

Subordinate Court System of Bangladesh: *Governance Challenges and Ways Forward*

Executive Summary

30 November 2017

Transparency International Bangladesh (TIB)

Subordinate Court System of Bangladesh: Governance Challenges and Ways Forward

Research Advisers

Dr. Iftekharuzzaman

Executive Director, Transparency International Bangladesh (TIB)

Professor Dr. Sumaiya Khair

Adviser - Executive Management, TIB

Mohammad Rafiqul Hassan

Director - Research and Policy, TIB

Research Supervisor

Abu Said Md. Juel Miah

Senior Programme Manager, Research and Policy, TIB

Researchers

Nazmul Huda Mina, *Assistant Programme Manager, Research and Policy, TIB*

Nahid Sharmin, *Deputy Programme Manager, Research and Policy, TIB*

Shammi Laila Islam, *Programme Manager, Research and Policy, TIB*

Field Assistants

Abu Saleh Md. Saddam

Lutfar Rahman

Acknowledgements

Our gratitude goes to concerned honourable judges, lawyers, judicial staffs, government and non-government stakeholders, media persons and experts for providing important information. The researchers are also grateful to TIB's Executive Director Dr. Iftekharuzzaman, Adviser - Executive Management Professor Dr. Sumaiya Khair, Director of Outreach and Communication Dr. Rezwan-ul-Alam, Director of Research and Policy Mohammad Rafiqul Hassan, and Senior Programme Manager of Research and Policy Abu Said Md. Juel Miah, along with other colleagues for enriching this report by providing valuable feedback and suggestions.

Contact

Transparency International Bangladesh (TIB)

MIDAS Center (4 th and 5th floors)

House # 5, Road # 16, (New) 27 (Old) Dhanmondi,

Dhaka 1209

Phone: 88-02-9124788, 9124789, 9124792 Fax: 88-02-9124915

E-mail: info@ti-bangladesh.org

Website: www.ti-bangladesh.org

1. Introduction

1.1 Research Background

Judiciary is one of the three vital organs of the State. In Bangladesh judicial structure, subordinate court system is an important stage for providing judicial services the people. Most of the cases are filed in such courts according to their jurisdictions. Chapter 2 (Article 114-116A) of Section 6 of the Bangladesh Constitution describes the mandates of subordinate courts. District and Session Judge Courts, Metropolitan Session Judge Courts, Chief Judicial Magistrate Courts, Metropolitan Magistrate Courts and other Special Courts and Tribunals functioning at local level are included under the Subordinate Courts.

Most of the sub-judice cases (86%) of the country are on trial in these courts. Every day clients including the poor and helpless ones receive services from these courts with the hope to get justice. According to Article 22 of the Constitution, State shall ensure the separation of the Judiciary from the Executive. In Bangladesh separation of the Judiciary resulted from a judgement (52 DLR, 2000) of the Appellate Division in the Mazdar Hossain case provided on 2nd December 1999. After eight years of this judgement Judiciary had been separated on 1st November 2007.

As an institution stated in the National Integrity Strategy (NIS) 2012 Judiciary has a significant "Watchdog" role in institutionalising democracy, establishing good governance, transparency and accountability in society. Sixth Five Year Plan of the Government of Bangladesh emphasised on strengthening Judiciary considering its strong implications with good governance and sustainable development of Bangladesh. Seventh Five Year Plan also provided to ensure financial and legal strength to the Judiciary to make speedy disposal of civil and criminal cases. Besides, National Integrity Strategy also emphasised on establishing Judiciary as an independent, effective and neutral part of the State. On the hand, Goal 16 of the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) also targets to ensure equal access to justice for all by 2030.

There are a many imperative initiatives taken in the Judiciary of Bangladesh to increase the effectiveness and excellence of the courts. These include construction of court building project, formation of case management committee, determination of time limit for case disposal, directives for disposal of cases on priority basis, introduction of Judicial web portal and the use of information technology in court management, e-judiciary project, introduction alternative dispute resolution (ADR) and legal aid services etc. Besides, there are a many initiatives taken by non-government level (NGOs, Donor Agencies etc.).

