitrary arrests under the Code of Criminal Procedure and the Metropolitan Police Ordinances in Bangladesh. She discussed the scopes for abuse of power by police during arbitrary arrests under Sec 54 and the treatment meted out to the arrestee after an order for detention, which is popularly known as "remand" is granted by a magistrate under Sec 167 of the C.R.P.C. She also came up with short-term and long-term recommendations for mitigating persistent abuse of powers by the law enforcement agencies. The key note paper is annexed with the report.

## Summary of discussions by the Special Guests:

### Khan Saifur Rahman:

People are not generally offenders. It is now our country's trend and practice that the law enforcement agencies tend to violate with impunity the fundamental human rights of the people that they are supposed to protect and uphold as a matter of duty. The process of appointment of police should be transparent. Otherwise corrupted persons will be appointed as police and abuse of police power will continue unabated.

### Advocate Alena Khan:

We witness that arbitrary arrests reach an all time high during hartals, political unrest and during major festivals such as Eid and Puja. It would be a very good step if a human rights monitoring cell could be set up at all the police stations run by human rights activists.. Custodial deaths in the name of crossfire are not acceptable. The benefits and remuneration of the police are inadequate and paltry and the situation could be changed if some additional incentives such as overtime, ration and bonus be offered to them as a token of appreciation for their relentless services. Sometimes police also carry out arbitrary arrests under DMP, CMP, KMP and RMO laws and an effective monitoring system should be established to prevent and reduce the scope of arbitrary arrests by law enforcement agencies.

**Nizamul Haq Nasim:**

It is a well-accepted myth that we assume whoever is arrested has committed a wrong and will be punished under the law. It is absolutely necessary to ensure that the victims and their families are adequately compensated for police atrocities and unless the law provides for such remedy, we do not expect that the situation will improve and the law enforcement agencies will refrain from abuse of unbridled powers conferred upon them under procedural laws

**Justice Habibur Rahman Khan:**

Custodial death is by far the most heinous crime in the world and it should be stopped. Section 54 is misused at a large scale and it is true that the brutal killing of Independent University student Shamim Reza Rubel in 1998 is a stark example of such abuse. The inquiry report that was prepared following the murder of Rubel in police custody was not published but the recommendations have been incorporated in the directives passed by the High Court Division in the writ challenging persistent abuse of power by law enforcement agencies filed by BLAST and other human rights organizations. The Hon'ble Court has provided very valuable insight into the safeguards relating to arrest, detention and treatment of arrestees in police custody to be complied by law enforcement agencies while carrying out arbitrary arrests. If the people are conscious about their rights and are informed about the directives of the Supreme Court, it is expected that the abuse of powers by the police and the magistrates will significantly reduce. We should work out ways to ensure that the police is perceived as a friend and not a sworn enemy of the people.

**Rokanuddin Mahmood:**

It is certain that we want elimination of terrorism but extra judicial killings by RAB, CHEETA, COBRA and other elite forces of the law enforcement agencies in the name of combating terrorism is not the solution and also eliminating a few terrorists cannot eradicate terrorism from this country. Our Constitution is the supreme law of the country and right to life is a fundamental human right and law enforcement agencies are also bound to comply with the Constitution while exercising their discretionary powers of arrest and detention. It is very important to identify the Godfathers of crime and those who sponsor terrorism through supply of arms and financial support. Terrorism cannot be eradicated from the society without eliminating their patrons and law enforcement agencies should track them down. People also have the right to know the real patrons of terrorism who are hiding behind the veil and crossfire killings only ensure safe haven for them. The people under whose custody he/she is must ensure a person's security. That means it is the duty of the law enforcement agencies to ensure safety and security of arrested persons under their custody.

**Abdul Matin Khosru, Former Minister for Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs:**

We need a competent and trained police force to prevent abuse of power by law enforcement agencies. Nobody even RAB or CHEETA have been conferred with the right of detaining a person in custody and inflicting any form of torture while in custody. The crossfire killings by the RAB, CHEETA, and COBRA are not only instance of flagrant violation of fundamental human rights but also utterly shameful for the civilization and an open manifestation of erosion of the principles of Rule of Law.

**Dr. Shahdeen Maleek:**

Actually we do not speak so much about the trial under the Criminal Procedure and this is also a reason for abuse of power by law enforcement agencies. Any new law gives new responsibilities to the police but most of the time the government takes no preparation. We witnessed a very different police force that ensured safety and security of its citizens during the Caretaker Government's regime and now the situation is completely different. People seem to have lost faith in the police and we should seriously think of some meaningful interventions in order to ensure that the people's trust in the law enforcement agencies is restored. Actually we need a strong and impartial leadership more than a trained police force.

