

## Law and Our Rights

### AN ANALYSIS

# Golam Azam's Nationality Case

By Barrister Omar Faruque

**However if he resided in Bangladesh territory after 26th March, 71 then he lived there as a Pakistani agent working in Bangladesh including the Prisoners of War. This cannot make him a Bangladeshi when his actions of the time speak far louder for itself.**

**Is Law An Ass?**  
**C**ONTRARY to popular belief law is not always an ass. In some countries it may be an ass and can be whipped by the Mafia Kings, in some countries it moves with the footsteps of the government and again in some the government even uses the law/judiciary to justify its un-caring, inhuman and anti-people governance and rules. While in a true democratic society (rule by social contract, it is caring and meant for the maximum good to its people) law works as the conscience bearer of the society and establish justice by enforcing the beneficial & humane rules with reference to its social values, fundamental rights, Natural Justice and the Rule of Law based on the immutable State Policies and strict enforcement of the body of laws without any fear or favour.

**Administration of Justice vis-a-vis Ministerial Duty**

In the latter category law is separated from the ministerial conscience of the state. Law is concerned with only the Administration of Justice. Where law is used to justify the unjust policies of the Ruling Clique there, the administration of justice is given the edge or allowed to perform the ministerial functions so that the ruling clique/government of the day can get away with passing the buck on to the judiciary. Then judiciary becomes oppressive and perverse.

Bangladesh and some countries of its like is one where law is in a flux. Historically it has moved with the fascist regimes, acted some times as the whip of the administrative clique and it also moved with the peoples movements. Therefore temperamentally the institution of judiciary is inherently weak, unstable and suffers from identity crisis and lack of self-confidence in as much as its people and the society at large in spite of its spectacular achievements in the War of Liberation of its pro-people objectives, immutable state policies and a democratic Constitution.

**Golam Azam, a Bangladeshi?**

This case represents such a trend of instability and insensitivity both our society and the judiciary. Golam Azam was without any shadow of doubt a Pakistani National and as far as one finds it from the press reporting he never opted for Bangladesh to come under the automatic Naturalisation process of the Bangladesh Nationality Law, nor did he apply for Bangladesh Citizenship after his disqualification on 18.4.73 by an Act of State of Bangladesh.

But after long 25 year of latches in his present manoeuvre seems now to be knocking through the back door of law to achieve what he could not do by a straight forward formal application for citizenship or a Declaration as such.

If what his Counsel has stated to be true that after his return in 1978 he submitted an application for the restoration

of his citizen ship, and surrendered his Pakistani passport then this decision of the supreme Court of Bangladesh will tantamount to granting him restoration of Bangladesh Citizenship which is a pure and simple ministerial function and far beyond the authority and jurisdiction of the Courts of law. And it is ultra-vires of the Act of the sovereign authority.

**The Single Bench's findings on Mr Azam is a Misdirection**

It constitutes a misdirection on both of facts and law that he fulfills all three conditions required to become a citizen laid down under Article 2 of the 14.4.73 Order (a). He was born in Bangladesh (b). He was a permanent citizen of Bangladesh on March 26, 1971 & (c) on March 26, 1971 he continued to be a permanent resident of the country. Factually it is graphically wrong.

The fact of the matter as one knows it is as follows: (A). He was a British Indian by birth(?) and then by the process of automatic Naturalisation became a Pakistani when Pakistan emerged as a State or by an act of option. For Pakistani Nationality as he could still be an Indian National, or British if he wished; (B). He was a permanent citizen of Pakistan on 26 March 1971 and chose to remain as such thereafter about which the Courts should have taken judicial Notice from its notoriety; & (C). He was resident outside Bangladesh after Bangladesh won the war.

However if he resided in Bangladesh territory after 26th March, 71 then he lived there as a Pakistani agent working in Bangladesh including the Prisoners of War. This cannot make him a Bangladeshi when his actions of the time speak far louder for itself.

Therefore from such misdirection and wrong assumptions it is submitted that only a wrong conclusion was arrived at by their Lordships in Bangladesh.

Not only the Order dated 18.4.1973 issued under the Bangladesh Citizenship (Temporary Provisions) Order 1973 of the government disbarred him from applying for the said automatic naturalisation, the very fact that he applied in 1978 for restoration of Bangladesh Citizenship falsifies all these three aforesaid assumptions.