In spite of having these reform and positive initiatives there exit limitations in subordinate court system of Bangladesh which have been reflected in different research reports and media. Apart from this, such scenario got exposed from some speeches given by different Chief Justices in different forums. Deficiencies in infrastructure, staff, logistics, legal reforms, case backlog and corruption in court system have been reported in many ways.

It has been stated in the National Integrity System Assessment: BANGLADESH report of Transparency International that the issue of independence of the Judiciary has received negligible recognition in political rhetoric, and despite formal separation of the Judiciary from the Executive, it has not met people's expectation of a truly independent institution since the subordinate courts continue to be influenced by the Executive. The Judiciary has increasingly been subjected to political manipulation under successive governments to the extent that its independence is found to be often compromised by controversial appointments, promotions, removals, and conduct of judges. Nonetheless, Judicial service has been ranked one of the most corrupt sectors in Household Survey on corruption in service sectors report of TIB in different years. UNDP, in its report (2015) shows procedural complexity, case backlog and lack of case management as main

obstacle to judicial system. According to a different report of UNDP, 31% people perceive that corruption exists in the judicial system.

1.2 Rationale of the Research

To increase the effectiveness of the subordinate court system in Bangladesh and to ensure justice for the people, it is very important to identify and address governance challenges prevailing in the system. Transparency International Bangladesh (TIB) has been working on establishing good governance and prudently exploring ways out to overcome the challenges in judicial service sector for many years. Under this context and as part of its continuous effort, TIB has conducted this research to find out the causes behind governance challenges in the subordinate court system of Bangladesh.

1.3 Purpose of the research

The objective of the research is to identify the challenges of good governance in the subordinate court system and to provide recommendations to overcome the challenges.

The specific objectives of this research are to:

1. Review the institutional capacity and limitations in the subordinate court systems;
2. Identify and review the state of transparency, accountability and integrity in the subordinate court system; and
3. Propose effective and implementable recommendations for ensuring good governance in the subordinate court system of Bangladesh.

1.4 Scope of the Research

In this research subordinate court system has been studied which includes the subordinate courts and activities of relevant stakeholders of subordinate court system of Bangladesh. The courts (District and Session Judge Courts, Metropolitan Session Judge Courts, Chief Judicial Magistrate Courts, Metropolitan Magistrate Courts and other Special Courts and Tribunals) functioning at district and divisional levels have been observed in this research. Data have been collected on basis of a few indicators of good governance which include capacity, transparency, accountability and integrity. It is specially mention-worthy that the observations presented in the research are not equally applicable for all stakeholders including judges, staffs, lawyers and others, however, this report gives an indication on the existing governance challenges of the subordinate court system in Bangladesh.

2. Research Methodology

This is a qualitative research. Considering the divisional representation and number of cases, 18 districts among 64 have been selected for data collection. Data have been collected from both primary and secondary sources. Key informant interviews have been used as the method of data collection. Interviews of the judges, lawyers, judicial staffs, government and non-government stakeholders and journalists have been conducted. Besides, nine group discussions have also been conducted. Furthermore, relevant laws and regulations, various articles and reports published in newspapers and other media have been reviewed. Data collection, analysis and report writing have been done during January to October 2017.

3. Research Findings

3.1 Institutional capacity of the subordinate court system

Gaps in laws: Some gaps in the laws have been identified in relation to the subordinate court system of Bangladesh. In the Constitution of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, Article 109, 115 and 116 provide the supervision and control of all the courts and tribunals on the one hand to the High Court Division and on the other hand, responsibilities of appointment of judges of the

subordinate courts have been provided to the President of the state. As a result, dual institutional control prevails over the subordinate courts in Bangladesh – simultaneously from the Supreme Court and Ministry of the Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs. Besides, rules of the judiciary service discipline and conduct has not been gazetted yet. In addition, because of the article 13 (conditions for full payment of the post) in Bangladesh Judiciary Service (Salary and Allowances) Order, 2016, in some cases despite getting the promotion judges are not entitled of getting salary in accordance with their promoted position. Article 13 of the Order states, if any member needs to get full payment for his promotion in higher post or salary scale, s/he should comply with the rules to complete the minimum duration of the post. Moreover, there is no provision that can provide the scope to Judiciary to take part in the budget formulation process. Furthermore, in some necessary cases trial duration of litigation has not been determined. This may in the long run make risk of delaying to finish judiciary procedure.

