city

# Summary of ICT verdict in Sayeedi Case

(FROM PAGE 12)

women and violation upon them.

78.P.W. 3 Mizanur Rahman, P.W.4 Sultan Ahmed Hawlader and P.W.5 Md. Mahatabuddin have narrated different crime occurrances took place at Parerhat during the War of Liberation. They have testified that accused as a member of Peace Committee and a Razakar took part in the attacks directed against unarmed civilians causing murder, looting, torture, converting Hindus to Muslims handing over women to Pakistani Army for committing rape upon them. P.W. 13 Gourango Chandra Saha has testified that in 1971 accused Delowar Hossain Sayeedi along with his associate Razakars went to his house and looted goods and they abducted his three sisters namely Mohamaya, Anno Rani and Komol Rani from his house and handed over those three woman to the Pakistani Army Camp for committing rape upon them. He further testified that his three sisters were forcefully raped and returned them after three days. He further stated that after a few days accused Delowar Hossain Sayeed went to their house and all the mem-

victim sisters left for India. 79.In cross-examination he denied the defence suggession that the accused was not involved in the act of abduction of his sisters and handing them over to Pakistani Army. It appears from the statement of Azit Kumar Sheel (Exbt. No. 264) that the evidence adduced by P.W. 13 has been corroborated by the statement as to abduction of three sisters of P.W. 13 and handing over them to Pakistani Army with the assistance of accused Delowar Hossain Sayeedi and his associates.

bers of their house were converted to Muslims. In order to get rid

of such disgraceful happenings, his father, mother and three

80. Upon scrutiny of the evidence discussed above, we are led to hold that the accused knowingly contributed and facilitated the commission of abduction of three women and paving the way in causing sexual violence upon them. The act of abduction and rape of victims were directed against civilians which manifestly fall within the purview of crimes against Humanity.

#### XXX. Adjutication of the charge no.17 (Confinement of Bipod Saha's daughter Bani

Saha at their house at Parerhat and committed rape upon her.)

81. That during the time of liberation war in 1971, accused Delowar Hossain Sayeedi along with other armed Razakars kept confined Bipod Saha's daughter Vanu Saha at Bipod Saha's house at Parerhat under Indurkani police station and regularly used to go there to rape her. This was committed by force or by threat and directed against a civilian population.

#### Evaluation of evidence and findings:

82.It is evident from the record that the prosecution has examined only one witness namely P.W. 4 Md. Sultan Ahmed Hawlader who has stated that accused Delowar Hossain Sayeedi and one Moslem Maulana used to rape Bani Saha, daughter of Bipod Saha of Parerhat regularly. He further stated that the accused compelled the father and brother of Bani Saha to be converted to Muslims and saying prayer in the Mosque. In crossexamination P.W. 4 denied the defence sugession that he falsely implicated the accused with the alleged commission of rape.

83. It is evident on record that neither Bani Saha nor her near relation has come forward before the Tribunal with the allegation of rape against the accused. It appears that P.W.4 did not disclose his source of knowledge about the allegation of rape against the accused. The uncorroborated testimony of a solitary witness (P.W.4), as to proving charge on rape is not sufficient to relyupon. In view of the fact, we hold that prosecution could not prove charge No. 16 beyond shadew of doubt.

#### XXXI. Adjudication of charge no.18 (Torture and killing of Vagirothi and throwing her dead body into the river.)

84. That during the Liberation War, Vagirothi used to work in the camp of Pakistani Army. On one day, after a fight with the freedom-fighters, and at the instance of the accused said Bhagiorithi was arrested on charge of passing information to the freedom fighters and was tortured and then after taking her to the bank of river Boleshwar she was killed and the dead body was thrown into the river.

#### Evaluation of evidence and finding

85. The prosecution has examined P.W. 12 A.K.M. Awal M.P. to prove charge No. 18 relating to killing and torture of ill-fated Vagirothi, an unofficial spy of the freedom-fighters. P.W.12 has depicted her as a brave lady who used to pass informations to the freedom-fighters about the movements of Pakistani forces. It is stated that local Razakars suspected her as a spy of freedomfighters and consequently she was caught and handed over to Pakistani forces who brutally killed her by gun shot and threw her body into the river. It is evident that P.W.12 in his statement did not suspect the accused in any way responsible for the tragic murder of ill-fated Vagirothi. It transpires from the statement (Exbt. No. 268) of Gonesh Chandra Saha that he has described the valient role of his mother Vagirothi in the War of Liberation but he did not implicate the accused with the killing of his mother. It is undisputed that Pakistani Army fastened Vagirothi with the back of a jeep and dragged her to river side and killed by gun-shot. Admittedly Vagirothi sacrificed her life for the noble cause of Liberation of Bangladesh. Having considered all aspects, we are led to hold that Prosecution could not connect the accused with the commission of killing of Vagirothi.

