

Strict rules

FROM PAGE 16
The bill requires that each private university has a syndicate comprising its vice chancellor, Pro-VC, treasurer, one dean, one departmental head and a member of its academic council nominated by the VC, an educationist nominated by the government, three members nominated by the board of trustees and a member nominated by the UGC, sources said.

The proposed bill also says VC would be the chairman of the syndicate, academic council and teacher appointment committee and member of board of trustees by position. It means the vice chancellor would have the authority to take all decisions regarding the university activities, sources said.

The VC will be accountable to the board of trustees for his activities as per the bill, said the sources.

One must have 20 years of teaching or administrative experience or 10 years of teaching and 10 years of administrative experience to be eligible to become a vice chancellor, they added.

Each private university will have to prepare a proper wage structure for teachers, officials and other employees and submit to UGC and the government.

The proposed bill also suggests formation of a nine-member Board of Trustees for every university and the board will nominate a member from the board as its chairman, according to the sources.

They added that there will be two members from the government and UGC in the syndicate.

Each university will have to have Tk 5 crore deposited with any scheduled bank approved by the government as Reserve Fund, said the sources.

According to the draft bill, any private university can conduct distance learning programmes or courses with

2 UPDF

FROM PAGE 16
districts, the latter opposing the peace accord.

Police rescued the bodies of Raju and Jampeda. Law enforcers visited the place and were patrolling in the area.

Meanwhile, a group of ethnic people allegedly set four houses of Bangalee settlers on fire at Adarsha para in Khagrachhari town yesterday, reports our Rangamati correspondent.

Abul Kashem, Maidul Islam, Mohammad Javed Ali and Harun ur Rashid are the owners of the houses.

Fire brigade and police sources said the houses were set on fire at 5:00pm.

Fire service, however, managed to douse the fire before it could spread throughout the village.

Deputy Commissioner Mohammad Abdullah said he had already started investigating the incident.

District Vice President of Awami League Rono Bikrom Tripura said Bengali settlers themselves might have done it to make the situation unstable.

Earlier, on February 23, following a clash between Bangalee settlers and Adivasis, a Bangalee was killed and 50 others injured in a fire that burnt down around 120 houses in Khagrachhari town.

Shibir rented

FROM PAGE 1
between Tk 4,160 and Tk 8,660 excluding the month of January in 2008 during the changed scenario under the caretaker rule.

In January 2008, the Suhrawardy Hall unit Shibir earned Tk 18,320 against 49 seats in 33 rooms. They collected Tk 120 to Tk 840 in rent from each student.

Their annual income from the hall was Tk 78,455 in 2007 and Tk 73,882 in 2008.

From this income, 44 Shibir men of different halls and Shibir-controlled private messes including Students' Welfare hostel of Binodpur were given credit amounting to over Tk 28,000 between February 2009 and January 2010.

The figures of their loan amount to Tk 100 to Tk 5,000, the documents show.

Shibir had other source of income through the general students on the campus. They used to earn up to Tk 2,000 each month through sale, often by force, of six publications -- Kishore Kantha, Chhitra Sangbad, Youth Wave, Nirjhor, Students Views and Current Issue.

The sources say Shibir men engaged in such illegal activities

the permission from the government.

The bill proposed five years imprisonment and a fine of Tk 10 lakh for any offence, they said adding that the authorities concerned will cancel temporary approval of any university if the university does not take permanent approval within the stipulated time.

One acre of land will be needed for establishing a private university under the metropolitan areas of Dhaka and Chittagong.

The cabinet on January 25 approved the proposed bill at its meeting chaired by Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina.

The Association of Private Universities of Bangladesh, however, is protesting the proposed bill saying that if the bill is passed, it will create an impasse in the higher education sector.

Probe body

FROM PAGE 16
Sources said the probe committee has shown Sir AF Rahman Hall unit BCL President Saidduzzaman Faruk, and BCL activists Mansur Ahmed Rony and Abu Zafar Md Salam, among others, responsible for the violence that day.

Rony and Zafar are also former activists of Jatityabadi Chhatra Dal, a member of the probe committee told The Daily Star.

Abubakar Siddique, a third year student of Islamic history and culture, was killed during a violent clash between two BCL factions on February 2. At least 25 people, including seven policemen and a journalist, were injured in the incident.

DU authorities formed a nine-member probe committee at a syndicate meeting on February 6 convened by DU Pro-Vice Chancellor Prof Harun-ur-Rashid. The committee was asked to submit its report within 15 working days. The deadline was extended by five days on February 23.

The committee gave a description of the incident and identified people responsible for it and the cause of Abubakar's death. In the process, it sought specialists' opinion, examined the post mortem report and talked with the Forensic and Neurosurgery Department of Dhaka Medical College, committee sources said. It held 14 meetings and visited the spot multiple times, interviewed more than 30 including the proctor, assistant proctors, provost, police, journalists, roommates, and students of the hall.