Challenges of dual institutional control: In some cases, there takes place administrative coordination between the ministry and the Supreme Court Registry and it impacts on any attempt or implementation of any decision related to subordinate courts. In some cases, it induces obstruction to initiate impromptu decision and instigates even further delay in taking administrative decisions in some cases of transfer, promotion, leave, and project implementation. In addition, by reason of dual administrative control in some cases some sorts of administrative conflict between two institutions take place. It exposes in implementing different decisions. In spite of having disagreement of the Supreme Court on particular proposal, there are examples of continuing the implementation by the ministry, which further encourages the conflict. For instance, in spite of having an objection made by the Supreme Court, some judicial officers were sent for foreign training by the ministry, which furthered conflict between two entities recently. Moreover, according to the respondents, because of dual administrative control some challenges have come up to ensure separation of judicial division effectively. They said, before the separation judge's appointment, transfer and promotion were solely entitled to the Ministry of Establishment and the Home Affairs, which have been shifted to the Ministry of Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs, which means that some important decisions on the judge's management remain with the Executive and so as the control. Therefore, in many situations it poses strong possibilities of making political influence on judicial matter, which eventually risks the process of ensuring judicial independence.

Infrastructural limitations: Many infrastructural limitations have been found in the areas selected for this research. In most of the areas, chief judicial magistrate buildings have not been constructed in spite of having plans. In some cases, construction has been started but not completed duly. Furthermore, in some cases, completed buildings have not been opened for judicial activities. Besides, although there are new courts established (for example, Land Survey Tribunal, special district court etc.) as time demanded, no separate infrastructure has been constructed yet. Seven areas out of 18 selected for the research have been found to be continuing the construction of Chief Judicial Magistrate's Court, while in other six areas construction of buildings has not been started yet. However, in rest five areas such construction initiatives have been completed. Due to having no separate building for judicial magistrate's courts, those courts have been found to be conducting their operations in District and Session Judge's Court buildings or in some rooms situated in the district council's office. These realities in some cases appear to be the hindrance in administering effective judicial procedure. In addition, there are some parts of many old court buildings which require repairing.

There is huge lacking of court rooms compared to the proportion of the judges. As a result, it is seen that two judges are sharing a court room for managing judicial activities. For this situation the judges cannot use their working hours properly, because, they need to consider that the courts

rooms would be left for other judges according to their schedules. In some cases, it appears that the judges cannot continue the hearing from the witnesses. This situation delays the litigation process. Moreover, it increases the expenses of the litigants i.e. transport, food, lawyer fees etc. There is also profound crisis of record rooms and store rooms in different courts. Many old structures have become damp and infested, which poses a risk on the furniture and important court documents. Besides, in many cases there lack of sufficient places for the court police to sit in the court premises. Alongside, there exist inadequate toilets and sitting and waiting places for the litigants and witnesses. Moreover, there is no separate toilets for female and no special facilities for the persons with disabilities. On the other hand, there is inadequate place to sit for the lawyers in court premises.

Budget constraints: It has been found that the subordinate courts are being administered with insufficient budget. Moreover, there is no provision to place budgetary demand by the subordinate courts. Budget which is provided from the ministry is not sufficient compared to the needs in the subordinate courts. In many cases, the courts need to demand for sector wise budget (likely for logistics, transport, training etc.) on contingency basis when their primary budget is spent within a few months of a year. Moreover, allowances (such as allowance for summon noticing, allowance for government lawyers) in the court systems are also sufficient in accordance with present market price.

