

## BCB's standing

"You know the last committee made a shortlist of three coaches, but we want to add more options. It looks impossible to appoint a coach before the Twenty20 World Championship, so we have some time to think about the issue," said Bobby.

The BCB body also formed a three-member selectors appointment sub-committee, with Shafiqur Rahman as chairman, Lipu vice-chairman and Iftiqaque Ahmed member, to choose the new selection panel after the Faruque Ahmed-led committee expires at the end of this month.

## STANDING COMMITTEES

**Finance:** M Abdul Momen (chairman), Feroz Ahmed (vice-chairman).

**Disciplinary:** Lt Col (retd) M Abdul Latif Khan (chairman), Gazi Ashraf Hossain (vice-chairman).

**Game development:** Lt Col (retd) M Abdul Latif (chairman), Iftiqaque Ahmed (vice-chairman).

**Tournament:** Selim Bhuiyan (chairman), Ahmed Sajjadul Alam (vice-chairman).

**Umpires:** Feroz Ahmed (chairman), M Abdul Momen (vice-chairman).

**Grounds and facilities management:** Shafiqur Rahman (chairman), Iftiqaque Ahmed (vice-chairman).

**CCDM:** Gazi Ashraf Hossain (chairman), Feroz Ahmed (vice-chairman).

**Marketing and commercial:** Mirza Salman Ispahani (chairman), Selim Bhuiyan (vice-chairman).

**Medical:** Selim Bhuiyan (chairman), M Abdul Momen (vice-chairman).

**Tender and purchase:** Lt Col M Abdul Latif Khan (retd) (chairman), Mirza Salman Ispahani (vice-chairman).

**Media and communication:** Ahmed Sajjadul Alam (chairman), Iftiqaque Ahmed (vice-chairman).

**Audit:** Monwar Anis Khan (chairperson), Selim Bhuiyan (vice-chairman).

**Women's wing:** Monwar Anis Khan (chairman).

**Logistic and protocol:** Ahmed Sajjadul Alam (chairman).

**CSA refutes booze**

FROM PAGE 17

that a confidential report with limited distribution to CSA officials should be leaked and sensationalised in this way."

Coach Mickey Arthur added: "The regulations about the intake of alcohol on tour was only one aspect of a generally very positive report on the fitness levels of the team from Adrian," he said. "We addressed all matters including this that arose regularly on tour and took steps accordingly."

Le Roux also made it clear his report was not meant for public consumption. "I was employed by CSA as the fitness trainer. In this professional capacity part of my duties is to submit regular reports on all aspects of physical conditioning."

"This was no different after the World Cup. A routine report was sent in confidentiality to individuals within CSA and it is disappointing that it is now public knowledge."

## Let's move on

FROM PAGE 17

to avoid their first home series defeat since 2001 was the form of paceman Chris Tremlett.

Playing in only his second Test, the 25-year-old Hampshire bowler took an impressive 3-12 in a penetrative seven-over spell.

"He bowled aggressively, he's grown with every spell he's bowled in the two Test matches."

The brilliant fieldman and explosive batsman, however, did not look out of place in the Broncos backline, producing a slick flick pass that would have done Darren Lockyer proud.

In 2003, after a frustrating time with his cricket, Symonds toyed with the idea of asking Brisbane coach



PHOTO: AFP

Martina Hingis of Switzerland hits a forehand against Michaella Krajicek of the Netherlands during their second-round match at the La Costa Resort and Spa in San Diego on Tuesday.

## BCCI steps into Nike-Adidas row

### Cricket

CRICINFO, undated

The Indian board has stepped into the

court case between sports goods manufacturers Nike and Adidas and said that when players enter into agreements for rights pertaining to their performance on the field while representing Team India, they can only enter those agreements which have been selected and promoted by the BCCI.

**Media and communication:** Ahmed Sajjadul Alam (chairman), Iftiqaque Ahmed (vice-chairman).

**Audit:** Monwar Anis Khan (chairperson), Selim Bhuiyan (vice-chairman).

**Women's wing:** Monwar Anis Khan (chairman).

**Logistic and protocol:** Ahmed Sajjadul Alam (chairman).

**CSA refutes booze**

FROM PAGE 17

that a confidential report with limited distribution to CSA officials should be leaked and sensationalised in this way."

Coach Mickey Arthur added: "The regulations about the intake of alcohol on tour was only one aspect of a generally very positive report on the fitness levels of the team from Adrian," he said. "We addressed all matters including this that arose regularly on tour and took steps accordingly."

Le Roux also made it clear his report was not meant for public consumption. "I was employed by CSA as the fitness trainer. In this professional capacity part of my duties is to submit regular reports on all aspects of physical conditioning."

"This was no different after the World Cup. A routine report was sent in confidentiality to individuals within CSA and it is disappointing that it is now public knowledge."

**Symonds playing right sport!**

### Cricket

INTERNET, undated

For a few seconds, the Twenty20

World Championship campaign of Australia cricketer Andrew Symonds looked in danger of being crushed.

The Queensland all rounder joined in training with the Brisbane Broncos, wrestling with 115kg giant Dave Taylor.

He completed Wednesday's entire session that finished with a wrestling drill where he ended up on the ground grappling with the massive figure of Taylor.

Even at a muscular 94kg, Symonds looked like a rag doll as he wrestled with the 19-year-old hulk.

The brilliant fieldman and explosive batsman, however, did not look out of place in the Broncos backline, producing a slick flick pass that would have done Darren Lockyer proud.

In 2003, after a frustrating time with his cricket, Symonds toyed with the idea of asking Brisbane coach

contract with the Indian board for the team's on-field uniform.

In its reply to the notice sent by the Monopoly of Trade and Restrictive Practices Commission (MTRPC) over this case, the board said: "BCCI is the body responsible for promotion and administration of the game of cricket in the country and the players who play in matches representing the country do so under the agreement entered into with the BCCI." This means that the endorsement and advertisement rights of players representing India in all international matches has an overriding effect on all other contractual agreements that individual players have with different companies.

The board said that it could not stop Nike from using Tendulkar in its advertisements. "Answering respondent (BCCI) could not ensure that Nike were violating Adidas's exclusive personal endorsement agreement with Tendulkar and argued that Nike, who sponsor the Indian cricket team, have the right to use images of Tendulkar only when he is playing for the country. Nike have a five-year

which is a separate corporate entity," the board responded.

The BCCI also accused Adidas of trying to harass the board "by filing frivolous and baseless proceedings which are not maintainable in law as well as in facts."

The MTRPC bench, hearing the case, asked Adidas and the BCCI to produce documents regarding their rights over Tendulkar by the next hearing which will take place in August.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively use Tendulkar's images in advertisements and promotions.

Nike had earlier responded to Adidas's claims by stating that the case filed by Adidas was not maintainable as the issue raised "arises out of contract". "It is an attempt to thwart the legitimate business activities of this respondent (Nike). The petitioner (Adidas) is a direct competitor of this respondent," Nike said while questioning Adidas's claims over its right to exclusively