The report says that a blunt object hit Abubakar on the back of his head but the committee has not also ruled out the possibility of a tear gas shell hitting him.

The syndicate has decided to temporarily expel 10 students who belong to BCL and issue show cause notices to them as to why they won't be expelled permanently, several syndicate members confirmed.

The syndicate will also urge the government to probe the role of police on that day.

Syndicate member Sadeka Halim, also a member of the probe committee, said the report will be made public as soon as the syndicate decides so.

She said the committee expressed its view that the tradition of politics centring hall seats should be stopped and changes should be brought in hall administration.

The DU authorities will brief journalists regarding the probe report today at 12:00noon at the VC's office.

ties created terror among the students and forced them to accept everything they did.

A document shows leaders of the Suhrawardy Hall unit were asked to send "hardcore Shibir men to the rooms of Bangladesh Chhatra League men with an aim to terrorise them".

Signed by different halls' Shibir leaders including Anisur Rahman, Abu Kawser Akand, Atikul Islam, Arif Hossain, Jahangir Alam, Habibullah Masum, Khalid Hossain and Faruk Hossain in last January, the document also suggested listing the hall officials and staff, increasing activities at every room and working among common students in a planned way.

The document says Shibir has a spy by the name of Mohammad Ali Khan among 11 BCL workers at the hall.

A diary maintained by hall unit Shibir secretary Abdur Razzak shows his notes from a meeting on how to launch attacks on other halls.

"Their activities [as found in the documents] appear to be too enormous to be carried out by students alongside their studies," commented the VC, saying, they built Shibir secretariat at every hall.

This is the second Darbar being held there after the VC, saying, they built Shibir secretariat at every hall.

Throughout February, the Indians have repeatedly attempted to fish in Dibir Haor and Kendri Beel area. But they failed in the face of resistance by locals and BDR jawans.

BSF kills

FROM PAGE 16
The BSF shooting, National Security Intelligence and BDR sources confirmed the death of Indian citizen.

Locals rescued Quaium and rushed him to Ranishankol Health Complex where the on-duty doctor declared him dead.

BSF personnel took away the body of Bodhu Miah immediately after the incident.

BDR in a letter to BSF strongly protested the unprovoked killing and asked its Indian counterpart to refrain from such incident.

BDR Darbar

FROM PAGE 16
people including 57 army officials and the mutiny spread to other BDR units in the country.

This is the second Darbar being held there after the VC, saying, they built Shibir secretariat at every hall.

India keen

FROM PAGE 1
will hand over Billal after finishing their own investigation.

Reacting to reports on arrests of the five suspected JeM operatives in Dhaka, Indian External Affairs Minister SM Krishna said his country "would get in touch with the government of Bangladesh and try to find out what the position is".

About the arrestee [Billal] in question, he said if the person turns out to be the one wanted by the Indian police, the government will surely take the matter up with Bangladesh.

In December 1999, militants hijacked the Delhi-bound Indian Airlines plane (flight number-814) after it took off from Kathmandu. They forced the aircraft to land in Kandahar of the then Taliban-ruled Afghanistan.

The Indian authorities had to release four terrorists including Jaish founder Moulana Masood Azhar in return for safe release of all the passengers.

Along with another militant group, Jaish is blamed for the attack on Indian parliament in Delhi in December 2001.

It is also suspected to have a role in the abduction and murder of American journalist Daniel Pearl in Karachi.

JeM's main objective is to detach Kashmir from India.

In primary interrogation with the Rapid Action Battalion and later talking to reporters at Rab headquarters, Billal admitted he had a role in the 1999 hijack.

He also said he had been jailed in India in a case filed for anti-state activities.

Border rules

FROM PAGE 16
While visiting Dibir Haor area in Jaintapur, the DG told journalists that steps had been taken to make the border guards better equipped.

A major reshuffle in BDR is underway through which facilities of BDR jawans would be increased, he added.

He made the visit amid a tense situation between the border guards of the two countries. Earlier on February 27, BDR and BSF exchanged gunshots over intrusion of Indian nationals into Bangladesh territory.

He regretted that despite repeated urge BSF is not following the border rules and intrude into Bangladesh territory.

He said a new outpost would be set up in Dibir Haor as the existing outposts are less in number than that of the Indian counterpart.

During a briefing at Sylhet BDR headquarters later in the afternoon, he accused BSF of firing at innocent Bangladeshi civilians. "They even made children and quarry labourers their targets," he said.

The BDR jawans were left with no choice but to retaliate, said the BDR chief.

Sylhet Sector Commander Col Neamul Islam Fatemi and other officials accompanied the DG during his visit. Mainul Islam also met Shillong BSF Deputy Inspector General (DIG) RK Ravigandhi during his visit at Dibir Haor border.

