

The  
Bangladesh Gazette



*Extraordinary*  
Published by Authority

---

THURSDAY, JULY 10, 1975

---

MINISTRY OF LABOUR, SOCIAL WELFARE, CULTURAL  
AFFAIRS AND SPORTS.

(Labour and Social Welfare Division)

*Section VI*

NOTIFICATION

Dacca, the 5th July 1975.

No. S.R.O. 240-L/75S-VI,1(16)/75/306.—In pursuance of sub-section (2) of section 37 of the Industrial Relations Ordinance, 1969 (XXIII of 1969), the Government is pleased to publish the following awards and decisions of the Labour Court, Rajshahi, in respect of the following cases, namely:—

- (1) Complaint Case No. 3 of 1975.
- (2) Complaint Case No. 7 of 1975.
- (3) I. R. O. Case No. 8 of 1975.
- (4) Complaint Case Nos. 2 and 4 of 1975.
- (5) I. R. O. Case No. 3 of 1975.
- (6) Complaint Case No. 5 of 1975.
- (7) Complaint Case No. 6 of 1975.
- (8) I. R. O. Case No. 7 of 1975.
- 9) Miscellaneous Case No. 2 of 1975.

By order of the President  
MUHAMMAD KHADEM ALI  
*Deputy Secretary.*

( 1865 )

Price 72 palsa.

IN THE LABOUR COURT AT RAJSHAHI IN BANGLADESH

Kazi Nazrul Islam Road, Rajshahi.

Complaint Case No. 3 of 1975.

Md. Muslemuddin,  
C/o. Rangpur Sugar Mills Workers' Union,  
Vill. and P.O. Mahimaganj,  
P.S. Gobindaganj,  
District Rangpur—*First Party*,

*versus*

1. Manager,  
Rangpur Sugar Mills Ltd.,  
P.O. Mahimaganj, —  
Dist. Rangpur.
2. Secretary,  
Bangladesh Sugar Mills Corporation,  
Shilpa Bhaban,  
Motijheel Commercial Area,  
Dacca-2—*Second Parties*.

PRESENT:

Mr S.M. Serajul Mawla—*Chairman*.

Mr Md. Amjad Ali }  
Mr S. K. Paul } *Members.*

Dated 20th May 1975:

This is a case under section 25 of Employment of Labour (Standing Order) Act, 1965. Petitioner Md. Moslemuddin was servicing under the second party O.P. No. 1 since 1965 as Seasonal Junior Clerk in Cane Accounts section. He was charged with gross negligence of duties inasmuch as he did not check Cash Book with W/RS which were interpolated by overwriting showing excess weight which if not detected would result in excess payment to the growers and loss to the Sugar Mills Corporation. Moslemuddin committed this offence in respect of two W/RS, dated 27-11-1974. He stated in his explanation that due to heavy pressure of works he failed to see if the weight written in words agree with the weight given in figures. The petitioner contended that the enquiry was held in his absence. He submitted grievance petition stating the circumstances under which the mistake took place and prayed for mercy, but the management rejected the petition as they did not find any extenuating circumstances. Hence this case.

Petitioner's duty was to check the weighment receipt in respect of gross weight in figures and in words and totally the W/RS with purchase sheets. It was also his duty to detect and report overwriting, interpolation, if any, and stop payment thereof. In his explanation he practically pleaded guilty by



stating that he failed to look into the overwriting due to heavy pressure of works. It also appears from papers produced by the second party that all legal formalities were correctly observed in conducting the enquiry. It is not true that the enquiry was held in his absence. He was informed by Memo, dated 13-12-1974 that the enquiry would be held on 19-12-1974 at 9 a.m. but on the same date by another memo he was informed that the enquiry will be held on 24-12-1974. I therefore, find nothing wrong with the enquiry held by a committee of three officers constituted by office order, dated 13-12-1974 (*vide* exbt. No. Kha 9 and 10).

A worker may be dismissed if he is found guilty of misconduct under section 18 of the Employment of Labour (Standing Order) Act. Certain act and commission have been specified as misconduct under section 17 clause (3). Petitioner was charged with negligence not with interpolation or overwriting of the W/RS. Under section 17 clause (3)(h) habitual negligence only shall be treated as misconduct making the worker liable for dismissal. It does not appear from the charge-sheet and the offence committed that the petitioner was guilty of habitual negligence, though the offence is no doubt very serious. Considering this aspect of this case proper punishment would have been an order of discharge instead of dismissal.

Learned members consulted.

#### Hence Ordered

That the cases be allowed in part. The prayer for reinstatement with back wages and benefits are hereby rejected and the order of dismissal of petitioner is commuted to an order of discharge.

S. M. SERAJUL MAWLA

*Chairman,  
Labour Court, Rajshahi.*

20-5-1975.

Sd/ Md. Amjad Ali

Sd/ S. K. Paul

20-5-1975.

Note taken and transcribed by  
Mr Md. Nural Hoque, at my  
dictation and corrected by me.

S. M. SERAJUL MAWLA

*Chairman,  
Labour Court, Rajshahi.  
20-5-1975.*

## IN THE LABOUR COURT AT RAJSHAHI IN BANGLADESH

Kazi Nazrul Islam Road, Rajshahi.

Complaint Case No. 7 of 1975.

Md. Abdul Karim Sardar, C/o. Rangpur Sugar Mills Workers' Union, P. O.  
and Village Mahimaganj, P. S. Gobindaganj, district Rangpur—*First Party*,*Versus*,

1. Manager, Rangpur Sugar Mills Ltd., P.O. Mahimaganj, district Rangpur.
2. Secretary, Bangladesh Sugar Mills Corporation, Shilpa Bhaban, Motijheel Commercial Area, Dacca—2—*Second Parties*.

PRESENT:

Mr. S. M. Serajul Mawla—*Chairman*.

Mr. Md. Amjad Ali

Mr S. K. Paul

} *Members*.

Dated 27th May 1975;

This is an application under section 25 of Employment of Labour (Standing Order) Act for reinstatement with all back wages against an order of dismissal by the second party. Petitioner used to serve as Seasonal Junior Clerk in Cane Department under second party opposite party No. 1. He was charged as follows:—

“It is reported that you have tampered and overwritten the weight of cane in the following W/Rs. of your centre—

W/R No.	Date.	Pass Book No.	Name of Growers.
51506	1-12-74	919	Md. Mobarak Ali, Panthapara.
51460	2-12-74	919	Ditto.
51446	2-12-74	919	Ditto.
51170	2-12-74	919	Ditto.

