



Case Summary

The Suai District Court

February 2017

Affirmation: The following case summaries set out the facts and the proceedings of cases before the court through JSMP's independent monitoring and is based on the testimony given by the parties before the court. This information does not reflect the opinions of JSMP as an institution.

JSMP strongly condemns all forms of violence, especially against women and vulnerable persons. JSMP maintains that there is no justification for violence against women.

A. Summary of trials at the Suai District Court

1. Total cases monitored by JSMP: 20

Article	Type of case	Number
Article 145 of the Penal Code (PC) as well as articles 2, 3, 35 36 of the Law Against Domestic Violence	Simple offences against physical integrity characterized as domestic violence (Article 2 on the concept of domestic violence, Article 3 on family relationships, Article 35 on different types of domestic violence crimes and Article 36 on domestic violence as a public crime)	2
Article 177 of the PC	Sexual abuse of a minor	2
Article 172 of the PC	Rape	1
Article 154 of the PC as well as articles 2, 3, 35 and 36 of the Law Against Domestic Violence	Mistreatment of a spouse	2
Article 23 & 138 of the PC as well as articles 2, 3, 35 and 36	Attempted homicide characterized as domestic violence	1

Rua Beco Lakateu, Aldeia Manu fuik,
Suku Colmera, Administrativu Vera Cruz
Dili Timor Leste
PoBox: 275

Telefone: 3323883 | 77295795

www.jsmp.tl

info@jsmp.minihub.org

Facebook: www.facebook.com/timorleste.jsmp

Twitter: @JSMPtl

of the Law Against Domestic Violence		
Article 295 of the PC	Embezzlement	1
Article 146 of the PC	Serious offences against physical integrity	3
Article 148 of the PC	Negligent offences against physical integrity	1
Article 145 of the PC	Simple offences against physical integrity	4
Article 258 of the PC	Property damage	2
Article 157 of the PC	Threats	1
Total		20

2. Total cases monitored by JSMP: 12

Type of Penalty	Number
Prison	2
Suspension of execution of a prison sentence (Article 68 of the PC)	2
Fine (Article 67 of the PC)	1
Withdrawal of complaint	6
Acquitted	1
Total	12

3. Total cases adjourned based on JSMP monitoring: 3

Reason for adjournment	Number
Victim and witness not present	2
Defendant and victim not present	1
Total	3

4. Total ongoing cases based on JSMP monitoring: 5

B. Short description of these cases

1. Crime of property damage

Case No. : 390/PEN/16/TDS
Composition of the court : Single Judge
Judge : Samuel da Costa Pacheco
Prosecutor : Bartoromeo de Araujo
Public Defender : Albino de Jesus Pereira
Type of Penalty : Withdrawal of complaint

On 1 February 2017 the Suai District Court attempted conciliation in a case of property damage involving the defendants MM, EMM, NM and AdC who allegedly committed the offence against the victim and in Covalima District.

Charges of the Prosecutor

The public prosecutor alleged that on 10 August 2015 the victim was driving a bus and picking up passengers between Dili and Suai. When the bus entered Zumalai, in Suai, the defendants twice stoned the bus that the victim was driving. This act caused damage to two windows.

The public prosecutor alleged that the defendant violated Article 258 of the Penal Code on property damage with that carries a maximum penalty of three years in prison or a fine.

Presentation of evidence

Pursuant to Article 262 of the Criminal Procedure Code on attempted conciliation, before progressing to the presentation of evidence the judge may seek to reach conciliation between the defendant and victim.

During this attempted conciliation the victim wanted to withdraw the complaint against the defendants because previously they entered into a written amicable agreement before the village authorities and handed over US\$ 250.00 to replace and repair the damaged windows. In addition, the defendants apologised to the victim, regretted their actions, and promised not to repeat such crimes in the future and agreed with the victim's request to withdraw the complaint.

Final recommendations

The prosecution and defence accepted the amicable agreement between the two parties and requested for the court to settle this process.

Decision

Based on the request of the victim's to withdraw the case and the amicable agreement between the defendants and the victim, the Court decided to validate the settlement.

2. Simple offences against physical integrity

Case No. : 324/PEN/2016/TDS
Composition of the court : Single Judge

Judge : Nasson Sarmento
Prosecutor : Bartoromeu de Araujo
Public Defender : Albino de Jesus Pereira
Type of Penalty : Fine of US\$ 45.00

On 6 February 2017 the Suai District Court announced its decision in a case of simple offences against physical integrity involving the defendant RMC who allegedly committed the offence against his sister (LC), in Maukatar Sub-District, Covalima District.