Throughout February, the Indians have repeatedly attempted to fish in Dibir Haor and Kendri Beel area. But they failed in the face of resistance by locals and BDR jawans.

BSF kills

FROM PAGE 16
The BSF shooting, National Security Intelligence and BDR sources confirmed the death of Indian citizen.

Locals rescued Quaium and rushed him to Ranishankol Health Complex where the on-duty doctor declared him dead.

BSF personnel took away the body of Bodhu Miah immediately after the incident.

BDR in a letter to BSF strongly protested the unprovoked killing and asked its Indian counterpart to refrain from such incident.

BDR Darbar

FROM PAGE 16
people including 57 army officials and the mutiny spread to other BDR units in the country.

This is the second Darbar being held there after the VC, saying, they built Shibir secretariat at every hall.

Throughout February, the Indians have repeatedly attempted to fish in Dibir Haor and Kendri Beel area. But they failed in the face of resistance by locals and BDR jawans.

BSF kills

FROM PAGE 16
The BSF shooting, National Security Intelligence and BDR sources confirmed the death of Indian citizen.

Locals rescued Quaium and rushed him to Ranishankol Health Complex where the on-duty doctor declared him dead.

BSF personnel took away the body of Bodhu Miah immediately after the incident.

BDR in a letter to BSF strongly protested the unprovoked killing and asked its Indian counterpart to refrain from such incident.

BDR Darbar

FROM PAGE 16
people including 57 army officials and the mutiny spread to other BDR units in the country.

This is the second Darbar being held there after the VC, saying, they built Shibir secretariat at every hall.

Lake recovery

FROM PAGE 1
It rather came up with a layout of the lakes prepared three years ago by a hired consultant, Digital Mapping Organisation, during the then caretaker government, and submitted it to the Planning Commission for the development and conservation project.

The layout was prepared taking only water-submerged areas as parts of the lake, allegedly to accommodate powerful encroachers.

The project is now awaiting approval of the Executive Committee of National Economic Council (Ecne).

Dhaka Settlement Office under DLRS wrote a letter to the Rajuk authorities asking for DMDP designs to demarcate the lake areas.

"But Rajuk did not even entertain my officials despite several attempts," said Dhaka Settlement Officer Faikuzzaman Chowdhury.

Rajuk's Deputy Town Planner Abu Hasan Mortuza said they prepared designs of the lakes on the basis of the Wetland Conservation Act, and DMDP -- taking mainly the water-submerged areas of the lakes into consideration.

Rajuk Chairman Md Nurul Huda said they carried out the survey without involving DLRS and the DC office because the lands of the lake areas belong to Rajuk.

Regarding publication of the list of illegal occupants, he said, "We will do it later."

Faikuzzaman Chowdhury of Dhaka Settlement Office said, "A survey of the lake areas on the basis of Wetland Conservation Act will just show the lakes' present status, and justify all encroachments that took place over the years."

The HC also directed Rajuk to take immediate measures to stop any further encroachments on the lakes. But the encroachments have been going on ever since.

While unscrupulous powerful quarters ruthlessly encroached on the lakes, successive governments also allowed creation of hundreds of plots through earth filling strip by strip over the years, narrowing down the original lakes. The practice started in the 1980s, allegedly to accommodate the then ruling high-ups.

Interestingly, Rajuk itself endorsed creation of such plots over the years.

Rajuk's Deputy Town Planner Mortuza said it is a mammoth task to reverse the allocations of plots which were done by Rajuk itself with approval of government high-ups at different times.

The Rajuk chairman said, "Whatever has been done in this regard is practically irreversible."

The HC order came in context of a writ petition that had been filed by the Gulshan Society to protect the lakes.

Fahima Nasrin, joint secretary of the society also a former deputy attorney general, said, "Rajuk is in clear violation of

Death penalty

FROM PAGE 16
Advocate Ruhul Quddus,

counsel for one of the petitioners, told reporters that under the criminal law the provision of death sentence should not be the only option as the punishment for the criminals.

From now on death penalty should not be the only option for the criminals following the HC verdict, he added.

The Women and Children Repression Prevention (Special) Act 1995 has been replaced by the Women and Children Repression Prevention Act 2000 with a provision of life-term imprisonment and capital punishment as an alternative.

On July 12, 2001, the Women and Children Repression Prevention Special Tribunal of Manikganj awarded capital punishment to Sukur Ali, now in Dhaka jail.

Later Sukur filed an appeal with the HC against the trial court verdict. But the HC on February 25, 2004 upheld the judgment of the trial court and the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court also upheld the HC verdict on February 23, 2005.

Then BLAST and Sukur Ali filed a writ petition with the HC on December 2005 challenging constitutional validity of the section.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.

After two days of the writ, the court issued a rule upon the government to show cause as to why the provision of the act under which the case was filed and trial was done should not be declared unconstitutional and without lawful authority.</