It appears to us that you have adopted the malpractice in collaboration with others to cheat the Company.

Since your above acts amount to gross misconduct you are hereby required to show cause in writing through proper channel within three days of the receipt of this letter as to why you should not be dismissed from service or otherwise punished.



In the meantime you are put under suspension with immediate effect." In his explanation marked exbt. Kha 1 he stated that on account of heavy pressure of work he could not detect the overwriting and interpolation in the W/Rs. mentioned above. His duty was to record the gross and tare weight of weightment receipts and tally the same with purchase sheets and to detect if there is any overwriting or manipulation. It appears from the charge and the connected W/Rs. that he failed to detect the tampering and overwriting in four W/Rs. on two different dates of one and same growers Md. Mobarak Ali of Panthapara. Complaint Case Nos. 2 and 4 of this case arising out of exactly similar facts also related to the W/Rs. of the same growers Md. Mobarak Ali of Panthapara. It appears that this Mobarak Ali for his own financial gain managed to interpolate the W/Rs. in collaboration with the officers of the Cane Purchasing Centre. Sugar Mills are required to pay heavy amount on account of false recording of weight in the Purchasing Centre. Hence it is not desirable to take lenient view of such offence which are rampant in the Cane Purchasing Centre. Petitioner's only ground for this case is that no enquiry was held and he was not given any chance to prove his innocence. It appears from the papers produced by the second party that the enquiry was held on 24-12-1974 due one notice to the petitioner. In his explanation he practically pleaded guilty and prayed for mercy. I, therefore, find no reason to think that he has been dismissed illegally.

Learned members consulted.

#### Hence Ordered

That the case be dismissed on contest without cost.

S. M. SERAJUL MAWLA

*Chairman,  
Labour Court, Rajshahi.  
27-5-1975.*

Sd/ Md. Amjad Ali.

Sd/ Md. S. K. Paul.

27-5-1975.

Note taken and transcribed by Mr. Md. Nural  
Hoque, at my dictation and corrected by me.

S. M. SERAJUL MAWLA

*Chairman,  
Labour Court, Rajshahi.  
27-5-1975.*

## IN THE LABOUR COURT AT RAJSHAHI IN BANGLADESH

Kazi Nazrul Islam Road, Rajshahi.

I. R. O. Case No. 8 of 1975.

Md. Khalilur Rahman,  
S/o. late Tamizuddin Mondal,  
Resident of Vill. Mohishbatan,  
P. S. Boalia,  
Dist. Rajshahi—*Petitioner*,

*versus*

1. Executive Engineer (M&P),  
Bangladesh Agricultural Development Corporation,  
Rajshahi Zone, Rajshahi at Ramchandrapur,  
(House when formerly Pakistan Council was located),  
P. S. Boalia, Dist. Rajshahi.
2. Assistant Engineer (M&P),  
Bangladesh Agricultural Development Corporation,  
Sagarpara, P.S. Boalia,  
Dist. Rajshahi—*Opposite Parties*.

## PRESENT :

Mr S. M. Serajul Mawla—*Chairman*.

Mr Md. Amjad Ali	} <i>Members.</i>
Mr S. K. Paul	

Dated the 10th May, 1975:

This is a case under section 34, I.R.O. arising out of the following facts:

The petitioner Md. Khalilur Rahman was appointed as Jeep Driver in 1967 by the then Assistant Director (MC), EPADC, Netrokona. He was transferred to Rajshahi in 1973 and was assigned with the job of Tank Lorry Driver. He was sent to Tangail Zone on deputation in pursuance of a Telegram from the Chief Engineer, BADC. The telegram reads as follows: "SEND TANK LORRY WITH DRIVER AND ASSISTANT TO TANGAIL ZONE". Exbt. Kha(1) is the telegram and official note thereon of the Executive Engineer, BADC, Rajshahi. Exbt. Kha (2) is Memo No. 781(3), dated, 29-9-1974. By this memo the copy of the telegram was sent to the Assistant Engineer (M&P), BADC, Rajshahi and others. By this memo the Assistant Engineer was "instructed to direct the Tank Lorry Driver and the Assistant to proceed to Tangail Zone with the Tank Lorry on deputation.....". The Assistant Engineer of Tangail Zone released the petitioner on 21-12-1974 but the Tank Lorry was retained by him. The petitioner reported for duties at Rajshahi on 22-12-1974 but the O. P. No. 2 by his memo, dated 14-1-1975 marked Exbt, Ka(2) informed the petitioner that his joining report cannot be accepted as he has joined to this office without the departmental Tank Lorry and was instructed not to sign the attendance register. Hence this case.



The contention of the Opposite parties is that the petitioner was transferred to Tangail Zone by the Chief Engineer and that the Assistant Engineer, Tangail Zone has no right to transfer the petitioner from Tangail to Rajshahi and as such they are unable to accept the joining report of the petitioner. The relevant portion of written statement is as follows: "The petitioner was deputed by the O.P. No. 2 under order by the Chief Engineer along with the Tank Lorry and his Helper, their services were placed under the disposal of the Assistant Engineer, BADC, Tangail under the order of the Chief Engineer *vide* his Telegram No. 2116 and subsequent memo No. 781(3), dated 26-9-1974 from O.P. No. 1. He cannot be released from Tangail office without the order of the Chief Engineer. The petitioner came over to Rajshahi but did not bring the Tank Lorry taken from Rajshahi nor did he produce any order of the Chief Engineer to this effect although he was transferred to Tangail under order of the Chief Engineer. Under the circumstances it was not possible for the O.P. No. 2 to allow him to join at Rajshahi Office."

### FINDINGS AND DECISIONS

From the above pleadings and also from the papers produced by the parties it is quite clear that the petitioner was sent to Tangail on deputation in pursuance of the telegram from the Chief Engineer. Hence the plea of the second parties that the petitioner was transferred to Tangail by the Chief Engineer is not correct. As per order of the opposite party No. 1, opposite party No. 2, Assistant Engineer, sent the petitioner to Tangail Zone on deputation [*vide* exbt. Kha(2).] By Memo No. 1814(7), dated 21-12-1974 marked exbt. Ka(3) Asstt. Engineer, Tangail Zone directed the petitioner to report himself for duties to opposite party No. 2 with immediate effect as his services were no longer required by the Tangail Zone. Petitioner had to comply with this order and reported for duties to Rajshahi Zone. Opposite party No. 1 had several correspondences and telephonic talk with the Chief Engineer at Dacca over the Tank Lorry retained by the Tangail Zone but the Chief Engineer kept silent for reasons best known to him. Thus in this tug of war between Rajshahi and Tangail Zone for the possession of the Tank Lorry, the petitioner has been made the escape goat and the matter has become a prestige issue between the opposite parties and the Assistant Engineer, Tangail Zone. I have just stated the fact and reasons behind this case and do not like to make any further comment. However, I am of the opinion that the petitioner was not sent to Tangail on transfer, he was sent there on deputation and the Assistant Engineer, Tangail Zone did not go beyond his jurisdiction by asking the petitioner to report for duties here as his services were no longer required by the Tangail Zone and as such it is not a case of transfer. The opposite parties were not justified in refusing to accept the joining report of the petitioner. Hence the case succeeds.

