

ANISUR RAHMAN

Act (SAT), 1950 basically terminated individual tenancies over certain lands and limited private tenancies to identified lands (.e,g. *khas* land, waste land, non-agricultural land, cultivable waste land, forest land and wetlands, orchards, tea gardens, *haats* and *bazaars*). The SAT Act not only recognised the titles of various *raiyats* but also declared land or building in a *haat* or *bazaar*, and "any land actually in use for ferry," as non-retainable properties. On these properties, community usufructuary rights were preserved against individual titles in the name of "public ownership." Therefore, the principle of "common property" appears to be accepted in the SAT Act, and is also found in sectoral laws including fishery, forestry, and energy.

Moreover, the right to environment is now well-recognised in our legal system since the apex court expanded the meaning of fundamental right to life to safe environment [*M. Farooque vs. Bangladesh*, 1996, 48 DLR (HC)]. Moreover, air is included in the definition of environment provided in Environment Conservation Act, 1995. But right to livelihood was not included in extending the right to life to right to environment. An Indian court included the right to livelihood within the auspices of environmental right. Therefore, there is scope for judicial activism to include right to livelihood as part of fundamental rights in our constitutional realm.

Therefore, taking into account the scope and challenges of the existing legal provisions in Bangladesh, one pro-active legal activist can bring a case for affected fisher folk of the coastal region of Bangladesh against the Bangladesh government under writ jurisdiction before the High Court Division of the Supreme Court of Bangladesh to protect their life and livelihood.

**The right to redress**

The above analysis illustrates that climate-affected coastal fisher folk of Bangladesh may argue a violation of their substantive rights under both international and domestic law. There are also procedural avenues to assert these rights, depending on the relationship between the claimant and respondent and their respective legal commitments. Judicial proceedings may result not only in legal mandates but can also bring a spillover effect in international agreements and national legislative procedures.

However, comprehensive groundwork is needed to pursue the case of climate- affected people of Bangladesh. It can be mentioned here that CSRL is organising a climate tribunal on November 8, with a view to establishing the evidence-based climate reality and to explore the legal avenues of filing a real case. CSRL is working with a group of climate scientists, legal experts and climate campaigners to organise this tribunal, which might be a worthy initiative to support and to provide necessary guidance to the government to work further to protect millions of climate-affected people of Bangladesh. The climate tribunal, definitely a substantial non-governmental initiative, strongly recommended that the government should take immediate initiatives to form a commission with scientific and legal experts to advance the case.

**M. Hafijul Islam Khan** is an environmental lawyer.