The Minister said—

We agree about the misuse of section 54 and 167 by the police and the magistrates however; we also cannot do without relying on the police. Police reform is the need of the hour and if we fail to strengthen the police the situation will worsen further. RAB seems to have become very popular with the general people for its contribution in improving the law and order situation significantly. Actually we do not have a highly skilled police force that could deal with crime effectively which has given rise to the need of creating elite forces like the RAB. Creation of RAB is both lawful and Constitutional and in the event of unnatural deaths as a consequence of torture in the custody of police/RAB, the magistrates are inquiring in to the matter and are yet to submit any report.

The abuse of Section 54 and 167 by the police and magistrates has reduced compared to earlier times. We do not see any reasons for repealing these provisions. However, we are going to incorporate necessary amendment in the relevant provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure. These amendments will be done in line with the judgement delivered by the High Court Division of the Supreme Court in April 2004 through which 15-point directives were issued to the Government to amend the law including effecting amendment to the C.R.P.C. The draft has been sent to Ministry of Home Affairs for its opinion as because it deals with the police and the Ministry is yet to respond to the proposal.

Community policing must also be improved and strengthened. Custodial violence occurs not only in Bangladesh but is recurrent in all other countries of the world. However, there is a better and improved investigation system in place in other developed countries and trial is also more transparent which has to be ensured in Bangladesh..

Human Rights training for the police is very necessary and BLAST is an important organization that can impart such training to the police. BLAST can play a constructive role and if other human rights organizations can work to assist the government, we may hope that the situation will improve over time.

### Observations by other participants:

- A.N Mahmood, Director (Administration), BLAST opined that unless and until we could resist political roguery in the police we cannot ensure people's safety. He also noted that appointment of police; their promotion should be kept free from any political influences.
- Sadrul Anam Ranju, Co-ordinator of Bogra unit of BLAST emphasized the need for organizing Human Rights training for the Police through BLAST and other legal-aid organizations.
- Shirajum Munira, Co-ordinator from Dinajpur unit of BLAST also stressed for human rights training for the police especially S.I of the police. She also claimed that for political reasons police are sometimes bound to release the criminals and apprehend innocent people by implicating them in false cases
- Dr. Kazi Rezaul Haq, Advocate, Supreme Court, observed that the educational qualifications of the low-ranking police is standard 8 or 9 completed and most often they are involved in interrogating arrested persons at the initial stage. Consequently, they are not skilled in asking questions and tend to arrest people on unjustifiable grounds.



*We agree about the misuse of section 54 and 167 by the police and the magistrates however; we also cannot do without relying on the police. Police reform is the need of the hour and if we fail to strengthen the police the situation will worsen further. RAB seems to have become very popular with the general people for its contribution in improving the law and order situation significantly.*



## Recommendations:

- ◆ Sufficient Human Rights training should be given to the police personnel.
- ◆ A good number of people suggested to establish a monitoring cell in different thanas to figure out whether there is any abuse of power by the police under section 54 and 167 of CRPC or not.
- ◆ There should be equality and fairness at the time of recruitment and training of the police.
- ◆ The Government receives donations for many unproductive sectors, which remain idle, and this money can be used to increase the number of police and police reform.
- ◆ Police must accord human behaviour to the arrestee and ensure that his/her fundamental human rights are not abridged while exercising their discretionary powers. Many opined that dialogue between the police and the people will serve to bridge the gap and foster better relationship between them which in turn would serve to reduce violence in police custody.
- ◆ The government must establish police ombudsmen.
- ◆ Police Commissioners should be made responsible to find out the causes of abuse of police power.
- ◆ Some people recommended that, BLAST should take steps to provide necessary awareness training to the police. Further, some participants suggested that BLAST should send their representatives to every thana to monitor the situation.
- ◆ Police should be kept free from any political influence.
- ◆ The benefits like salary, ration, and bonus of the Police should be significantly raised, which would in turn serve to reduce corruption.
- ◆ If a person is arrested without any sufficient ground and harassed by the police, in such event the police must be forced to give compensation to the arrestee, so that the abusing tendency of the police power reduces.

## Conclusion:

The objective of this roundtable was to explore and identify solutions, bring out do-able recommendations, protect people's rights to be free from arbitrary arrests and custodial violence and ensure accountability and transparency of law enforcement agencies while exercising their right of arbitrary arrests and detention.. Everybody in the roundtable agreed that the rampant misuse of section 54 and 167 of the C.R.P.C should be checked and people's faith in the police should be restored. Police do not have license to kill even a killer and it is their duty to protect the right to life and personal liberty of an arrested person in their custody. The forum also expressed serious concern over the extra-judicial killings by the elite forces of the law enforcement agencies and noted that State sponsored terrorism is not a solution to combat terrorism. Participants also iterated that the State should rein in their agents and bring them to justice those are abridging the fundamental human rights of arrestees and subjecting them to torture, physical harassment and custodial violence. It was also agreed that investigation reports on death in custody of law enforcement agencies should be made public and there should not be any political interference with the report. Efforts should be made to restore the faith of the people in the police given that law enforcement agencies are integral for maintaining law and order in the country and their contribution to the society cannot be undermined.