And verily it is obtuse to invoke the principles of natural justice after about 20 years of latches to challenge an Act of State which is again beyond the purview of the Judiciary.

**Principles of Estoppel**

Even if Mr Azam's participation with the Pakistani occupational forces is discounted for the purpose of ascertaining his national status, he was defacto and de-jure a Pakistani even on the day of the judgment by the Supreme Courts of Judiciary in Bangladesh and he should have been estopped from denying that declared status of his.

After the declaration of independence of Bangladesh on 26th March 1971 his anti-Bangladeshi activities which can be taken judicial Notice of, holding himself out as a true

and patriotic Pakistani transcends the definition of a collaborator and makes him a foreigner; as well as his acts of travelling in so many countries of the world after liberation holding himself out as a Pakistani national and using his Pakistani Passport (For that matter the even entered into Bangladesh with a Pakistani passport). Yet the highest judiciary of Bangladesh declared him to be a Bangladeshi by birth when he did not even apply for one, usurping the ministerial responsibility nullifying the existing act of state, albeit following the wishes of the ruling cliques of Bangladesh who let Mr Azam into Bangladesh in the first place and allowed him to stay there without any let or

hindrance. It is submitted that the Rule of Law is fundamentally flawed here in that: (i) the Courts applied the Deeming provisions of law which did not exist at all here and which can be applied only when it is specifically provided in law, and never against the Act of state; (ii) The Honorable and Learned lord Justices failed to consider the actual and foreseeable expectancy of Golam Azam in 1971 and onward which is the most crucial test in such cases when a new nation emerges. See many British Citizens Cases from the colonies; (iii) In this context his holding himself out as a Pakistani in different countries makes his Credibility a major issue

his Credibility a major issue to decide his case which is apparently totally missing from the judgment making the decisions look like Pedestrian jargons without any judicial probing. If he was a Bangladeshi with fear of persecution in Bangladesh he could have applied for Political Asylum while abroad and had many other options open to him to demonstrate his political status and he did none for the simple reason that he was a Pakistani and was happy to be so. (iv). It is also ironical that reports of the highest courts of Bangladesh which apparently have no reference to the legal burden of proof the most basic question but very important which rested on Mr Azam

all through without shifting on to the state; and has he proved his case? As opposed to these one finds the application of the High Sounding principles of Natural Justice which in this case, it is submitted is utter non-sense and totally inapplicable. The principles of Natural Justice has been rendered hollow and amazing here when Mr Azam never applied and denied citizenship of Bangladesh; also it is a mockery when his non-existent Bangladeshi citizenship is being enforced and claimed through the backdoor after such a long lapse of time. It is submitted that the Courts in Bangladesh acted in aid of Golam Azam rather than enforcing the laws of the land

and behaved and sounded paternalistic which made the decision unreasonable in a Wednesday sense (Associated Provincial Picture house Ltd. v Wednesday Corporation, 1948, 1 KB. 223. Justifiability of all English Judicial Review i.e. Writ cases are decided with reference to the ratio decidendi of this case)

**Lex Domicili and Nationality Law**

One also finds the confusing and misleading arguments in favour of Golam Azam in that the Nationality law and the law of Domicile have been wrongly proffered as is apparent on the press reporting.

In respect of the law of Domicile it is quite clear that a person must have a Domicile which governs his personal matters of say marriage, divorce, inheritance & etc. i.e. his Civil Status as opposed to his political status. Domicile is of two types (a). Domicile of Origin and (b) Domicile of Choice. Domicile of Origin is derived from ones place of Birth and Domicile of Choice is an act of acquiring a new Domicile by abandoning his Domicile of Origin and it is proved by showing: 9i) his animus i. intention of acquiring a new domicile of choice and (ii) the factum of residence with the new territorial jurisdiction. It is determined by the person's own acts and intentions and declarations and as to how, when and to whom made.

As opposed to that Nationality is quite different and it determines the Political Status of a person on the basis of legislative enactment of the state. And it is quite wrong to state that citizenship by birth cannot be cancelled and nobody can be declared Stateless which is on partly right in respect of the law of Domicile.

**Statelessness**

With the emergence of all the new states people as a whole become stateless nationally until they actually acquire the new status of citizens of the new state by exercising their options or under the automatic Naturalisation process of the Act of the State.