#### XXXII. Adjudication of the charge no. 19 (Conversation of Hindus to Muslims by using

86. That during the period of Liberation War starting from 26.03.1971 to16.12.1971 accused Delowar Hossain Sayeedi being a member of Razakar Bahini, by exercising his influence over Hindu community of the then Pirojpur Subdivision (now Pirojpur District) converted the following Hindus to Muslims by force namely, (1) Modhusudan Gharami(2) Kristo Saha(3) Dr. Gonesh Saha(4) Azit Kurmar Sil(5)Bipod Saha(6)Narayan Saha(7)Gowranga Pal(8)Sunil Pal(9)Narayan Pal(10) Amullya Hawlader,(11)Hari Roy(12) Santi Roy Guran (13) Fakir Das (14) Tona Das(15) Gourangaa Saha(16) his father Hori Das(17) his mother and three sisters (18) Mahamaya (19) Anno Rani and (20) Kamol Rani and other 100/150 Hindus of village-Parerhat and other villages under Indurkani police station and the accused also compelled them to go the mosque to say prayers. The act of compelling somebody to convert his own religious belief to another religion is considered as an inhuman act which is

#### treated as crimes against Humanity. Evaulation of evidence and findings:

The prosecution has examined as many as 5 witnesses to prove charge No.19 relating to conversation of Hindus to Muslims agasinst their will.

87. Upon scrutiny of the evidence adduced by P.W.2, 3,4,13 and 23 it is corroboratively found that during the War of Liberation accused Delowar Hossain Sayeedi was a member of local Peace Committee as well as member of Razakar Bahini of Parerhat. It is evident from the evidence discussed above that he compelled a good number of Hindus to embrace Islam putting them in fear of death. P.W-13 Gourango Chandra Saha and P.W.23 Modhu Sudan Ghorami are the victims of conversion who candidly narrated under what compelling circumstances they agreed to convert their religion. P.W-23 testified that the accused took him along with members of his family to local mosque and converted them to Muslims against their will. P.W.13 also gave direct evidence asserting that the accused compelled all the members of his family to embrace Islam under threat and they

were also compelled to go to mosque regularly to say prayers. It is found on solid evidence that during the War of Liberation the accused under coersion and threat compelled a good number of Hindu Community people to convert religious belief which is considered as inhuman act, torture and mental persecution which fall within the purview of crimes against humanity. O u r Holly Quran teaches us not to impose any sort of pressure upon the followers of other religion, because Islam was preached only by rational appeal and not by coersion or threat.

However, havining considered the evidence on records, we are satisfied to hold that prosecution has succesfully proved commission of offence against the accused mentioned in Charge No.19.

#### XXXIII. Adjudication of charge no.20

#### (Confinement of 85 persons at Talukdar Bari looting of valuables and women were raped)

88. That in the last part of November 1971 while civilians were fleeing to India, accused Delowar Hossain Sayeedi with his associate Razakars attacked them at the house of Talukdar Bari of Indurkani village and detained 85 persons therein and looted away their valuables and some female persons were raped by Pakistani Army by his assistance and thereby the accused committed offences of abduction, torture and abetment of rape which fall within the purview of the crimes aganist Humanity.

#### Discussion on evidence:

We have perused the documents both oral and documentary produced by the prosecution. It is found on evidence that no witness has been exanmined to prove the occurrance of Talukdar Bari and the prosecution has failed to prove the charges mentioined in charge No.20.

#### XXXIV. Plea of Alibi of the defence

89.On behalf of the accused Delowar Hossain Sayeedi a plea has been taken to the effect that since before starting the war of Liberation of Bangaldesh he used to reside in Jessore and he came back to his village home at Pirojpur in the middle of July,

### Evaluation of evidence as to proving plea of

90.It may be mentioned here that failure to prove plea of alibi is not fatal to the accused. Sub-rule (3) of Rule 51 of the Rules of Procedure have provided protection of the defence which reads as follows:

91.Mere failure to prove the plea of alibi and or documents and materials by the defence shall not render the accused guilty. Moreover, the accused charged with offence presumming him to be innocent until he is found guilty.