Charges of the Prosecutor

The public prosecutor alleged that on 6 June 2016 the defendant sent a message via a mobile phone to the son of the victim (the defendant's nephew) stating that his father's behaviour was not good. Therefore the victim and the defendant had an argument and the defendant shoved the victim on her shoulder and caused her to fall to the ground. This act caused the victim to suffer an injury to her knee.

The public prosecutor alleged that the defendant violated Article 145 of the Penal Code on simple offences against physical integrity that carries a maximum penalty of three years in prison or a fine.

Presentation of evidence

During the trial the defendant acknowledged that he sent the message as described in the indictment but he denied pushing the victim. The defendant said that the victim fell down because the defendant moved his arm suddenly and accidentally made contact with the victim's arm. However, the victim maintained the facts set out in the indictment of the public prosecutor.

The witness MdC who is the son of the victim testified that he received the message from the defendant and as described in the indictment and saw the defendant push victim to the ground.

Final recommendations

The public prosecutor requested for the court to sentence the defendant to 3 months in prison suspended for 1 year because the public prosecutor considered that the defendant had been found guilty of committing the crime against the victim.

Meanwhile the defence requested for the court to acquit the defendant from the charges of the public prosecutor because he considered that the defendant's actions did not fulfil the elements of the crime of simple offences against physical integrity. In addition, the defence also requested for the court to consider the mitigating circumstances of the defendant because he had cooperated with the Court.

Decision

After evaluating all of the facts, the Court found the defendant guilty of committing the crime against the victim and ordered the defendant to pay a fine of US\$45.00. This fine is to be paid in instalments of US\$1.00 per day for 45 days. If the defendant fails to pay the aforementioned fine, then he will be sent to prison for 30 days as an alternative punishment. The court also ordered the defendant to pay court costs of US\$ 10.

3. Crime of serious offences against physical integrity

Case No.	: 408/PEN/16/TDS
Composition of the court	: Single Judge
Judge	: Samuel da Costa Pacheco
Prosecutor	: Bartoromeu de Araujo
Public Defender	: Fransisco Caetano Martins
Type of Penalty	: Acquitted

On 8 February 2017 the Suai District Court read out its decision in a case of serious offences against physical integrity involving the defendant AM who allegedly committed the offence against the victim CPA in Bobonaro District.

Charges of the Prosecutor

The public prosecutor alleged that on 12 April 2016 the defendant hid in a drain waiting for the victim. When the victim went past on a motorcycle taking food to the brother of the victim at the Headquarters of the Firefighters the defendant stopped the victim and threw two stones at the victim's head and mouth and dragged the victim from the motorcycle. These acts caused the victim to suffer injuries to the head and mouth. The victim received treatment at the Guido Valadares National Hospital in Dili for two weeks.

The public prosecutor alleged that the defendant violated Article 146 (e) of the Penal Code on serious offences against physical integrity endangering the life of the victim which carries a maximum penalty of 2 – 8 years in prison.

Presentation of evidence

During the trial the defendant totally denied the facts set out in the indictment of the public prosecutor and stated that he was at home at the aforementioned time and does not know the victim. In addition, the victim also confirmed the defendant's statement and said it wasn't the defendant who committed the act against the victim and the victim did not know the defendant.

Final recommendations

The public prosecutor requested for the court to acquit the defendant from the charges against him because the defendant did not commit the crime against the victim.

In addition, the defence also requested for the court to acquit the defendant because it wasn't the defendant who committed the crime against the victim.

Decision

After assessing all of the facts the court found the defendant not guilty. For this reason the court acquitted the defendant from the charges of the prosecution.

4. Crime of property damage

Case No.	: 308/PEN/16/TDS
Composition of the court	: Single Judge
Judge	: Samuel da Costa Pacheco
Prosecutor	: Bartoromeo de Araujo
Public Defender	: Albino de Jesus Pereira
Type of Penalty	: Withdrawal of complaint

On 6 February 2017 the Suai District Court attempted conciliation in a case of property damage involving the defendants JdC against the victim MdR in Covalima District.