In this context be it noted that with the emergence of the new independent states from the British colonial rules during the 60s, hundreds of thousands of UK Citizens became stateless due to the Acts of states of the United Kingdom and the newly emerged states in Africa and Latin America/West Indies. Even today there would be about 22000 East African British who have been residing in India as Stateless persons.

Also under the British new Nationality law of 1981 which amended the 'jus sanguinis' principles of British Nationality has rendered many children born in the United Kingdom of foreign parents as Stateless. They are British Overseas Citizens without any right of settlement and of politics in the United Kingdom and European Community.

It is also not unknown that convicted spy's naturalisation can be ... him see Klaus Fuchs case & Dr Goodwin-Gill's International Law ... at p203.

However as to Domicile of Golam Azam it is proven beyond doubt that he never lost

his tenacious Domicile of Origin of Pakistan which is still subsisting or he has definitely acquired a Pakistani Domicile on choice as his home was Pakistan combined with the factum of his residence outside Bangladesh. (An Englishman died in France after living most of his life in France and yet English Courts found him died domiciled Englishman because some letters only showed that he wished he died in England but could not live in England due to health reasons; also see Bell v Kennedy, 1868, H. L. Winnans v AG, 1904; Ross v Ross, 1930).

The nature of the nationality law is thus clear that these are legislative enactments and the question of nationality of an individual is governed by Nationality law combined with the Administrative Discretion and acts of State.

This Administrative Discretion is never delegated to any court of law in any country where there is Rule of Law simply because it operates under the sovereign authority of the state as a ministerial duty outside the purview of judicial function. (See Sobhuza II V Miller, 1926 AC p 518; held such an act cannot be questioned or made the subject of legal proceeding in any court of law).

There may be hundreds of cases where British Citizens were refused permission to enter or stay permanently in the United Kingdom. So it would be incorrect to say that English law was followed in this case.

(See The Queen v Secy of State Ex Parte Mohammed Alzal, QBD, 1992 where a British citizen was refused settlement in the United Kingdom. He was treated as a British Overseas Citizen confirming the refusal of the Secretary of State for Home Office).

On the overall performance of this case of such socio-political significance one tends to ponder deeply and tends to conclude logically that the Noble, Honourable and the Learned Justices of the Highest Courts of Bangladesh were scared to face up to the law which they were called upon to apply and enforce without fear or favour, excepting the Noble, Learned Mr. Justice Sarkar who only seemed to have addressed the issue judicially.

May we concluded thus, that Golam Azam did not win. He was a happy Pakistani and never suffered any injustice as such. It was Bangladesh and its law that was on trial who lost it. Unfortunately taking advantage of such lack of confidence in the people of Bangladesh, and their social weaknesses and instability many more Pakistanis in the garb of Bangladeshi citizenship are now getting stronger and emboldened and daring enough to hoist their favourite national flags on their national occasions in this their promised land of mild and honey.

Does it indicate anything the loss or decay of the Bangladeshi national sovereignty so valiantly fought and won by the martyrs?

Barrister Omar Faruque, Advocate, Supreme Court of Bangladesh and Solicitor-Advocate of the Supreme Court of England and Wales.

## Where feeding the homeless is a crime

Feeding the homeless can get you a jail sentence in California reports Haider Rizvi

**M**ORE than 700 social activists have been arrested in the west coast city of San Francisco in the past two years for the 'crime' of distributing free food to the homeless people, according to the US-based Institute for Food and Development Policy.

Robert Khan of the social action group 'Food Not Bombs' was sent to jail for two months beginning 17 June following a two-year trial. He was sentenced despite an appeal by the district attorney to set him free. He had been charged with handing out free food to the homeless in public.

Activists say San Francisco Police continue to arrest and harass homeless people as well as food rights groups under a California state law that forbids distribution of free food to the homeless without permission from authorities.

Officials contend the law is to ensure that the foods is safe for human consumption, but civil rights and human rights advocates allege it is a device that the police are using to persecute activities and to drive the homeless out of the city.

The repressive measures of the authorities, are disguised attempts to push the hungry and the homeless out of public places to promote the tourist industry, says Alice Kolser of the Food First Information and Action Network (FIAN), a Germany based group that tracks economic rights violations worldwide.