Learned members consulted.

### Ordered

That the case be allowed on contest with cost. The Opposite parties are hereby directed to accept the joining report of the petitioner and allow him

to sign the attendance register from the date of his joining at Rajshahi office. Hearing fee is assessed at Tk. 50 (Taka fifty only).

Sd./Md. Amjad Ali .  
10-5-1975.

Sd./S. K. Paul.  
10-5-1975.

S. M. SERAJUL MAWLA  
*Chairman,*  
*Labour Court, Rajshahi.*  
10-5-1975.

Note taken and transcribed by  
Mr Md. Nural Hoque, on my dic-  
tation and corrected by me.

S. M. SERAJUL MAWLA  
*Chairman,*  
*Labour Court, Rajshahi.*  
10-5-1975.

---

IN THE LABOUR COURT AT RAJSHAH I IN BANGLADESH

Kazi Nazrul Islam Road, Rajshahi.

Complaint Case Nos. 2 and 4 of 1975.

Md. Mahtabuddin,  
C/o. Rangpur Sugar Mills Workers' Union,  
P.O. and Vill. Mahimaganj,  
P.S. Gobindaganj,  
Dist. Rangpur—(Case No. 4)

AND

Md. Hazrat Ali,  
C/o. Rangpur Sugar Mills Workers' Union,  
P.O. and Vill. Mahimaganj,  
P.S. Gobindaganj,  
Dist. Rangpur—(Case No. 2)—*First Parties,*

*versus*

1. Manager,  
Rangpur Sugar Mills Ltd.  
P.O. Mahimaganj,  
Dist. Rangpur.
2. Secretary,  
Bangladesh Sugar Mills Corporation,  
Shilpa Bhaban,  
Motijheel Commercial Area,  
Dacca-2—*Second Parties.*

PRESENT:

Mr S.M. Serajul Mawla—*Chairman.*

Mr Md. Amjad Ali }  
Mr S. K. Paul } *Members.*



Dated the 21st May 1975:

These two cases by different petitioners against the same second party opposite parties were taken up for analogous hearing. These are cases under section 25 of Employment of Labour (Standing Orders) Act for reinstatement with back wages against an order of dismissal preceded by charges of misconduct and other legal formalities by the second party. The contention of the petitioners is that the enquiry was held in their absence. Charge against Md. Hazrat Ali, petitioner in case No. 2 is as follows:

"It is reported that the weight of cane in the following W.Rs. of your centre has been tampered/over written showing excess weight than the actual:

W/Rs. No.	Date.	Pass Book No.	Name of Growers.
51506	1-12-1974	919	Mr. Mobarak Ali, Panthapara.
51460	2-12-1974	919	"
51446	2-12-1974	919	"
51170	2-12-1974	919	"

While you were taking tare weight of the cart against the above W.Rs. you could not detect the tampered/overwritten figures in the W. Rs. We, therefore, presume that you have adopted above kind of malpractice in collaboration with others to cheat the Company.

You are hereby required to show cause in written through proper channel within 3 days of the receipt of this letter as to why you should not be dismissed from service or otherwise punished.

Should you fail to submit the explanation as required, the matter shall be disposed of without further reference to you."

His explanation is that the discrepancy and overwriting could not be detected due to heavy rush. The charge against Md. Mahatabuddin, petitioner in case No. 4 is as follows:

"It is reported that you have tampered and overwritten the weight of cane in the following W/Rs. of your centre:

W/Rs. No.	Date.	Pass Book No.	Name of Growers.
51506	1-12-1974	919	Mr Mobarak Ali, Panthapara.
51460	2-12-1974	919	"
51446	2-12-1974	919	"
51170	2-12-1974	919	"

It appears to us that you have adopted the malpractice in collaboration with others to cheat the Company.

Since you above acts amount to gross misconduct, you are hereby required to show cause in writing through proper channel within three days of the receipt of this letter as to why you should not be dismissed from service or otherwise punished.

In the meantime you are put under suspension with immediate effect."



His explanation is that the grower himself did the overwriting and he could not detect it due to heavy rush.

Duty of Hazrat Ali was to take tare weight and to write net weight in the weighment receipts. Duty of Mahatabuddin was to check the weighment receipts in respect of gross weight in figures and in words and to tally the weighment receipts with purchase sheets. Both of them were also responsible to observe, detect and to report any overwriting or manipulation in any figure in the weighment receipt and to stop payment thereof if any manipulation and overwriting is detected. It appears from the charge that both the petitioners committed the same kind of offence in respect of the cane and cart of the same grower Md. Mobarak Ali of Panthapara. It is also to be noticed that they committed this offence not once but on 4 occasions on two different dates. Hence these are cases of habitual negligence of duty coming within the scope of section 17 clause (3) (h) making them liable for dismissal. The charges framed against them are, however, defective. Hazrat Ali was charged for his failure to detect the overwriting and it was presumed that he adopted this malpractice in collaboration with others to cheat the company. Mahatabuddin was charged directly for tampering and overwriting the W/R. But there was no direct evidence to show that they personally tampered with the W/Rs. or abated or collaborated with the person who actually tampered or did the overwriting. I am, therefore, of the opinion that these are cases of gross negligence and the petitioners practically pleaded guilty when they stated in their explanation that they overlooked it due to heavy rush. This is no excuse. Now the only question for our consideration is if the enquiry was held after proper notice to the petitioners. The Enquiry Committee was constituted by an office orders dated 13-12-1974 marked Exbt. Kha 10. The enquiry was to be held on 19-12-1974. By another memo of the same date marked Exbt. Kha 9 the petitioners were informed that the enquiry which was scheduled to be held on 19-12-1974 will be held on 24-12-1974. Hence it is not true that the enquiry was held behind their back. Things admitted need not be proved. They practically admitted the offence which in my opinion, for reasons stated above, is habitual negligence. Considering the seriousness of the offence I am of the opinion that they have been rightly dismissed.