Charges of the Prosecutor

The public prosecutor alleged that on 15 December 2015 the victim was in his plantation and saw the defendant dismantling the victim's fence that was made from piles of stones. Then on 28 December 2016 the victim again saw the defendant removing the stones. For this reason the victim and his older sister went to the home of the defendant in the afternoon to ask why the defendant removed the stones. The defendant answered that he removed the stones because the land that the victim was using to plant crops did not belong to the victim, but it belonged to the defendant's godmother.

The public prosecutor alleged that the defendant violated Article 258 of the Penal Code on property damage with that carries a maximum penalty of three years in prison or a fine.

Presentation of evidence

Pursuant to Article 262 of the Criminal Procedure Code on attempted conciliation, before progressing to the presentation of evidence the judge may seek to reach conciliation between the defendant and victim.

During the attempted conciliation the victim wanted to withdraw the complaint against the defendant because the defendant apologised to the victim and promised not to repeat such acts in the future. The defendant also agreed with the victim's request to withdraw the matter.

Final recommendations

The prosecution and defence accepted the amicable agreement between the two parties and requested for the court to settle this process.

Decision

Based on the request of the victim to withdraw the complaint and the agreement between the two parties to settle the matter, the court validated the amicable settlement.

5. Attempted homicide characterised as domestic violence

Case No.	193/PEN/16/TDS
Composition of the court	: Panel
Judges	: Constâncio Barros Basmery, Samuel da C. Pacheco and Nasson Sarmento
Prosecutor	: Bartoromeu de Araujo
Public Defender	: Albino de Jesus Pereira
Type of Penalty	: 4 years in prison

On 8 February 2017 the Suai District Court announced its decision in a case of attempted homicide characterized as domestic violence involving the defendant CG who allegedly committed the offence against his wife in Covalima District.

Charges of the Prosecutor

The public prosecutor alleged that during the evening of 21 December 2016 the victim was weaving a basket to store tobacco and the defendant was sitting next to the victim. The defendant asked the victim if she was weaving a large or small basket. Then the defendant took a machete and from behind the victim slashed the victim once on the shoulder and once on the arm. As a result of these acts the victim suffered an injury to her shoulder and two fingers were cut off. After the act the defendant immediately went and handed himself in to the Police.

The public prosecutor charged the defendant for violating Article 138 of the Penal Code on homicide that carries a penalty of between 8 – 20 years, and for violating Article 23 on attempt to commit a crime as well as Article 2 of the Law Against Domestic Violence on the concept of domestic violence, Article 3 of the Law Against Domestic Violence on family relationships, Article 35 of the Law Against Domestic Violence on different types of domestic violence and Article 36 on domestic violence as a public crime.

Presentation of evidence

During the trial the defendant totally confessed to the facts set out in the indictment of the prosecution and stated he did not intend to kill the victim. At that time he lost his mind and didn't know who he was.

The victim maintained the facts set out in the indictment of the prosecution and corroborated the statement of the defendant that he suffers an illness and loses his mind and doesn't know who he is.

Final recommendations

The prosecution did not believe that the defendant had the intent to commit this crime and therefore requested for the court to amend the charge from attempted homicide to serious offences against physical integrity set out in Article 146 of the Penal Code. Pursuant to Article 146 the prosecutor requested for the court to sentence the defendant to 6 years in prison.

On the other hand the defence requested for the court to sentence the defendant to 4 years in prison because the defendant did not intend to kill the victim. The defence also requested for the court to consider the mitigating circumstances such as the defendant's cooperation with the court and regret for his actions.

Decision

The court considered all of the facts and also considered the medical report that showed that the defendant is suffering from a mental illness. The court found the defendant guilty of committing the crime of attempted homicide against the victim. For this reason the court sentenced the defendant to 4 years in prison.

6. Simple offences against physical integrity

Case No.	: 352/PEN/16/TDS
Composition of the court	: Single Judge
Judge	: Samuel da Costa Pacheco
Prosecutor	: Bartoromeo de Araujo
Public Defender	: Fransisco Caetano Martins
Type of Penalty	: Withdrawal of complaint

On 9 February 2017 the Suai District Court attempted conciliation in a case of simple offences against physical integrity involving the defendant TdC against the victim AC in Covalima District.

Charges of the Prosecutor

The public prosecutor alleged that on 25 October 2015 the defendant and the victim had an argument about land that was being occupied by the defendant's younger sibling. For this reason the defendant punched the victim once in the nose and caused bleeding. The defendant and victim are related.