FIAN claims there are five

million children in the United States, who go to sleep hungry each night and that there are 23,000 children who die of poverty-related causes each year. It says people in the United States lack adequate food mainly because they have insufficient income; and that California has experienced a deep and prolonged recession in which jobs have been lost and wages eroded.

Over the past four years, Aid to Families With Dependent Children grants have been cut by 14%. The maximum monthly grant for a family of three fell from \$ 694 in 1990 to \$ 594 in 1995, which represents an almost 30% loss in real dollars.

In addition, budget cuts have deprived 26 million children of school lunch programme, five million children of school breakfast programmes, and deprived 5.9 million pregnant women of food stamps, according to the Institute for Food and Development Policy (IFDP).

The child poverty rate in the United States has risen from 18% in the 1980s to 22% in the 1990s, which, according to IFDP, is the highest among the industrialised countries.

**The State's responsibility**

Rejecting the official argument of lack of resources, food activists insist that the state must take the responsibility to ensure the right to food by providing jobs and adequate social security for those unable to work.

Karen Parker, a lawyer spe-

cializing in international human rights law, notes that the United States is the largest exporter of agricultural products, yet the agricultural surplus in the United States by no means indicates the everyone is well fed in the country.

Both the London-based Amnesty International and the United Nations Human Rights Commission are investigating charges of police brutalities against the Food Not Bombs activists.

Amnesty International sent several letters last year to US authorities, including the US Department of Justice, seeking explanation for the arrests and police harassment of Food Not Bombs activists in San Francisco. In a letter to California governor Pete Wilson dated 14 June, amnesty said it was disturbed at evidence suggesting the law may have been used against the activists because their beliefs and activities were unpopular with the city administration.

Amnesty and others have been dissatisfied with the response to their appeals. There is a complete silence from the US side on this issue, says Parker, who is closely assisting the UN Human Rights Commission in investigations into police harassment of food activists. It is really shameful, he added.

Food Not Bombs activists say they are harassed not because of their charity work but for political reasons. We don't merely distribute

free food. We make political and social statement at public places, says Hugh Mejia, a spokesman for the group.

"We try to make people aware of their basic human rights. Food Not Bombs says it has applied for the official permit for free distribution of food 130 times, but that authorities have never responded to their requests.

Human rights advocates say police harassment of those increasing public awareness about the right to food is a gross violation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, which recognises the right to be free from hunger, the right to adequate living, and the right to work.

The United States has yet to join over 130 nations that have already ratified this Covenant.

"It is questionable how the United States can justify its role as a world leader in international affairs when it does not promote the universal standards of well-being on its own soil," said the San Francisco Bay Guardian in a recent editorial on Kahn's arrest.

Imagine what the United States would say if this occurred in another country, added Parker. "If the military dictatorship in Burma arrested people for feeding the poor, the United States would condemn them. Here in San Francisco, there is silence."

Courtesy - Centre For Legal Studies

**Sunday 8th December**

(All programmes are in local time. There may be changes in the programmes).

**BTV**

3:00 Opening Announcement  
 Al-Quran Programme Summary  
 3:10 News in Bangla 3:15 Patriotic Songs 3:20 Recitation from the Bible 3:25 Telecast of Drama 4:50 Maram 5:00 News in Bangla 5:25 Sports Programme 6:00pm Getmalaya 6:35 Meyeer Janyro 6:50 Open University 7:00 The News 7:25 Documentary on Freedom Fighting 8:00 News in Bangla 8:25 Women in Freedom Fighting 9:00 Film Series: Akbar The Great 10:00 News in English 10:25 Those Days of Freedom Fighting 10:30 Shono Anaban 11:30 News in Bangla 11:35 Monday's programme 11:40 Close down