Learned members consulted.

**Hence ordered**

That the cases be dismissed on contest without cost.

Sd/Md. Amjad Ali.  
Sd/ S.K. Paul.  
21-5-75.

S.M. SERAJUL MAWLA  
Chairman,  
Labour Court, Rajshahi.  
21-5-1975.

Note taken and transcribed by Mr Md.  
Nurul Hoque at my dictation  
and corrected by me.

S.M. SERAJUL MAWLA  
Chairman,  
Labour Court, Rajshahi.  
21-5-1975.



## IN THE LABOUR COURT AT RAJSHAHI IN BANGLADESH

Kazi Nazrul Islam Road, Rajshahi.

I. R. O. Case No. 3 of 1975.

Abdus Sattar (Tara),  
General Secretary,  
Bogra Cotton Spinning Worker's Union,  
Kalitola Hat,  
College Road, Bogra—*1st Party*.

*versus*

General Manager,  
Bogra Cotton Spinning Co. Ltd.,  
Kalitola Hat,  
College Road, Bogra—*Opposite Party*.

## PRESENT:

Mr. S. M. Serajul Mawla—*Chairman*.

Mr. Md. Amjad Ali }  
Mr. S. K. Paul } *Members.*

Order No. 6, dated 22-5-1975:

Petitioner files an application for withdrawal of the case, Prayer allowed.

## Ordered

That the case be withdrawn without cost.

Sd/ Md. Amjad Ali.  
Sd/ S. K. Paul.  
22-5-1975.

S. M. SERAJUL MAWLA  
*Chairman,*  
*Labour Court, Rajshahi.*  
22-5-1975.

Typed by Mr. Md. Nural Hoque,  
Stenographer,  
Labour Court, Rajshahi.

S. M. SERAJUL MAWLA  
*Chairman,*  
*Labour Court, Rajshahi.*  
22-5-1975.

IN THE LABOUR COURT AT RAJSHAHÍ IN BANGLADESH

Kazi Nazrul Islam Road, Rajshahi.

Complaint Case No. 5 of 1975.

Md. Saidur Rahman,  
C/o. Rangpur Sugar Mills Workers' Union,  
Vill. & P. O. Mahimaganj,  
P. S. Gobindaganj,  
Dist. Rangpur—*First Party*,

*versus*

1. Manager,  
Rangpur Sugar Mills Ltd.,  
P. O. Mahimaganj,  
Dist. Rangpur,
2. Secretary,  
Bangladesh Sugar Mills Corporation,  
Shilpa Bhaban,  
Motijheel Commercial Area,  
Dacca-2—*Second Parties*.

PRESENT :

Mr S. M. Serajul Mawla—*Chairman*.

Mr Md. Amjad Ali }  
Mr S. K. Paul } *Members*.

Dated 22nd May, 1975:

This is an application under section 25 of the Employment of Labour (Standing Orders) Act for reinstatement against an order of dismissal with all back wages. Petitioner used to serve under the second party as Seasonal Junior Clerk in Cane Department and was entrusted with the task of recording tare weight. On 18-12-1974 he took tare weight of a bullock cart against W/R No. 80660 and recorded tare weight 4-15 seers but on spot checking it was detected that the tare weight of the said bullock cart was 6-25 seers. On account of wrong recording of weight the growers would get excess money as price of 2-10 seers of cane causing corresponding loss to the Company. He was, therefore, charged for gross misconduct, placed under order of suspension and after enquiry was dismissed from service with effect from 19-12-1974. His contention is that no enquiry was held and he was not given any chance to prove his innocence. It appears from the papers produced by the second party that the enquiry was held on 6-1-1975 after due intimation to the first party *vide* exbt. Kha and 4.



Though it has been proved beyond doubt that the applicant has recorded excess weight of 2-10 seers this case has got a peculiar circumstances which deserves careful consideration. In his explanation marked exbt. Kha 6 the petitioner stated that he recorded the weight after the cane guard announced that the cart is in correct position. Mr. Paul, Learned Member of the Court who is connected with the Sugar Mills since long told us that the machine on which the cart is placed is outside the room where the tare weight recording clerk takes down the weight and it is not possible for him to see from his room the position of the cart. He has to depend on the guard outside. We were further told that weight of the cart depends on its placing on Weighing Machine. If the cart is not correctly placed the meter will not reflect the correct weight. Hence the guard outside is responsible to see if the cart has been placed correctly on which depend the correct reading of the meter. Of course, even after cart is placed in correct position the Recording Clerk, if he so desires, can write excess or less weight than the actual weight. In this particular case it is not known if this mistake was intentional by the petitioner or it took place through foul play of the guard. We are of the opinion that both the guard and the clerk should have been jointly charged for this wrong recording of weight to find out who was the real culprit. In this view of the matter we are of the opinion that the petitioner is entitled to benefit of doubt.

Learned Members consulted.

#### Hence Ordered

That the case be allowed on contest without cost. The order of dismissal of the petitioner dated 17-1-1975 is hereby set aside. Petitioner being a Seasonal Clerk he is to be treated as retrenched after seasonal work was over with right of re-employment in the next season. His claim for reinstatement with back wages for the last season is hereby rejected.

Sd./ Md. Amjad Ali.

Sd./ S. K. Paul.

22-5-1975.

S. M. SERAJUL MAWLA

*Chairman,*

*Labour Court, Rajshahi.*

22-5-1975.

Note taken and transcribed by  
Mr. Md. Nurul Hoque at my  
dictation and corrected by me.

S. M. SERAJUL MAWLA

*Chairman,*

*Labour Court, Rajshahi.*

22-5-1975.



## IN THE LABOUR COURT AT RAJSHAHI IN BANGLADESH

Kazi Nazrul Islam Road, Rajshahi.

Complaint Case No. 6 of 1975.

Md. Jahurul Haq,  
S/o. Dr. Jamal Uddin Ahmed,  
Vill. Kamardaha,  
P. O. Chandpur,  
P. S. Gobindaganj,  
Dist. Rangpur—*First Party*,

*versus*

1. The Manager,  
Rangpur Sugar Mills Ltd.,  
P. O. Mahimaganj.  
Dist. Rangpur,
2. The Secretary,  
Bangladesh Sugar Mills Corporation,  
Shilpa Bhaban,  
Motijheel Commercial Area,  
Dacca-2—*Second Parties*.

## PRESENT :

Mr. S. M. Serajul Mawla—*Chairman*.