92.On perusal of the evidence adduced by D.W.5 it is found that the evidence of P.W. 4 and 6 that they have categorically stated while accused Delowar Hossain Sayeedi used to reside in Jessore before starting the War of Liberation in 1971, at that time he had two children. The prosecution has proved the copy of Nomination paper (Exbt. 151) for National Assembly election filed by accused Delowar Hossain Sayeedi which shows that the accused gave particulars of his four sons with the date of birth as quated bellow:-

Date of birth Name of son 18.11.1970 RafiqBinSayeedi Shamim Sayeedi 01.01.1972 Masud Sayeedi 01.11.1975

08.12.1976 Nasim Sayeedi 238.The Nomination Paper (Exbt. 151) dated 30.11.2008 submitted by the accused goes to prove that he had only one son at the time of War of Liberation in 1971. The learned defence counsel gave suggessions to P.Ws. 1,2,4,5,6,8,9,10,12 and 13 that the accused used to live in Jessore since before starting the war of Liberation till middle of July, 1971 but all the P.Ws flatly denied the suggessions as to his alleged residing in Jessore at the time of starting liberation struggle. The aforesaid P.Ws and the accused belong to same locality and the PWs have categorically stated his presence and participations in the atrocities committed in Parerhat area since May, 1971. P.W. 2 Ruhul Amin Nobin as a commander of freedom-fighter testified that he went to Parerhat Bazar on 18.12.1971 but he could not arrest accused fled away. P.W.12 A.K.M.A Awal M.P. also stated that after Liberation the accused left his locality for saving his life. It is evident that while Bangladesh war was over, diberted the accused left his village home and went into hiding. The factual aspect supposes that soon after Liberation the accused might have taken shelter in Jessore for his safety, at that time D.W.4 and 6 might have seen the sons of the accused. 93.In consideration of both oral and documentary evidence,

we are inclined to hold that the defence could not prove the plea of alibi. Thus, the plea of alibi does not inspire any amount of credence and appears to be a futile effort with intent to evade the charges brought against him.

#### XXXVI.Conclusion:

94. As Judges of this Tribunal, we firmly hold and believe in the doctrine that 'Justice in the future cannot be achieved unless injustice of the past is addressed'.

95.Horrendous incidents took place in Bangladesh about 40/41 years back in 1971 and as such memory of live witnesses may have been faded and as a result discrepency may have occurred in their versions made before this Tribunal. But, in practice, we found no significant inconsistencies in their testimonies in proving old incidents occurred during the War of Liberation.

96.We should keep in mind an important aspect of the case that we are not holding the trial of an Ex-M.P. or Nayb-e-Amir of Jamat-e-Islam named Allama Delowar Hossain Sayeedi, a renouned Oazin who is popularly known as an Islamic orator through out the country for his gift of the gab. Now let us go back to 40/41 years while the struggle for Liberation War started in 1971. From the evidence on record we have found that accused Delowar Hossain Sayeedi had a very low profile having no significant social or political status in the society. He was simply a grocery shop keeper who used to sell oil, salt, onion, pepper etc. at Parerhat Bazar. His financial condition was not good. This trial is being held against that Delowar Hossain Sayeedi for the commission of crimes against Huminity alleged to have been committed by him about 41 years back at Parerhat area while he was a Potential Razakar as well as member of local Peace Committee. The defence took a plea to the effect that there was a Razakar named Delowar Hossain Mollik who was killed after Liberation but prosecution with an ulterior motive, shifted the liability of that dead Delowar Mollik upon this present accused Delowar Hossain Sayeedi.

97. In the above aspect, we find no substance because a good number of prosecution witnesses and the accused himself hail from the same locality who identified the accused in dock as the sole accused in this case and as such there is no confussion as to identity of the accused.

98. The experssion 'directed against civilian population' as mentioned in section 3(2)(a) of the Act of 1973 specifies that in the conduct of a crimes against Humanity the civilian population is the primary object of the attack. From our discussion on adjudication of the charges we have found that all the attacks were systimatically made to cause widespread destruction of properties and lives directing against unarmed civilians belonging to pro-libeation poeple.