Logistics crisis: There are huge gaps in meeting necessary logistics (such as furniture, printer, forms, transport etc.) for the subordinate courts. In some areas, although new buildings have been constructed, they have not been provided with sufficient logistics. In many aspects, decrepit and useless furniture have been found in some courts. Furthermore, the numbers of computers are not sufficient for administering courts while many computers have been found slow and some got damaged. Therefore, court activities get hampered for this reason. Besides, there are shortages of printer and toner. Again, forms necessary for order writing have inadequate supply. And in many aspects there are no internet facilities.

Shortage of human resources: Gigantic number of litigations remains in the subordinate courts and they are constantly increasing. To bear on these huge litigations subordinate courts experience shortages of human resources. There are shortages of judges compared to the proportion of litigation alongside other officials and support staff compared to the work pressures existing in the courts. Human resources are disproportionate in regards to increasing number of litigations. Additionally, despite establishment of new courts considering the demand and necessity, essential human resources of those courts have not been allocated. Relevant sources show that that there are only 10 judges available to serve 10 lacks people. According to the field level data, it is reported a temporary inadequacy of 114 judges as observed in 661 courts. In many cases, if any judge is retired or transferred or remains on leave (maternity leave along with others leaves) from courts, the post is not usually filled up immediately rather it remains bare temporarily. In this situation another judge would get the responsibility as extra charge, however, due to his/her existing pressure and responsibility of administering his/her own courts, in most cases the additional job gets unattainable. It impacts on the procedure and leads to the congestion of litigations.

There is also inadequacy of court staff in those research areas where almost 579 numbers of posts remain unfulfilled. Disproportion between litigations and court staff is increasing. Due to inadequacy of court staff, working pressure has increased and led eventually to the low pace of work. To minimise this pressure court staff tend to engage people (termed as "Umeder") on informal basis.

Inadequate training: Judicial training institute does not provide adequate training in some cases especially on some specialised laws (such as the Hill Tracts Manual, Cyber Law etc.). On top of that a judge waits for long time to get training opportunities. It has been found that it even takes several years to get the foundation training designed for the newly appointed judges. There is also allegation that in some cases there exists irregularity in providing training opportunity, regarding that some officers may get training opportunity for several times throughout a year when some officers get deprived of getting same opportunity. On the other hand, training for the court staff is notably insufficient compared to the needs. Although a training programme is usually conducted for the court staff by the judges in particular court once in a year, it is not sufficient compared to the needs. Also, notable inadequacy of providing training to public prosecutors (PPs) and general prosecutors (GPs) has been reported while there is no opportunity for the assistant public prosecutors (APPs) and assistant general prosecutors (AGPs) to get any training. Moreover, the training allocated for the lawyers is not sufficient.

Challenges in appointment, transfer and promotion of Judges and Court Staff: Judges' appointment usually takes longer time. It also takes long process for their transfer and promotion. If a transfer of a judge is made from a court, the filling up process takes longer time. For transfer and promotion Annual Confidential Report (ACR) is crucial which is generally assessed by District Judges and Chief Judicial Magistrates. It is alleged that they take longer time to send the ACR to the Supreme Court due to their negligence. It has also been alleged that in some cases ACRs if done with manipulated assessment jeopardises their junior judges' promotion. On the other hand, in some cases there are allegations of irregularities or corruption in the transfer process of the Judges. In many cases, there exist influence and lobbying in the transfer process. The Supreme Court Registry and senior official of the ministry in many cases influence in the process, most often based on relations, and/or political connections. In the subordinate courts, there are also other various challenges including illegal financial transaction in appointment and transfer of the court staff, influences from different relevant groups, etc. There are allegations of lobbying and influencing in court staff recruitment from relevant authorities. In some cases, there are allegations of unauthorised financing transactions, which vary from case to case based on the importance of the position and thus transaction money ranges from three lakh to ten lakh taka. Court staff are not transferred regularly. It sometimes happens and in that case it is done through lobbying and unauthorised financial transactions take place. In this case, courts staff willing to get transfer tend to prefer some special courts, where the number of litigation is high, areas belong to their own locality and where more corruption opportunities prevail. As a whole there is less opportunity for the court staff to get promotion.