Mr. Md. Amjad Ali	} <i>Members</i> .
Mr. S. K. Paul	

Dated the 26th May, 1975:

This is an application under section 25 of the Employment of Labour (Standing Orders) Act for reinstatement with all back wages against an order of discharge dated 17-1-1975. Petitioner was not dismissed as stated in his petition but he was discharged. The petitioner with others were called upon for explanation by memo dated 11-12-1975 for manipulating actual weight of cane or two W/Rs. but the petitioner did not care to submit any explanation and again he with others were found to have manipulated actual weight of canes in five W/Rs. and were placed under suspension with effect from 24-12-1974 with direction to submit explanation immediately. In his explanation petitioner stated that he did not manipulate or overwrite the W/Rs. but might have overlooked the manipulation, while passing pay order during the busy period of procurement. His explanation was not considered satisfactory and after enquiry into the matter he was discharged from service. The contention of the petitioner is that he appeared before the Enquiry Committee and approached the same to take oral and documentary evidence in support of his case but the Enquiry Committee did not allow it. Hence this case.

Petitioner could not prove by oral or documentary evidence that his prayer to adduce evidence was turned down by the Enquiry Committee. Petitioner was working under the second party as Fieldman and Centre In-charge. It is expected that he would exercise strict vigilance over the activities of the seasonal staffs of the Centre. It was his duty to look carefully into the weighment receipts before passing payment order to check, if there was any irregularity. As the principal officer of the Purchasing Centre it is his responsibility to see



that the Mill is not cheated by the staffs working under him. He cannot shift the responsibilities to others. It is no excuse to say that he overlooked the overwriting during the busy hours. From the papers produced by the second party it appeared that all legal formalities were correctly observed and he was given full chance to prove his innocence. Considering that he was an old employee the management took a lenient view and instead of dismissing him, they discharged him from service. I find nothing wrong with the order of discharge in view of the fact that the offence committed by him amounts to repeated negligence of duty.

Learned members consulted.

**Hence Ordered**

That the case be dismissed on contest without cost.

Sd./-Md. Amjad Ali.  
26-5-1975.

Sd./-S. K. Paul.  
26-5-1975.

S. M. SERAJUL MAWLA  
*Chairman,*  
*Labour Court, Rajshahi.*  
26-5-1975.

Note taken and transcribed by  
Mr Md. Nural Hoque  
at my dictation and corrected by me.

S. M. SERAJUL MAWLA  
*Chairman,*  
*Labour Court, Rajshahi.*  
26-5-1975.

IN THE LABOUR COURT AT RAJSHAHI IN BANGLADESH

Kazi Nazrul Islam Road, Rajshahi

I. R.O. Case No. 7 of 1975.

Mr. Md. Shahidul Alam  
S/o. Late Dr. Ashraf Ali Ahmed of  
Vill. Sutrapur,  
Gohail Road,  
Bogra Town P.S.  
Dist. Bogra,  
dismissed Clerk, Grade-I,  
Bangladesh Bank, Bogra and  
*Ex-General Secretary, Bangladesh Bank Employees, Association,*  
Bogra—*Petitioner*

*versus*

1. Mr. Shah Md. A.H. Ansari (Manager),  
Bangladesh Bank,  
Bogra;
2. Governor,  
Bangladesh Bank,  
Head Office,  
Dacca—*Opposite Parties.*



## PRESENT:

Mr S.M. Serajul Mawla—*Chairman.*

Mr Md. Amjad Ali }  
 Mr S.K. Paul } *Members.*

Dated the 31st May 1975:

This case was instituted on 9-10-1974 under section 25 of the Employment of Labour (Standing Orders) Act and was numbered as Complaint Case No. 8 of 1974. Subsequently by amendment dated 24-2-1975 it was made a case under section 34 of I.R.O. and was numbered as I.R.O. Case No. 7 of 1975. The facts of this case are as follows:

Petitioner Mr. Md. Shahidul Alam was a Clerk, Grade-1, of the Bangladesh Bank, Bogra and was the General Secretary of the Bangladesh Bank Employees' Association, Bogra for the year 1971-72/73. By letter No. STAFF (62) (C) 2532/73, dated 20-9-1973 marked exbt. Ka, the petitioner as per direction of the Head Office was allowed to use the office telephone for his association work as and when required. This is the outcome of an agreement between the Employees' Association and the Bank. On 3-11-1973 at about 2 p.m. petitioner booked a Trunk Call from Office Phone No. 6191 to P.C.O., Nandigram and had at elephonic talk with the Officer-in-Charge, Nandigram P.S. O.P.W.1 Mr. Md. Majibor Rahman, Stenographer and P.A. to the Manager O.P. No. 1 recorded this call as official one in the register maintained for that purpose. On 5-11-1973 O.P. No. 1 asked the petitioner by Memo No. MGR. 7(B)345/73 to let the office know what was the nature of official talk he had with the O.C., Nandigram P.S. as the General Secretary of the Association. On the same date by another confidential memo O.P. No. 1 requested the O.C., Nandigram P.S. to let him know the nature of the call, Mr. Alam had with him, as in his opinion the General Secretary of the Association has no official business with him, with copy to Superintendent of Police, Bogra, but the O.C. gave no reply. On 19-12-1973 by another letter O.P.No. 1 requested S.P., Bogra, to look into the matter personally and to favour him with the reply stating the correct position, with copy to the O.C., Nandigram P.S. Several reminders followed thereafter. O.P. No. 1 was examined as P.W.1 he stated in his deposition that the O.C., Nandigram P.S. came to his office before 19-12-1973 but he did not obtain any written report from him. However, a report from the O.C. was received through the S.P., Bogra, on 18-1-1974.

Petitioner sent reply to letter dated 5-11-1973 on 7-11-1973. His letter has been marked exbt. Kha (3). In this letter he maintained that he was not bound to disclose what official talk he had with the O.C., Nandigram P.S. and also advised the Manager O.P. No. 1 not to poke his nose into the confidential affairs of the Association. This letter was not at all happily worded and the language used therein is really objectionable. By letter dated 7-11-1973 the O.P. No. 1 clarified the position and wanted to know from the petitioner if the nature of the talk was official or private. Petitioner by his letter dated 10-11-1973 informed the Manager that the talk was official. Not satisfied with the reply the Manager O.P. No. 1 on 13-2-1974 drew up a proceeding against



the petitioner and charged him as follows, exbt. Kha (20) is the charge-sheet dated 30-2-1974. Relevant portion of the charge-sheet is as follows:

- (1) That he used office telephone for his private purpose misrepresenting the same to be in the name of the Association and thereby wilfully played gross misconduct.
- (2) That although he used the office telephone for his private purpose he categorically gave false statement by stating that the call was an official one relating to the Association and thereby he has proved himself dishonest.
- (3) That he used the office telephone for his private purpose and in reply to the query in the matter he showed disregard to the Bank and Manager which is breach of office discipline.