#### Guiding Principle for fixing up liability for the crimes described in section 3(2) of the Act of 1973

99.According to Section 3(1) of the Act it is manifested that even any person (individual or a member of group of individuals) is liable to be tried and punished if he is found to have com-

mitted crimes specified in Section 3(2) of the Act. In consideration of the nature of criminal charges brought against the accused, we are led to hold that the principle for determining liability for crimes as laid down in Section 4(1) of the Act is the guide line in this regard. The provision for fixing up liability for crimes is quoted below:-

Section 4(1) of the Act of 1973 provides "When any crime as specified in Section-3 is committed by several persons, each of such person is liable for that crime in the same manner as if it were done by him alone."

100. From the oral and documentary evidence as produced by the prosecution, we are convinced to hold that the accused was a member of Razakar Bahini of Parerhat during the War of Liberation in 1971 which has been decided in chapter XVII of this judgment. It is also proved that the accused could speak Urdu well which brought him to a close associate with Pakistani Army. We are also convinced from the evidence on record that the accused knowingly the context of Liberation War he purposely stood against the War of Liberation and joined the Razakar Bahini to resist it. From the forgoing discussion, it is proved that the accused as one of the Razakars or a person of a group of individuals took active part in the attacks directed against civilian population at Parerhat area, causing murder, deportation, rape, looting of goods, setting fire on the houses and shops of civilians, forceful religious conversion, inhuman acts and torture which fall within the purview of crimes against Humanity. On scrutiny of the evidence on record, we have found that out of 20 charges the prosecution has successfully proved 8 charges against the accused who as a member of local Razakar Bahini contributed and facilitated in committing those offences by his active participation and presence at the crime sites. According to the guiding principle for fixing up liability as provided under section 4(1) of the Act, the accused is found guilty to the offences mentioned in charge Nos. 6,7,8,10,11,14,16 and 19 as if, those were done by him alone as a member of Razakars and/or also in the capacity of a member of atrocious group of individuals.

#### XXXVII. Verdict on conviction

101. Having considered all evidence, materials on record and arguments advanced by the learned lawyers of both the parties, we hold that the prosecution has successfully proved 8(eight) charges out of 20 against accused Delowar Hossain Sayeedi beyond reasonable doubt.

Charge Nos. 1 to 4 and 13: The accused is found NOT GUILTY to the offences of murder, persecution, genocide, abduction and torture which fall within the purview of crimes against Humanity and genocide as specified in section 3(2)(a) and 3(2)(c)(i) of the I.C.T. Act of 1973 and he be acquitted from the aforesaid charges levelled against him.

Charge No. 5:- The accused is found NOT GUILTY to the offences of murder, abduction and abetment which fall within the purview of crimes against Humanity as specified in section 3(2)(a) of the I.C.T. Act of 1973 and he be acquited from the said charge.

Charge No. 6:- The accused is found GUILTY to the offence of persecution which falls within the purview of crimes against Humanity as specified in section 3(2)(a) of I.C.T. Act of 1973 and he be convicted and sentenced under section 20(2) of the said

Charge No. 7:- The accused is found GUILTY to the offences of persecution and abetment of torture which fall within the purview of crimes against Humanity as specified in section 3(2)(a) and (g) of the I.C.T. Act of 1973 and he be convicted and sentenced under section 20(2) of the said Act.

Charge No. 8:- The accused is found GUILTY to the offences

of murder, abduction, torture and persecution which fall within the purview of crimes against Humanity as specified in section 3(2)(a) of the I.C.T. Act of 1973 and he be convicted and sen tenced under section 20(2) of the said Act. Charge No. 9:- The accused is found NOT GUILTY to the

offence of persecution which falls within the purview of the crimes against Humanity as specified in section 3(2)(a) of the I.C.T. Act of 1973 and he be acquitted from the said charge. Charge No. 10:- The accused is found GUILTY to the offences

Delowar Hossain Sayeedi and his associates as they reportedly of murder and persecution which fall within the purview of the crimes against Humanity as specified in section 3(2)(a) of the I.C.T. Act of 1973 and he be convicted and sentenced under section 20(2) of the said Act. Charge No. 11:- The accused is found GUILTY to the offences

of torture and persecution which fall within the purview of the crimes against Humanity as specified in section -3(2)(a) of the I.C.T Act of 1973 and he be convicted and sentenced under section 20(2) of the said Act.

Charge No. 12:- The accused is found NOT GUILTY to the offence of genocide which falls within the purview of genocide as specified in section 3(2)(c)(i) of the said Act and he be acquitted from the said charge.

