

# Petition filed with HC challenging stay order on imprisonment of Dr Yunus

February 4, 2024

**Online Desk:** A petition was filed with the High Court on Sunday against the Labour Appellate Tribunal's order that had stayed the effectiveness of the jail sentence awarded to Nobel laureate Dr Muhammad Yunus and three others in a Labour Law violation case.

Senior Advocate Khurshid Alam Khan filed the petition to the HC bench concerned.

Besides, a petition was also filed seeking a bar on traveling abroad without the permission of the court.

Earlier on January 28, the Labour Appellate Tribunal on January 28 granted bail to Dr Yunus and three others in the case.

Chairman of Labour Appellate Tribunal MA Awal stayed the punishment of the Nobel laureate and three others and fixed March 3 for next hearing.

On January 1, Dhaka 3rd Labour Court Judge Sheikh Merin Sultana sentenced Dr Yunus and three top officials of Grameen Telecom to six months' jail in a case over violation of labour law.

The court also fined them Tk 30,000 each.

The other convicts were– Ashraful Hasan, CEO of Grameen Telecom Trust; trustee Nurjahan Begum; and managing director M Shahjahan.

On September 9, 2021, Labour Inspector Arifuzzaman, of the Department of Inspection for Factories and Establishments, filed the case with Dhaka's 3rd Labour Court.

On June 6, 2023, Dhaka Labor Court-3 framed charges against the four accused.

Dr Yunus and the three others filed a petition challenging the legality of the charge framing and seeking a stay order on trial proceedings in the case.

The High Court on July 23 last year issued a rule asking the government to explain as to why the indictment order against the four should not be scrapped.

On August 3, the Appellate Division directed the High Court to dispose of the rule questioning the charge framing against Dr Yunus and others by the lower court in the case.

According to the case, during an inspection visit to Grameen Telecom, inspectors of the department found that 101 workers and staff members who were supposed to be permanent were not made so.

No participation fund and welfare fund was formed for them and five percent of the company's profit was not provided to the workers following the law. Upon a complaint, a criminal case was filed under sections 4, 7, 8, 117, 234 of the Labour Act.