He is, therefore, found guilty of wilful misconduct, dishonesty and breach of office discipline and hence liable for disciplinary action under Regulation 22 of the State Bank of Pakistan (Staff) Regulations as adopted in Bangladesh Bank.

He is, therefore, called upon to answer the above charges framed against him in writing or in person in which case his defence will be taken down in writing and read out to him. Any defence which he may wish to offer including the list of witnesses he may wish to produce should be submitted to Mr. K.M. Alauddin, Agricultural Credit Officer of this office who has been appointed as Enquiry Officer, not later than 10-00 a.m. on 18th February, 1974. If he does not submit his reply within the stipulated period, *ex parte* proceedings will be taken against him."

On the next day another proceeding was drawn up against the petitioner for making certain addition to his petition for leave after it was rejected and the same officer Mr. K.M. Alauddin was appointed Enquiry Officer. He found the petitioner guilty of the charge dated 13-2-1974, but acquitted him of the charge dated 14-2-1974. But the Manager could not agree with the findings of the Enquiry Officer in respect of second proceeding and dismissed the petitioner by letter dated 18-5-1974. He informed the petitioner that all the charges framed against him were established beyond doubt and dismissed him under Article 22 (i)(e) of Staff Regulation as adopted in Bangladesh Bank. Petitioner preferred an appeal against the order of dismissal but it was rejected. He also submitted a grievance petition dated 12-8-1974 without any success and then instituted this case.

The case of the first party is as follows:

One Mr. Alimuddin Khondaker, Clerk, Grade-1 of the Bank and member of the Association who had his village home within Nandigram P.S., Bogra met with an accident and was seriously injured. Petitioner booked a Trunk Call on 3-11-1973 from the office telephone of O.P. No. 1 and had a telephonic talk with O.C., Nandigram P.S. and enquired about the accident of Mr. Alimuddin Khondaker who was then on leave.

The contention of the opposite parties is that Alimuddin Khondaker met with the accident on 6-10-1973 near Bogra Mohammad Ali Hospital and was at Bogra Town all along during his period of illness. The Trunk Call booked on 3-11-1973 from the office telephone was purely for the private purpose of the petitioner not for any work of the Association.



### Points for Decision

(1) If the proceeding drawn up against the petitioner and the enquiries held thereunder were legally conducted and if all legal formalities were rightly observed.

(2) If the petitioner is entitled for reinstatement with back wages and other allowances and benefits.

### FINDINGS AND DECISIONS

Both the points are taken up together for the sake of convenience. As regards the scope of enquiry into such matter by this Court, myself is of the opinion that the duty of the Court is only to see if all legal formalities were duly observed and if the accused (Petitioner) were given full opportunities to defend himself and to prove his innocence. We are not concerned whether the findings and decisions of the Enquiry Officer is correct in the light of facts, evidence and circumstances of the case. We are required only to see if he came to his conclusion after observing all the legal formalities with a mind free from prejudice and outside influence. However, for proper appreciation of the facts and circumstances of this case I shall make reference to the enquiry proceeding as and when it will be necessary.

The original report of the O.C., Nandigram P.S. has not been produced in this Court but the forwarding letter of the S.P., Bogra No. 432/E, dated 18-1-1974 has been produced in this Court. The report of the O.C. as it appears from the uncertified and unattested copy marked X for identification was signed by him on 22-11-1973. The O.P. No. 1 gave reminder to S.P., Bogra on 24-11-1973 and the second reminder is dated 19-12-1973. Hence it can be presumed that the O.C. did not submit his report till December, 1973 but the copy of his report is dated 22-11-1973. It is not known why the S.P. held it up till 18-1-1974 if it was received by him in November, 1973. Be that as it may this report of the O.C. is of no legal worth in as much as he was not examined by the Enquiry Officer and this Court also cannot take into consideration the unattested copy of the report of the O.C. specially because he was neither examined by the Enquiry Officer nor he was produced before this Court. O.P. No. 1 as P.W. 1 stated that the O.C. came to him before 19-12-1973 but he did not obtain any written report from O.C. O.P.W. 1 who recorded the Trunk Call in the Register as official one stated that from the "mode of talking", it appeared to him that the talk was private. He overheard the talk and still recorded it as official talk. He could not say nor it is possible to say what was the dialogue between the two persons at the two ends of the telephone line. The Manager as P.W. 1 stated that O.P.W. 1 reported to him that the talk was private. He further stated that the report of the P.A. has not been produced. Admittedly Alimuddin Khondaker, Gr-1 Clerk meet with an accident. Accepting the statement of the Manager as P.W.1 and his Personal Assistant as O.P.W.1 I have nothing before me to say where and on which date Alimuddin met with the accident though it is admitted that he comes from Nandigram P.S. and he was on leave till November, 1973. The O.P. No. 1 as P.W.1 and O.P.W. 1 stated that Alimuddin stayed at Bogra sown during the whole period of his leave. These are the facts and evidence ta transpired in this Court regarding the telephonic talk with the Officer-in-Charge, Nandigram.