Charge No. 14:- The accused is found GUILTY to the offences of persecution and rape which fall within the purview of crimes against Humanity as specified in section 3(2)(a) of the I.C.T. Act of 1973 and he be convicted and sentenced under section 20(2) of the said Act.

Charge No. 15:- The accused is found NOT GUILTY to the offence of genocide which falls within the purview of genocide as specified in section 3(2)(c)(i) of the I.C.T. Act of 1973 and he be acquitted from the said charge.

Charge No. 16:- The accused is found GUILTY to the offences of abduction, confinement, rape and abetment which fall within the purview of crimes against Humanity as specified in section 3(2)(a) and (g) of the I.C.T. Act of 1973 and he be convicted and sentenced under section 20(2) of the said Act.

Charge No. 17:- The accused is found NOT GUILTY to the offence of rape which falls within the purview of crimes against Humanity as specified in section 3(2)(a) of the I.C.T. Act of 1973 and he be acquitted from the said charge. Charge No. 18:- The accused is found NOT GUILTY to the

offence of abetment of torture which falls within the purview of crimes against Humanity as specified in section 3(2)(a)(g) of the I.C.T. Act of 1973 and he be acquitted from the said charge. Charge No. 19:- The accused is found GUILTY to the offence

of inhuman act which falls within the purview of crimes against Humanity as specified in section 3(2)(a) of the I.C.T. Act of 1973 and he be convicted and sentenced under section 20(2) of the

Charge No. 20:- The accused is found NOT GUILTY to the offences of abduction, torture and rape which fall within the purview of the crimes against Humanity as specified in section 3(2)(a) of the I.C.T. Act of 1973 and he be acquitted from the said

#### XXXVIII.Verdict on sentence

250.From the foregoing discussions we have found the accused guilty to the offences of murder, abduction, torture, rape, persecution, forcible religious conversion and abatement as mentioned in 8(eight) charge Nos.6,7,8,10,11,14,16 and 19 which fall within the purview of crimes against humanity as specified in section 3(2)(a)(g) of ICT Act of 1973. Now a partinent question is before us as to decide what punishment can be awarded to the accused which shall squarly meet the ends of justice.

251. We have weighed up gravity of offences proportionately which had been committed by the accused during the War of Liberation of Bangladesh. We are of agreed view that 8(eight) charges brought against the accused have been proved beyond reasonable doubt. It is well proved that accused Delowar Hossain Sayeedi substentially contributed and facilitiated in killing Ibrahim alias Kutti and Bisabali as listed in charge Nos.8 and 10 respectively. It is also proved that the killing of Ibrahim

alias Kutti and Bisabali was followed by looting of properties and setting fire on two Hindu Para as a part of systematic attack directed agaisnt unarmed civilians as well as pro-liberation

252. In consideration of the gravity and magnitude of the offences committed particularly in charge Nos. 8 and 10, we unanimously hold that the accused deserves the highest pun-

#### Hence it is, ORDERED

ishment as provided under section 20(2) of ICT Act of 1973.

That accused Delowar Hossain Sayeedi alias Delu @ Abu Nayeem Mohammad Delowar Hossain@ Allama Delowar Hossain Sayeedi, son of late Yousuf Ali Sikder of villages-South Khali, Police Station Indurkani/Zianagar, District-Pirojpur, at present 914-Shaheed Bag, Police Station Motijheel, District-Dhaka is found guilty to the offfences of crimes agaisnt humanity (listed in charge Nos.8 and 10) and he be convicted and sentenced to death and be hanged by the neck till he is dead under

section 20(2) of the International Crimes (Tribunals) Act, 1973. 253. In our due consideration, the gravity of the offences as listed in charge Nos. 6,7,11,14,16 and 19 appear to be lesser than that of as listed in charge Nos.8 and 10. Since we have awarded Capital Punishment to the accused for the offences as listed in charge Nos. 8 and 10, we refrain from passing any separate sentence of imprisonmant for the offences as listed in the rest charge Nos.6,7,11,14,16 and 19 though those charges have also been proved beyond reasonable doubt.

254. Accused Delower Hssain Sayeedi is, however, found not guilty to the offences of crimes against humanity as listed in charge Nos. 1,2,3,4,5,9,12,13,15,17,18 and 20 and he be acquitted from the said charges.