Challenges in the appointment of state prosecutors: Commonly, state prosecutors are recruited on the basis of their political affiliation and they are preferred over talented and experienced lawyers.

Challenge of providing license to the lawyers: In some cases, people who are not properly qualified are also permitted to practice in the court. There are complaints of illegal financial transaction in some cases for obtaining license from the Bar Council. On the other hand, in some aspects, some private universities and law colleges provide law degrees widely by exchanging money; but not by providing proper education on law. It lowers the quality of the lawyers getting certificates through such processes. In some cases, such degree holders are involved in law practices do not have proper skills on the one hand and honesty on the other.

3.2 Accountability in subordinate court system

Gaps in supervision and grievance management: In some cases, there lacks accountability of the judges and court staffs alongside other related persons (lawyers, government prosecutors, public prosecutors). Although there is a provision to carry out financial audit of the courts by the Office of the Comptroller and Auditor General, it is not conducted in many courts since a long time. In addition to that, there exist some challenge in overseeing the judiciary activities. In some cases, there are allegations against judges that they sometimes do not follow the Supreme Court's directives. For example, despite the instructions, allegations exist that they do not provide enough time in their offices. There are also allegations that some judges leave their workplace on the weekends and they tend to leave office early on Thursday and resume the court lately on Sunday. On the other hand, there are allegations of violation of code of conduct and corruption-irregularities against the judges. Although there is a provision to execute justice beyond fear, in some cases some risks arise due to the pressure made from higher authority over the judgement as well as local pressures mainly on socially and politically sensitive cases. Although some actions have been taken against violation of the code of conduct, there are complaints of not taking immediate action locally. The responsibility of supervising the court staff in the subordinate courts is ascribed upon District Judges or the respective Court Chief and to the respective Court Judges. However, there is gaps in the supervision of the court staff by the judges. Moreover, there are allegations that extortion of money and bribery by the court staff has become a part and parcel in the subordinate court systems. Apart from this, there is a shortage of regular inspection to various important branches of the subordinate courts (such as nezarot, record room, store room etc.).

There lacks monitoring of lawyers and state prosecutors. Due to the political affiliation, accountability mechanism does not work for the state prosecutors. There is also gaps in supervising the activities of lawyers from the Bangladesh Bar Council. Although in some cases the local legal committee supervises, it is alleged that members of the committee rather become more active in ensuring the interests of lawyers. The members of the local Bar Association and Bangladesh Bar Council have been elected by the vote of lawyers, thus a conflict of interest prevails in the accountability mechanism.

There is a shortage of formal system of complaints management in the subordinate courts of Bangladesh. No complaint boxes or complaint centres to receive complaints from the litigants have been found in the court premises. Also, no register is maintained for recording the complaints, if given by any litigant. Written or verbal complaints can be made to the Chief Judge of the respective courts. However, there is no form specified for it; it is required to file such complaint by writing on paper. In most cases of the observed courts, no complaints have been placed by the litigants in any form. The litigants informed that they do not know about the complaints procedure. They further informed that they refrain from making any complaint from the fear that it might impact on their cases.

3.3 Transparency in subordinate court system

Lack of transparency: It has been observed that there are no citizen charters or information boards in the subordinate court premises. Moreover, no marks indicating the information centres have been found in the court premises. Besides, there are no information centres in the courts. In two areas there are infrastructures of information centres but those are not functional. Alongside, no nameplate of the designated information officer has been found in the court premises. It has been found that information delivery is slower as documents and information are stored and managed manually and there is a lack of modern technology to manage information. Moreover, the websites of the courts are not updated and some important information are missing in the websites. District wise annual report or a consolidated report combining all subordinate courts are not prepared.

