

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BANGLADESH  
HIGH COURT DIVISION  
(SPECIAL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION)

**Present**

Mr. Justice Sikder Mahmudur Razi  
And  
Mr. Justice Raziuddin Ahmed

**Writ Petition No. 15070 of 2024**

Md. Minhaj Uddin  
.....Petitioner.

**-Versus-**

Bangladesh and others.  
.....Respondents.

Ms. Mahabuba Huq, Advocate  
.....For the petitioner.  
Mr. Md. Mahabubur Rahman Kishore, Advocate  
.....For the respondent No. 6.  
Mr. Mohammad Mehdi Ha san, DAG with  
Mr. Mohammad Rashadul Hassan, DAG with  
Mr. Kamrul Islam, AAG with  
Mr. Md. Shagar Hossain, AAG with  
Mr. Bishwanath Karmaker, AAG with  
Mr. S.K. Obaidul Haque (Wasim), AAG  
....For the respondents

**The 09<sup>th</sup> December, 2025**

This is an application for discharging Rule.

Mr. Md. Mahabubur Rahman Kishore, learned Advocate for the respondent No. 6-applicant submits that the petitioner is not a general member of “জাতীয় দৃষ্টি প্রতিবন্ধী সংস্থা” and his membership was cancelled on 26.08.2017 at Annual General Meeting (AGM) and the same was duly informed to the petitioner vide letter dated 15.09.2017 but suppressing this fact the petitioner filed the instant writ petition and as such he has no *locus standi* to file this instant writ petition. He next submits that the petitioner is not a general member of the “জাতীয় দৃষ্টি প্রতিবন্ধী সংস্থা” and he is a government service holder under Bangladesh Telecommunication Company Limited and as per Rule 5 of the by-laws of “জাতীয় দৃষ্টি প্রতিবন্ধী

সংস্থা” only the member can file a suit or any case before any competent court and as such the petitioner has no *locus standi* to file this instant writ petition. The learned advocate next submits that the executive committee of the “জাতীয় দৃষ্টি প্রতিবন্ধী সংস্থা” has been formed following due process of law and approved by the authority concerned on 01.03.2023 and the same is valid till 03.03.2026 and there is no scope to appoint administrator by cancelling the elected executive committee and as such the instant Rule is liable to be discharged for ends of justice. He also submits that since 2016 the writ petitioner and others filed writ petitions one after another though they are not the general member of “জাতীয় দৃষ্টি প্রতিবন্ধী সংস্থা” and some of the writ petitions were summarily rejected and some of the writ petitions were discharged on contesting hearing which clearly shows the *malafide* intention of the writ petitioner and the instant writ petition has also been filed only to harass and humiliate the respondent -applicant. He further submits that after obtaining the order dated 05.05.2025 the writ petitioner misused the order of the High Court Division by making false news through online and also humiliating and harassing the respondent No.6-applicant. He lastly submits that there are criminal cases pending against the petitioner and he has no *locus standi* to file the instant writ petition. With these submissions the learned advocate prays for discharging the Rule.

The learned advocate for the petitioner failed to controvert the allegations and submissions of the respondent-applicant.

We have heard the learned Advocate for the respondent No. 6-applicant. We have also gone through the application and materials on record.

It appears that in paragraph no. 1 of the writ petition, the petitioner described himself as a General Member of the জাতীয় দৃষ্টি প্রতিবন্ধী সংস্থা. However, the respondent-applicant emphatically contended that the petitioner is not a general member of the said organization, as his membership was cancelled on 26.08.2017 at an Annual General Meeting, and that such decision remains in force. In support of this contention, the respondent annexed copies of the relevant proceedings and resolution of the said Annual General Meeting, which have been marked as Annexures-1 and 2 to the application.

In view of the fact that the petitioner is not a member of the organization, he lacks the requisite *locus standi* to institute the present writ petition. Nevertheless, suppressing this material fact, the petitioner filed the instant writ petition, and the learned Advocate appearing on his behalf failed to rebut or dislodge the said allegation or the other submissions advanced by the learned Advocate for the respondent.

Accordingly, we find substance in the instant application and resultantly, the same is allowed and the Rule issued in the instant matter is hereby discharged. Interim order, if there be any, is hereby recalled and vacated.

Communicate the judgment to the concerned authority, at once.

.....  
(Sikder Mahmudur Razi, J.)

I agree

.....  
(Raziuddin Ahmed, J.)