**BBC**

6:00am BBC World News 6:30 India Business Report 7:00 BBC World News 7:25 This Week 8:00 BBC World News 8:30 India Business Report 9:00 BBC World News 9:25 This Week 10:00 BBC World News 10:05 BBC Focus: Horizon 11:00 BBC World News 11:25 India Business Report 12:00noon BBC World News 12:20 Britain in View 1:00 BBC World News 1:20 This Week 2:00 BBC World News 2:05 World Focus: Assignment 3:00 BBC World News 3:30 Time Out: The Cloth Show 4:30 BBC World News 4:05 World Focus: Everyman 5:00 BBC World News 5:20 Window On Europe 6:00pm BBC World News 6:05 World Focus: Pole to Pole 7:00 BBC World News 7:05 Breakfast With Frost 8:00 BBC World News 8:30 Time Out: The Clothes Travel Show 9:00 BBC World News 9:05 World Focus: Horizon 10:00 BBC World News 10:20 Earth Report 10:30 Time Out: Film 96 11:00 BBC World News 11:30 Time Out: Top Gear 12:00 BBC World News 12:20 Time Out: The Record 1:00 BBC World News 1:20 Window On Europe 2:00 BBC World News 2:05 World Focus: Bell On Bosnia 3:00 BBC



Nirma Aahaa on Zee TV, tonight at 9:00

World News 3:30 Time Out Tomorrow's World 4:00 BBC World Report Int World Business Report/24 Hours

**CHANNEL V**

6:00am Frame by Frame 7:00 Rewind VJ Sophia 8:00 Frame by Frame 9:00 Big Bang Week-end VJ Alessandra 11:00 BP: One 12:00 Sansa Mangla hai 12:30 First Day First Show 1:00 Rewind VJ Sophia 1:30 Speak Easy 2:00 Videocon Flashback 3:00 Asian Top 20 VJ Trey 5:00 The Vibe Weekend 7:00pm Fashion Police 7:30 Soul Curry 8:00 The Indian Top 10 9:00 Launchpad VJ Samira 10:00 House Of Noise VJ Luke 11:00 Rewind VJ Sophia 12:00am Big Bang VJ Alessandra 1:00 The Ride VJ Trey 2:00 By Demand VJ Trey 3:00 Big

Sophiya in Rewind on Channel [V] at 11:30 pm

**STAR PLUS**

6:00am Nanny and the Profs Oz Slye 7:30 Alaap 8:30 Tara Rum 9:30 Chandrakanta 10:30 T. U. Manu Manu 11:00 Kaisadiksha 11:30 Amul India Show 12:00noon The Road Show 12:30 India Business Week 1:30 Star Trek 2:00pm Hindi Classic Film Devas 3:00pm 1996 Channel Music Awards 9:00 Reporter 9:30 Countdown Plus 10:30 STAR News Sunday 11:30 Dynasty 12:30 India Business Week 1:30 Amul India Show 2:00 BBC Documentary 'All Our Children' 3:00 Movie Classic: 'They Made Me a Criminal' 5:00 Thetakers

**STAR SPORTS**

6:00am World Wrestling Federation Blast Off 8:00 LIVE NBA Game Of The Week Miami 10:00 1996 Asian Cup Championships A1 UAE vs A3 Kuwait Venue Abu Dhabi 12:00 1996 Asian Cup Championships A4 Republic vs A2 Indonesia Venue Abu Dhabi 2:00 1996 Omega Tour-Tugu Pattana Indonesian PGA Champ H/Ls 3:00 Squash Super Series World Open 4:00 NBA Game Of The Week Miami @ Chicago 6:30 Live Lipton World Grand Prix Finals, 1996 Final From Bali 10:00 Same Day Delay 1996 Asian Cup Championships Saudi Arabia vs Iraq Venue Dubai 12:00 Same Day Delay 1996 Asian Cup Championships B4 Thailand vs B2 Iran Venue Dubai 2:00 NBA Game Of The Week Miami @ Chicago 4:30 Live Lipton World Grand Prix Finals, 1996 Final From Bali

**STAR MOVIES**

7:30am Family The Chipmunk Adventure PG (Hindi Subtitles) 9:30 Family Tommy Tricker And The Stamp Traveller PG (Hindi Subtitles) 11:30 Classic: Sink The Bismarck! 12 (Hindi Subtitles) 1:30 Family: A Young Architect Yankee in King Arthur's Court 12 (Hindi Subtitles) 3:30 Sunday Show Time: Pee-Wee's Playhouse (PG) 4:30 Sunday Show Time The