Let us now see how the Enquiry Officer, Mr Alauddin conducted the enquiry. He examined the petitioner and his cited witness Mr Md. Alimuddin Khondaker and Mr Md. Aminur Rahman. He also examined Mr Majibor Rahman, P. A. to the O. P. No. 1 who also deposed in this Court as O. P. W. I. The Enquiry Officer issued questionnaire to the petitioner on 3-5-1974 and the petitioner wrote his reply in the space below each question on the same date. Mr Md. Alimuddin Khondaker and Mr Md. Aminur Rahman were examined in the similar manner on the next day. The last question asked to each of the witnesses was whether he has got to say anything more in addition to what he had already stated. So far the examination of the petitioner is concerned though this is not the correct procedure did not in any way prejudice the petitioner but certainly the other two witnesses were not examined in the legal manner. There is no note below to the effect that the answer given by these witnesses were shown to the petitioner. Above all the petitioner himself was not given the chance to examine his own witnesses. The petitioner had no opportunity to ask any question to his cited witness. The questionnaire were set forth by the Enquiry Officer himself to serve his own purpose. Hence it can be safely said that the petitioner has been denied the right to adduce oral evidence by examination of his own witness. Exbt. Kha 22 and 23 are respectively the answers of Mr Alimuddin Khondaker and Mr Aminur Rahman to the questionnaire issued to them by the Enquiry Officer. Exbt. 25 is the statement of witness Mr Majibor Rahman examined for the prosecution. Questionnaire were issued to him on 30-3-1974 he himself wrote the reply and submitted the same on 8-4-1974. There is nothing in this deposition sheet to show that it was shown to the petitioner or he was given a chance to cross-examine this important witness. Other Questionnaire and replies were attested by witnesses but this was not so attested and there is nothing to show that the petitioner was at all aware about the examination of this witness Mr Majibor Rahman. In this Court Mr Majibor Rahman said that he cannot say if the petitioner was given an opportunity to cross examine the witnesses. This peculiar way of examining the witnesses has no doubt seriously prejudiced the petitioner and in my opinion it amounts to denial of the right given to him by law to defend himself and to prove his innocence. Witness Mr Alimuddin Khondaker was not asked where he was on 3-11-1974. He stated that the petitioner enquired about his health. But when Mr Aminur Rahman stated that the conversation related to important and secret matter of the Association. However, on consideration of these evidences Enquiry Officer found that the charges dated 13-2-1974 were well-established. He observed that trade union has got nothing to do with the Officer-in-Charge of a Thana. Its activities being confined to demands and grievance against the employers it cannot have any secret urgent business with an Police Officer. Without any comment on the observation of the Enquiry Officer, I simply want to say that the activities of a trade union is not confined only to collective bargaining for demands and grievances. It can legitimately look after the welfare of a follow worker in respect of other matters which may or may not be connected with the condition of his service. Leaving aside this and many other observations and opinion of the Enquiry Officer which guided him to arrive at his decision, I am of the opinion for the reasons stated above that the enquiry was not properly conducted in as much as the petitioner was not allowed to examine his own witness and to cross-examination the prosecution witness. Learned Advocate for the petitioner drew our attention to a sentence occurring after the charges dated 13-2-1974 reading "He is, therefore, found guilty of wilful misconduct, dishonesty and breach of office discipline". It was argued that this observation of the



Manager O.P. No. 1 in the charge-sheet forwarded to Mr Alauddin for enquiry who is a subordinate officer under the Manager left no scope for Enquiry Officer to exercise his free and independent judicial discretion. There is no doubt enough force in this argument.

The next charge dated 14-2-1974 was brought against the petitioner for adding the words “ও চিকিৎসা সংক্রান্ত” after the words “অসুস্থতা পানিবাহারীক কারণে ছুটি দিনের জন্য ছাড়া পানন” in his leave application after it was rejected by the Manager. The Manager passed the order on the petition and when it was shown to the petitioner he made this addition and simultaneously submitted another petition for leave on medical ground. It was Saturday. In reply to question No. 4 of the questionnaire issued to him in connection with this proceeding he stated that he was suffering from Jaundice and trouble of Tooth. The Enquiry Officer observed “whatever he did he did in present of all in good faith in view of urgent nature of the case and marginal time factors. In this case the petitioner was acquitted of the charges brought against him but the Manager O.P. No. 1 dismissed him on account of both the charge-sheets. The Manager said that he can disagree and over-ride the decision of the Enquiry Officer. It might be true. But he should have given reasons and grounds for not agreeing with the findings and decisions of the Enquiry Officer. From the very start the Manager O.P. No. 1 took a very serious view and pursued the matter with a vengeance. He might have reasons for disliking this particular employee who as Secretary of the Association had to bring civil suit for injunction and Misc. Case for violating the injunction against the Manager and for many other reasons. The Manager O.P. 1 appeared in this Court to depose as a witness. He is a nice gentleman. Possibly on account of undesirable activities of the Association he wanted to get rid of the Secretary, the petitioner. Article 22 of the Regulations prescribes 5 punishment—the last one is dismissal and the 4th one is recovery from the pay of the whole or part of any pecuniary loss caused to the bank by the employee. This punishment should have been considered as sufficient to put a stop to the illegal use of official phone as it is always difficult to ascertain without knowing the correct dialogue whether a particular call was a private one or for the purpose and benefit of the Association or any of its members. The order of dismissal appears to us as too severe a punishment for the offence alleged to have been committed by the petitioner. This severity of punishment is in my opinion by itself a ground for application in this Court and for interference by this Court as a Court of arbitration and conciliation set up with the purpose of bringing harmony between the employer and the employee. When the punishment inflicted is too severe this Court should play its part as a moderator. Considering these special circumstance of this case and legal position as discussed above we are of the opinion that the case should succeed in part. Myself and Learned Members are of the same opinion as to the relief to which the petitioner is entitled.

#### Hence Ordered

That the case be allowed in part on contest without cost. The Order of dismissal dated 18-5-1974 is hereby set-aside, and the petitioner be reinstated in his original position with effect from the date he submits his joining report



after this judgement to the Manager opposite party No. 1. The period commencing from the date of his dismissal till the date he submits his joining report be treated as leave without pay.

S. M. SERAJUL MAWLA  
Chairman,  
Labour Court, Rajshahi.  
31-5-1975.

Sd/- Md. Amjad Ali  
31-5-75.

Sd/- S. K. Paul  
31-5-1975.

Note taken and transcribed by  
Mr Md. Nurul Hoque at my  
dictation and corrected by me.

S. M. SERAJUL MAWLA  
Chairman,  
Labour Court, Rajshahi.  
31-5-1975.

IN THE LABOUR COURT AT RAJSHAHI IN BANGLADESH

Kazi Nazrul Islam Road Rajshahi.

Miscellaneous Case No. 2 of 1975.

Md. Azahar Ali Sk.  
S/o. Late Sukur Ali Sk.  
Vill. Shibbati,  
Bogra—*Petitioner.*

*versus*

Manager,  
Bhandari Oil Mills,  
College Road,  
Bogra—*Opposite Party.*

PRESENT:

Mr. S.M. Serajul Mawla—*Chairman.*

Mr Md. Amjad Ali }  
Mr S. K. Paul } *Members.*

Ordered No. 6 dated the 22-5-1975.

First party files a petition stating that it shall not proceed with case

**Ordered**

That the case be dismissed for nonprosecution.

S. M. SERAJUL MAWLA  
*Chairman,*  
*Labour Court, Rajshahi.*  
22-5-1975.

Sd/- Md. Amjad Ali  
Sd/- S. K. Paul  
22-5-1975.