3.4 Integrity practices in the subordinate court system

Fraudulent and forgery: Field data show that litigants are being victimised of fraud by different persons including brokers, lawyers, lawyers' assistants, court staff and son on at various stages of a litigation. Touts and brokers are seen in the court premises and clients are trapped and get victim of fraud before going to the lawyers. In some cases, lawyers or lawyers' assistants take extra money (beyond their fees) instead of charging genuine cost required in any task. It is alleged that sometimes lawyers or lawyers' assistants give false hearing date to their clients. In some cases, clients are being provoked by saying that judgement can be managed as they have good relations with judges. Besides, there are allegations against lawyers of making collusion with other party for money. Furthermore, there are some allegations of changing order by forgery and making fake documents and signature.

Negligence to provide services: It has been found in the research that in some cases duty bearers have negligence to provide services properly. According to a High Court order, judges are bound to give maximum time in court rooms, but in some cases it has been alleged that few judges start their work in late hours. As a result, time for judicial activities gets reduced. Besides, some staff are not carrying out their duty properly. On the other hand, some lawyers out of self interest or business make the case lengthy by neglecting the case. Some time they don't give the proper or full information (merit of the case, risk etc.) to their clients. There are allegations that sometimes public prosecutors do not remain present in the court on time.

Bribery or illegal transactions: It is alleged that litigants are forced to bribe to different people such as court staff, PPs, lawyers so on for different services at different stages of their litigation. It is alleged that it has become a culture of bribery and there are common perceptions among the litigants that they would face delay and harassment if they do not bribe. Field data show that the amount of bribe or illegal money is not fixed for all tasks or cases rather it depends on the type of cases, importance and urgency of tasks, number of defendants, ability of the litigants and locations.

In case of a civil sue, summon is one of the important tasks and comparatively higher amount has to be paid for this task. Field data show that bribe money in such cases ranges between 200-10, 000 Taka. Like this, other tasks (such as signing any documents 50-100 taka, viewing any document 150-1000 taka, to get copy of judgement 200-5000 taka etc.) need certain amount of money. Sometimes, the amount bribe money depends on the number of copies and the volume and pages of the judgment.

It is also alleged that some PPs and GPs receive unauthorised money from the litigants for different tasks and at different stages of litigation. Sometimes if the litigants want to withdraw their case, they are forced to pay unauthorised money to the public prosecutors. Apart from this, there are allegations of transactions (20,000-10, 00,000 Taka) of money for influencing order or judgement, which takes place by making collusion among different persons. Field data suggest that in some cases, unauthorised money is asked from the litigants in the name of judges – and there are strong chances that the judges do not know about the transactions or collusions.

Sometimes lawyers claim extra money from their clients for signing documents and even for withdrawing cases or changing lawyer. In some cases, they forcefully claim the portion from the dower money that a woman might get through a court order. Sometimes lawyers or their assistants claim extra money in the name of different persons such as court staff, PPs, Judges and so on.

Influence peddling and other pressures: Field data suggest that there is a tendency to influence the court activities. In some cases, different persons including judges and PPs face some persuasion and political pressure. Sometimes, persuasion and influence are made to the judges regarding bail, judgement, conviction, appointment of staffs etc. Sometimes there are allegations of making negative impacts (negative ACR, punishment transfer, harassment etc.) on the judges if the persuasions are not addressed. Besides, the judicial officers feel mental pressure and fear during court inspection or even the personal visit of higher authority as the judicial officials are required to arrange extra protocol or in some cases provide gifts. Sometimes the judges feel mental pressures to deal with politically or socially sensitive issues seeing that the boycott or destructive works of court by the lawyers.

3.5 Challenges relating to legal aid services

In spite of having many positive steps and good practices, a few challenges prevail in the legal aid services. There is lack of human resources, budget and infrastructure. Besides, in some cases it is alleged that service recipients face corruption in getting legal aid services. It is also alleged that in few cases legal aid panel lawyers claim unauthorised money from the service seekers. In some cases, they take money from both parties of the case. Apart from this, there is lack of awareness raising campaigns on the legal aid services.