**PTV**

8:00am Talawat Aur Tarjuma/Hamd/Naat 8:20 Cartoon 6:30 Dear EL 7:00 Snowcem Kai Bh: Aaj Bhi 7:30 Ten Bh: Chup Men: Bhi Chup 8:00 Abhineth: 8:20 Kinetic: Pride Hasen: Pal: 8:30 Borog: The Real Governor: 9:00 Praful V3: 9:30 Shatranj: 10:00 Alko Ru: Ba Ru: 10:30 Stand by: 10:40 Hollywood Se Bollywood: 11:00 Navaratri: 11:30 Manaranjan: 12:00 Kinetic: Pride Hasen: Pal: 12:10 Karz: 12:30 Karz: 12:50 Karz: 1:00 Karz: 1:10 Karz: 1:20 Karz: 1:30 Karz: 1:40 Karz: 1:50 Karz: 2:00 Karz: 2:10 Karz: 2:20 Karz: 2:30 Karz: 2:40 Karz: 2:50 Karz: 3:00 Karz: 3:10 Karz: 3:20 Karz: 3:30 Karz: 3:40 Karz: 3:50 Karz: 4:00 Karz: 4:10 Karz: 4:20 Karz: 4:30 Karz: 4:40 Karz: 4:50 Karz: 5:00 Karz: 5:10 Karz: 5:20 Karz: 5:30 Karz: 5:40 Karz: 5:50 Karz: 6:00 Karz: 6:10 Karz: 6:20 Karz: 6:30 Karz: 6:40 Karz: 6:50 Karz: 7:00 Karz: 7:10 Karz: 7:20 Karz: 7:30 Karz: 7:40 Karz: 7:50 Karz: 8:00 Karz: 8:10 Karz: 8:20 Karz: 8:30 Karz: 8:40 Karz: 8:50 Karz: 9:00 Karz: 9:10 Karz: 9:20 Karz: 9:30 Karz: 9:40 Karz: 9:50 Karz: 10:00 Karz: 10:10 Karz: 10:20 Karz: 10:30 Karz: 10:40 Karz: 10:50 Karz: 11:00 Karz: 11:10 Karz: 11:20 Karz: 11:30 Karz: 11:40 Karz: 11:50 Karz: 12:00 Karz: 12:10 Karz: 12:20 Karz: 12:30 Karz: 12:40 Karz: 12:50 Karz: 1:00 Karz: 1:10 Karz: 1:20 Karz: 1:30 Karz: 1:40 Karz: 1:50 Karz: 2:00 Karz: 2:10 Karz: 2:20 Karz: 2:30 Karz: 2:40 Karz: 2:50 Karz: 3:00 Karz: 3:10 Karz: 3:20 Karz: 3:30 Karz: 3:40 Karz: 3:50 Karz: 4:00 Karz: 4:10 Karz: 4:20 Karz: 4:30 Karz: 4:40 Karz: 4:50 Karz: 5:00 Karz: 5:10 Karz: 5:20 Karz: 5:30 Karz: 5:40 Karz: 5:50 Karz: 6:00 Karz: 6:10 Karz: 6:20 Karz: 6:30 Karz: 6:40 Karz: 6:50 Karz: 7:00 Karz: 7:10 Karz: 7:20 Karz: 7:30 Karz: 7:40 Karz: 7:50 Karz: 8:00 Karz: 8:10 Karz: 8:20 Karz: 8:30 Karz: 8:40 Karz: 8:50 Karz: 9:00 Karz: 9:10 Karz: 9:20 Karz: 9:30 Karz: 9:40 Karz: 9:50 Karz: 10:00 Karz: 10:10 Karz: 10:20 Karz: 10:30 Karz: 10:40 Karz: 10:50 Karz: 11:00 Karz: 11:10 Karz: 11:20 Karz: 11:30 Karz: 11:40 Karz: 11:50 Karz: 12:00 Karz: 12:10 Karz: 12:20 Karz: 12:30 Karz: 12:40 Karz: 12:50 Karz: 1:00 Karz: 1:10 Karz: 1:20 Karz: 1:30 Karz: 1:40 Karz: 1:50 Karz: 2:00 Karz: 2:10 Karz: 2:20 Karz: 2:30 Karz: 2:40 Karz: 2:50 Karz: 3:00 Karz: 3:10 Karz: 3:20 Karz: 3:30 Karz: 3:40 Karz: 3:50 Karz: 4:00 Karz: 4:10 