

## Grenade attack

FROM PAGE 1

over the bail orders. The prosecution will file appeals within a short time with the higher court against the bail orders.

Advocate Syed Rezaur Rahman, chief state counsel, told The Daily Star that every court has a discretionary jurisdiction to grant bail to any accused. But the August 21 grenade attack cases are very sensational ones. Earlier, the same court recorded statements of 61 prosecution witnesses. Moreover, these two accused gave confessional statements admitting their involvement with the incidents. So, the court should not grant bail to the accused at this stage.

"I shall go to the higher court against the orders after getting certified copies of the orders," he said.

Dhaka Metropolitan Public Prosecutor advocate Mohammad Abdullah Abu also told The Daily Star that the trial court should not grant bail to the accused considering the depth of the offences brought against them.

Advocate Masud Ahmed Talukder said the cases are very much sensational and the court should not grant bail to the accused at this stage of trial even though the court has discretionary jurisdiction to grant bail to any accused.

On condition of anonymity, a litigant said no accused should be detained in jail custody if the accused in the grenade attack cases get out on bail.

During the hearing on the bail petitions, Sumon's lawyer advocate Aminul Goni Titu argued that his client's name was not in the first information report (FIR) and that he did not implicate himself even though he had given confessional statements.

Mohibullah's lawyer told the court that his client, whose name was also not in the FIR, was implicated in the case as part of a conspiracy.

The prosecution opposed the bail petitions, saying the two along with six others, including Huji chief Mufti Hannan, had confessed to their involvement with the grenade attack.

After the hearing, the

judge granted bails to Mohibullah and Sumon and rejected the bail petitions of detained former deputy minister and BNP leader Abdus Salam Pintu and four others.

Details of the court orders could not be known immediately.

The same court on August 3 ordered further investigation into the cases after the prosecution submitted petitions on June 25 this year.

### BACKGROUND

Even though the then opposition leader Sheikh Hasina escaped injuries, the attack left 24 Awami League leaders, including President Zillur Rahman's wife Ivy Rahman, dead and 300 others injured.

A day after the grenade attack, police filed two cases—one for murder and another under the Explosive Substances Act—with Motijheel Police Station.

Before submission of the charge sheets, the nation witnessed drama during the trial of the BNP-Jamaat government centring investigation into the grisly attack.

Three former CID investigation officers are now facing charges for misdirecting the investigations.

The charge sheet, accusing 22, was submitted before the court last year but the investigators could not find out the sources of the grenades used in the attack.

### CONFESSION

In his confessional statement, Sumon said he attended the meeting arranged in Kajol's house at Merul Badda on August 20, 2004 to plan the attack.

He said he heard every detail of the attack preparations.

After Fazr prayer on August 21, Sumon left for the rally on Bangabandhu Avenue with two grenades, he said in his statement.

CID investigation officer ASP Fazlul Kabir in the charge sheet quoted the confessional statement of Sumon.

Mohibullah in his confessional statement said he was present when the plan to carry out the grenade attack was made on August 20. He said Mufti Abdul Hannan, Maulana Abu Sayeed, Maulana Abu Jandal, Jahangir Alam, Masud, Iqbal, Babu and Bulbul also attended the meeting.

## Water supply

FROM PAGE 1

Setting up of Gazi tanks at busting points for a free drinking water supply, said Shahjahan Ali.

Besides, tanker lorries would be pressed into service to supply water to areas of the city according to the demand, he added.

Nurul Haque, chief executive officer of Dhaka City Corporation, who chaired the meeting, said the DCC will provide WASA with every possible help necessary for water supply.

DCC's own tanker lorries would also be ready for supplying water whenever necessary, he said.

WASA, Khulna WASA, Rajshahi City Corporation, Sylhet City Corporation and Barisal City Corporation high-ups claimed to have their preparations complete for uninterrupted supply of water during Ramadan.

Sources said, Dhaka WASA can supply 190 to 197 crore litre water against the city's demand of 210 crore litre.

Before submission of the charge sheets, the nation witnessed drama during the trial of the BNP-Jamaat government centring investigation into the grisly attack.

### Khaleda, Tarique

FROM PAGE 1

appear before the court. The lawyers replied their clients were earlier granted bails from the HC for the next six months.

But the accused must appear before it on the scheduled date, even though they were on bail from the higher courts, the judge said.

Later, Khaleda's lawyers submitted another petition seeking adjournment of the hearing. In the petition, they mentioned that their client could not appear before it on security grounds and appealed to the court to ensure her security on her way to the court.

The lawyers also said Tarique had earlier gone abroad for his treatment and he was earlier granted bail in the case.

The court then fixed August 30 for hearing on the petition regarding Khaleda's security. Salimul was also granted bail in the case, but there was no step taken on his behalf.

On August 5, deputy assistant director of Anti-Corruption Commission (ACC) Harunur Rashid, also the investigation officer of the embezzlement case, submitted the charge sheet to the Dhaka Chief Metropolitan Magistrate's Court showing 36 prosecution witnesses.

According to the case statement, then prime minister Khaleda Zia and the other accused embezzled over Tk 2.10 crore by establishing Zia Orphanage Trust that exists only on paper.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The EC wants more institutional reforms to make the election process foolproof to ensure security to voters and institutionalise democratic practices.

Addressing the inaugural session he said the 2008 parliamentary elections were not only free and fair but also drew the highest turnout of voters including the marginalised, the disabled and women and witnessed no post-polls violence.

The EC is independent in discharging its duty as it was during the caretaker government.

According to the case statement, then prime minister Khaleda Zia and the other accused embezzled over Tk 2.10 crore by establishing Zia Orphanage Trust that exists only on paper.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

According to the case statement, then prime minister Khaleda Zia and the other accused embezzled over Tk 2.10 crore by establishing Zia Orphanage Trust that exists only on paper.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a fund that was created by the then premier shortly before the transfer—as part of the embezzlement scheme.

The complainant alleged that on June 9, 1991, a grant of \$1,255,000, equivalent to about Tk 4.45 crore at the time, was transferred from United Saudi Commercial Bank to prime minister's orphanage fund—a