Typed by Mr Md. Nural Hoque,  
Stenographer, Labour Court,  
Rajshahi.

S. M. SERAJUL MAWLA  
*Chairman,*  
*Labour Court, Rajshahi.*  
22-5-1975.

---

**MINISTRY OF LABOUR, SOCIAL WELFARE, CULTURAL AFFAIRS AND  
SPORTS**

**(Labour and Social Welfare Division)**

*Section VI*

**NOTIFICATION**

**Dacca, the 9th July 1975.**

**No. S.R.O. 241-L/75/S-VI/2(2)/75/308.**—Whereas Mr Azimuddin Ahmed and Janab A. Kader Master, members representing the employers and workers respectively of the Salt Crushing Mills have absented themselves from the three consecutive meetings of the Minimum Wages Board without leave of absence from the Chairman of the Board;

NOW, THEREFORE, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (4) of rule 4 of the Minimum Wages Rules, 1961, the Government is pleased to declare the seats held by Mr Azimuddin Ahmed and Janab A. Kader Master as members of the Minimum Wages Board to be vacant with immediate effect.

By order of the President  
MUHAMMAD KHADEM ALI  
*Deputy Secretary.*



## যোগাযোগ মন্ত্রণালয়

সড়ক, জনপথ, সড়ক পরিবহন ও বন্দর

বন্দর উন্নয়ন শাখা

ইশতাহারসমূহ

ঢাকা, ২৮শে জুন ১৯৭৫।

নং এস,আর,ও,২৪২-এল/৭৫/পিডি/৫বি-১/৭৫-২৩২—পোর্টস্ এ্যান্ড, ১৯০৮ (১৯০৮-এর XV)-এর ৬ নম্বর ধারার অন্তর্গত উপ-ধারা (১)-এ প্রদত্ত ক্ষমতাবলে গণপ্রজাতন্ত্রী বাংলাদেশ সরকার এতম্বারা উক্ত ধারার উপ-ধারা (২) অনুযায়ী তদানীন্তন পাকিস্তান সরকার কর্তৃক প্রকাশিত গেজেট বিজ্ঞপ্তি নম্বর এস, আর, ও, ১৩৩(ক)/৬৪, তারিখ ১১-২-১৯৬৪-এর আংশিক সংশোধন করিয়া স্টীভিডোরিং কন্ট্রোল্লর, ক্রিয়্যারিং কন্ট্রোল্লর, লেবার কন্ট্রোল্লর এবং জাহাজ চ্যাণ্ডলারস্-এর জন্য লাইসেন্স ইস্যু ও রিনিউয়াল ফিস্ আদায় করার ব্যাপারে নিম্নলিখিত সংশোধনী জারী করিলেন।

উক্ত আদেশ ১লা জুলাই ১৯৭৫ তারিখ হইতে বলবৎ হইবে:

স্টীভিডোর এবং লেবার কন্ট্রোল্লরদের জন্য:

উক্ত আদেশ ১লা জুলাই ১৯৭৫ তারিখ হইতে বলবৎ হইবে:

- (২) ১০,০০০'০০ টাকা সিকিউরিটি ডিপোজিট হিসাবে জমা দিতে হইবে।
- (৩) ২,০০০'০০ টাকা বাৎসরিক লাইসেন্স ফিস্ হিসাবে প্রদান করিতে হইবে।

জাহাজ চ্যাণ্ডলারস্ এবং ক্রিয়্যারিং কন্ট্রোল্লরদের জন্য:

- (১) দরখাস্তের সহিত ১০'০০ টাকা (ফেরৎযোগ্য নহে) প্রদান করিতে হইবে।
- (২) ২,০০০'০০ টাকা সিকিউরিটি ডিপোজিট হিসাবে জমা দিতে হইবে।
- (৩) ৫০০'০০ টাকা বাৎসরিক লাইসেন্স ফিস্ হিসাবে প্রদান করিতে হইবে।

বাৎসরিক রিনিউয়াল ফিস্:

- (ক) স্টীভিডোর এবং লেবার কন্ট্রোল্লর লাইসেন্সের জন্য ফিস্—১,০০০'০০ টাকা।
- (খ) জাহাজ চ্যাণ্ডলার এবং চিপিং পেইন্টিং লাইসেন্সের জন্য ফিস্—২০০'০০ টাকা।

নং এস,আর,ও,২৪৩-এল/৭৫/পিডি/৫বি-১/৭৫-২৩৩—পোর্টস্ এ্যান্ড, ১৯০৮ (১৯০৮-এর XV)-এর ৬ নম্বর ধারার অন্তর্গত উপ-ধারা (১)-এ প্রদত্ত ক্ষমতাবলে গণপ্রজাতন্ত্রী বাংলাদেশ সরকার এতম্বারা উক্ত ধারার উপ-ধারা (২) অনুযায়ী তদানীন্তন পাকিস্তান সরকার কর্তৃক প্রকাশিত গেজেট বিজ্ঞপ্তি নম্বর পি-৪(৪৮)/৫০/১২, তারিখ ৫-১২-১৯৫০-এর আংশিক



সংশোধন করিয়া ক্যাটাম্যারান, ফ্লাট, বাজর্, যাত্রীবাহী অথবা অন্যান্য নৌ-যানের জন্য লাইসেন্স ফিস্ আদায় করার ব্যাপারে নিম্নলিখিত সংশোধনী জারী করিলেন।

উক্ত আদেশ ১লা জুলাই ১৯৭৫ তারখ হইতে বলবৎ হইবে :

- |   |                        |
|---|------------------------|
| (১) চালনা এ্যাঞ্কারেজের সীমান্ন মধ্যে কাগেণী বোট হিসাবে ...   | ০.৫০ টাকা প্রতি টন     |
| চলাচলকারী রেজিষ্টার্ড ফ্লাটের জন্য অস্থায়ী লাইসেন্স ফিস্।  | ৩০ (ত্রিশ) দিনের জন্য। |
| (২) ফ্লাট এবং বাজর্ের জন্য বাৎসরিক লাইসেন্স ফিস্ ...  | ১.৫০ টাকা প্রতি টন।    |
| (৩) জাহাজ এবং নৌ-যানসমূহের অর্ধবার্ষিক লাইসেন্সের জন্য (যদি উহা যে কোন বৎসরের ৩০শে জুনের পরে ইস্যু হয়ে থাকে) ফিস্। | ০.৭৫ টাকা প্রতি টন।    |

পীয়ুষ কান্তি সমান্দার  
উপ-সচিব।