Karz: 4:20 Karz: 4:30 Karz: 4:40 Karz: 4:50 Karz: 5:00 Karz: 5:10 Karz: 5:20 Karz: 5:30 Karz: 5:40 Karz: 5:50 Karz: 6:00 Karz: 6:10 Karz: 6:20 Karz: 6:30 Karz: 6:40 Karz: 6:50 Karz: 7:00 Karz: 7:10 Karz: 7:20 Karz: 7:30 Karz: 7:40 Karz: 7:50 Karz: 8:00 Karz: 8:10 Karz: 8:20 Karz: 8:30 Karz: 8:40 Karz: 8:50 Karz: 9:00 Karz: 9:10 Karz: 9:20 Karz: 9:30 Karz: 9:40 Karz: 9:50 Karz: 10:00 Karz: 10:10 Karz: 10:20 Karz: 10:30 Karz: 10:40 Karz: 10:50 Karz: 11:00 Karz: 11:10 Karz: 11:20 Karz: 11:30 Karz: 11:40 Karz: 11:50 Karz: 12:00 Karz: 12:10 Karz: 12:20 Karz: 12:30 Karz: 12:40 Karz: 12:50 Karz: 1:00 Karz: 1:10 Karz: 1:20 Karz: 1:30 Karz: 1:40 Karz: 1:50 Karz: 2:00 Karz: 2:10 Karz: 2:20 Karz: 2:30 Karz: 2:40 Karz: 2:50 Karz: 3:00 Karz: 3:10 Karz: 3:20 Karz: 3:30 Karz: 3:40 Karz: 3:50 Karz: 4:00 Karz: 4:10 Karz: 4:20 Karz: 4:30 Karz: 4:40 Karz: 4:50 Karz: 5:00 Karz: 5:10 Karz: 5:20 Karz: 5:30 Karz: 5:40 Karz: 5:50 Karz: 6:00 Karz: 6:10 Karz: 6:20 Karz: 6:30 Karz: 6:40 Karz: 6:50 Karz: 7:00 Karz: 7:10 Karz: 7:20 Karz: 7:30 Karz: 7:40 Karz: 7:50 Karz: 8:00 Karz: 8:10 Karz: 8:20 Karz: 8:30 Karz: 8:40 Karz: 8:50 Karz: 9:00 Karz: 9:10 Karz: 9:20 Karz: 9:30 Karz: 9:40 Karz: 9:50 Karz: 10:00 Karz: 10:10 Karz: 10:20 Karz: 10:30 Karz: 10:40 Karz: 10:50 Karz: 11:00 Karz: 11:10 Karz: 11:20 Karz: 11:30 Karz: 11:40 Karz: 11:50 Karz: 12:00 Karz: 12:10 Karz: 12:20 Karz: 12:30 Karz: 12:40 Karz: 12:50 Karz: 1:00 Karz: 1:10 Karz: 1:20 Karz: 1:30 Karz: 1:40 Karz: 1:50 Karz: 2:00 Karz: 2:10 Karz: 2:20 Karz: 2:30 Karz: 2:40 Karz: 2:50 Karz: 3:00 Karz: 3:10 Karz: 3:20 Karz: 3:30 Karz: 3:40 Karz: 3:50 Karz: 4:00 Karz: 4:10 Karz: 4:20 Karz: 4:30 Karz: 4:40 Karz: 4:50 Karz: 5:00 Karz: 5:10 Karz: 5:20 Karz: 5:30 Karz: 5:40 Karz: 5:50 Karz: 6:00 Karz: 6:10 Karz: 6:20 Karz: 6:30 Karz: 6:40 Karz: 6:50 Karz: 7:00 Karz: 7:10 Karz: 7:20 Karz: 7:30 Karz: 7:40 Karz: 7:50 Karz: 8:00 Karz: 8:10 Karz: 8:20 Karz: 8:30 Karz: 8:40 Karz: 8:50 Karz: 9:00 Karz: 9:10 Karz: 9:20 Karz: 9:30 Karz: 9:40 Karz: 9:50 Karz: 10:00 Karz: 10:10 Karz: 10:20 Karz: 10:30 Karz: 10:40 Karz: 10:50 Karz: 11:00 Karz: 11:10 Karz: 11:20 Karz: 11:30 Karz: 11:40 Karz: 11:50 Karz: 12:00 Karz: 12:10 Karz: 12:20 Karz: 12:30 Karz: 12:40 Karz: 12:50 Karz: 1:00 Karz: 1:10 Karz: 1:20 Karz: 1:30