4. Causes and consequences of governance deficiencies in the Subordinate Court System

Causes	Results	Impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dual institutional control • Institutional limitations (Legal, infrastructural, logistics, budget, human resources, training etc.) • Lack of effective accountability • Lack of transparency and disclosure of information • Procedural complexity of cases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflict between the ministry and Supreme Court • Hindrance to judicial activities • Obstacle to administrative activities • Case backlog and congestion • Corruption and irregularities • Harassments of the litigants • Risk in achieving judicial independence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hindrance to access to justice • Financial, physical and mental shocks of the litigants • Fear in having access to the courts • Hindrance to justice

5. Conclusion

Subordinate Courts have a very vital role in ensuring good governance and social stability. In spite of having several limitations and obstacles these courts have been adding a significant contribution to ensuring justice in society. Although there are positive initiatives for increasing effectiveness, there are some challenges in the subordinate court system of Bangladesh. Dual institutional control and supervision system by the Supreme Court and Ministry are creating the administrative process lengthy, leading to administrative conflicts and risking the judicial independence in the real sense. Moreover, there are deficiencies of infrastructure, logistics, budget, human resources, trainings, effective transparency and accountability in the subordinate court system of Bangladesh. These deficiencies lead to a situation that judicial and administrative works are being impacted and corruption and irregularities including bribery and illegal

transaction of money through collusion of different stakeholders take place in some ways. As a result, justice seekers are being victims of harassment and sufferings. The findings of this research suggest that corruption and lengthiness of cases are induced by governance deficits in the subordinate court system of Bangladesh. In some ways, corruption creates lengthiness of cases and lengthiness of cases creates corruption. As a whole, access to justice becomes jeopardised because of the lack of good governance in the court system.

6. Recommendations

TIB proposes the following recommendations for establishing good governance in the subordinate court system of Bangladesh:

Increase institutional capacity:

1. The institutional control and supervision of the subordinate courts should be provided solely to the Supreme Court;
2. Formulation of necessary laws and legal reforms should be carried out;
3. Sufficient financial allocations for the subordinate courts must be ensured; needs assessment of the subordinate courts should be carried out for proper budgeting;
4. Sufficient human resources, infrastructure, logistics and modern technology must be ensured for all subordinate courts;
5. Recruitment process of the judges for the subordinate courts should be completed in a more faster way.
6. Recruitment process of subordinate court staff has to be transparent and free from corruption;
7. Appointment process of public prosecutors has to be transparent and free from political influence;
8. Sufficient training courses should be arranged for the judges, court staff and public prosecutors and equal training opportunity should be ensured for all judges – Capacity of Judicial Administration and Training Institute should be enhanced;

Ensure transparency

9. Disclosure of information in court activities should be ensured; In this view citizen charters, information centres should be introduced in the court premises;
10. Publication of consolidated annual report of all subordinate courts has to be introduced;
11. Annual audit has to be done on regular basis and published in the website.

Ensure accountability

12. Service discipline and conduct rules of the subordinate court judges should be published in a faster way and strict compliance with codes of conduct by all judicial officers must be ensured; Separate conduct rules should be introduced for subordinate court staff;
13. Regular monitoring of the court activities and conduct of judges, court staffs and public prosecutors should be ensured; For ensuring this:
 - Yearly inspection by the High Court authority should be increased;
 - Regular inspection and proper management of different offices of the subordinate courts should be ensured;
 - Mandatory disclosure of income and assets of the judges and court staffs should be ensured on annual basis;
14. Regular monitoring system should be introduced by the Bar Council and local Bar Associations to increase accountability of the lawyers;
15. Complaint box, register should be introduced and effective measures have to be taken to resolve the complaints

Ensure integrity practices

16. Allegation of corruption and breach of the code of conduct must be dealt with sharp and swift decisions and made public;
17. Enabling environment should be ensured for enhancing judicial independence in the real sense;

Others

18. Awareness raising campaign for legal aid should be enhanced and measures have to be taken to remove the challenges in legal aid services.