255. The convict accused is at liberty to prefer appeal to the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of Bangladesh against the order of conviction and sentence within 30(thirty) days from the date of passing the order of sentence as per provisions of section 21 of the Act.

Let a certified copy of the judgment be furnished to the prosecution and the convict free of cost at once. Let another copy of the judgment be sent to the District Magistrate, Dhaka for information and necessary action.

Issue conviction warrant accordintly.

(A.T.M. Fazle Kabir, Chairman)

(Jahangir Hossain, Member)

(Anwarul Haque, Member)

(CONCLUDES)

NOTE: [Delawar Hossain Sayedee is spelt as Delowar Hossain Sayeedi in court documents]

# Agonising wait ends

Tasnim.

Abul Kashem, an elderly flower seller in the capital, said, "I've been following the Shahbagh movement, and I'm glad the prayers of the nation have been met. I have seen what happened during the Liberation War."

85, can barely walk without support. She said she had come to Dhaka from Tangail four days ago to witness the Shahbagh protests before she died.

Sheikh Halima, aged about

Asked who was accompanyingher, she muttered, "I am here with you, the souls of the martyrs of '71, my Allah and myself."

In broken sentences, she noted that she had seen Razakars wreck havoc in her

Selimul Alam Mukti, a businessman from Mirpur-12, said the success of the Shahbagh movement will come when the sentence is actually executed and all the other war criminals get the same punishment.

The movement should be intensified to achieve the target he added.

"I will distribute 10 kg sweetmeats among people when Sayedee is executed," said an elated Anowara Begum, a woman who sells roses on the footpath.

People also refuted the suggestion that the Shahbagh movement demanding capital punishment to the war criminals influenced the tribunal.

"The verdict matches the expectations of people who waited for a long time to see Sayedee tried in a court of law. It's a coincidence that both the people's verdict and the tribunal's judgement was the same. I don't think there was any undue pressure on the tribunal from the mass people," said Bidyut Bhowmik, a private banker.

In a similar note, NGO worker Raihan Bin Shafiq said the verdict is an achievement of the government. "But I must add that the verdict was not influenced by the popular demands. Rather, it came after from many witnesses and considered the plights of many victims.'

Families of martyrs of '71 were particularly relieved. Martyred intellectual Dhirendranath Dutta's great granddaughter Esha Aurora said, "My great grandfather was the first person to tell Muhamamd Ali Jinnah that Bangla should be our lingua franca. This verdict respects his sacrifice and of all those who wanted to see a free Bangladesh."

Twenty-four-year-old NGO

worker Afreen Khan said the verdict gave her an inexplicable sense of joy.

Calming her voice, she added that she is waiting for similar verdicts against all the otherwar crime suspects.

## Justice, finally

**FROM PAGE 20** 

Mahbubul Alam Hanif at a 14party press conference at AL chief's political office in Dhanmondi in the capital.

"Today, they got justice." Hanif asked the party men not to be overwhelmed by the verdict.

Activists of the ruling alliance would remain on the streets to avert any chaos by the Jamaat-e-Islami, said Workers Party President Rashed Khan Menon.

The 14-party has decided to hold demonstrations in all districts and upazilas on March 4 and in the capital on March 9, demanding that the war crimes trial be expedited.

When contacted, four top leaders of the BNP declined to comment on the verdict. While seven Islamist parties in a joint statement last night said Sayedee did not get justice as the ongoing Shahbagh movement, what they said, had influenced the verdict.

Earlier in the evening, Abdul Latif Nejami, chairman of Islami Oikya Jote, a partner in the BNPled 18-party opposition coalition, and Nur Hossain Quasimi, convenor of Iman O Desh Rokkha Andolon, said they had nothing to say about the court judgment on Sayedee.

Meanwhile, Law Minister Shafique Ahmed told reporters at his Secretariat office that the nation was going to get rid of the culture of impunity as the victims of crimes against humanity committed during the 1971 Liberation War got justice through the verdict.

Judges of the International Crimes Tribunal-1 passed on the verdict on the basis of documents and evidence, maintain-

ing neutrality, Shafique said. State Minister for Law the court heard depositions Qamrul Islam said Jamaat might hatch conspiracies afresh following the verdict and that they could launch attacks on Gonojagoron Manchas set up across the country demanding capital punishment to all war criminals and other sensitive places.

> However, BNP in a press statement, issued last night, lambasted the government for "killing the general people". The party said the whole

country was frightened as police, Rab and Awami League terrorists had created anarchy in the whole country.