The public prosecutor alleged that the defendant violated Article 145 of the Penal Code on simple offences against physical integrity that carries a maximum penalty of three years in prison or a fine.

Presentation of evidence

Pursuant to Article 262 of the Criminal Procedure Code on attempted conciliation, before progressing to the presentation of evidence the judge may seek to reach conciliation between the defendant and victim.

During the attempted conciliation the victim stated that the defendant apologised to the victim and promised not to repeat such behaviour in the future. Therefore the victim wanted to withdraw the complaint against the defendant. The defendant also agreed with the victim's request to withdraw the matter.

Final recommendations

The prosecution and defence accepted the amicable agreement between the two parties and requested for the court to settle this process.

Decision

Based on the amicable agreement between the defendant and victim and the victim's request to withdraw the complaint, the Court validated the settlement.

7. Mistreatment of a spouse

Case No.	: 244/PEN/15/TDS
Composition of the court	: Panel
Judges	: Argentino Luisa Nunes, Samuel da Costa Pacheco and Nasson Sarmento
Prosecutor	: Matias Soares
Public Defender	: Albino de Jesus Pereira
Type of Penalty	: 2 years in imprisonment

On 9 February 2017 the Suai District Court announced its decision in a case of mistreatment of a spouse involving the defendant JM who allegedly committed the offence against his wife in Ainaro District.

Charges of the Prosecutor

The public prosecutor alleged that on 15 March 2015 the defendant threw a helmet at the victim's head, kicked the victim twice in the mouth and pulled the victim's hair. These actions caused injuries to the victim's head and swelling to her mouth.

The public prosecutor also alleged that previously on 5 August 2014 the victim asked the defendant to give her money to buy milk for their child but the defendant said that there was no money and the defendant punched the victim once in the back, kicked her once on her side. These actions caused the victim to suffer pain to her back.

In addition, on 7 August 2014 the victim took five dollars of the defendant's money to buy some clothes washing detergent and the defendant kicked the victim once in the mouth and punched her once on the back of her neck. These actions caused the victim to suffer pain to her neck, an injury and swelling to her mouth.

Then on 13 August 2014 the victim took seventy five cents of the defendant's money to buy vegetables and the defendant kicked and punched the victim many times all over her body. These actions caused the victim to suffer swelling to her body.

The public prosecutor charged the defendant for violating Article 154 of the Penal Code on mistreatment of a spouse that carries a penalty of between 2 – 6 years in prison as well as Article 2 of the Law Against Domestic Violence on the concept of domestic violence, Article 3 of the Law Against Domestic Violence on family relationships, Article 35 of the Law Against Domestic Violence on different types of domestic violence and Article 36 on domestic violence as a public crime.

Presentation of evidence

During the trial the defendant confessed some of the facts and denied some others. The defendant confessed the facts that occurred on 15 March 2015, 5 August 2014 and 7 August 2014. However, regarding the incident on 13 August 2014, the defendant denied the facts and stated that he slapped the victim once on the cheek and punched her once on the back. However, the victim maintained the facts set out in the indictment of the public prosecutor.

Final recommendations

The public prosecutor requested for the court to sentence the defendant to an effective prison sentence of five years. The public prosecutor requested this penalty to prevent the defendant from repeating his actions in the future because he believed that the defendant had mistreated the victim.

Meanwhile, the defence requested for the court to apply a suspended prison sentence against the defendant because the defendant confessed that he committed the crimes against the victim, but he regretted his behaviour and was a first time offender.

Decision

After evaluating the facts the court found the defendant guilty of committing the crimes against the victim. Based on this evidence the court sentenced the defendant to 2 years in prison and ordered him to pay court costs of US\$ 25.00.

8. Negligent offences against physical integrity

Case No.	: 110/PEN/16/TDS
Composition of the court	: Single Judge
Judge	: Argentino Luisa Nunes
Prosecutor	: Bartoromeo de Araujo
Public Defender	: Manuel Amaral
Type of Penalty	: Punishment of 1 year in prison, suspended for 1 year

On 16 February 2017 the Suai District Court announced its decision in a case of negligent offences against physical integrity involving the defendant JdN who allegedly committed the offence against his wife in Covalima District.

Charges of the Prosecutor

The public prosecutor alleged that the victim borrowed some money and the defendant did not know about it so the defendant punched the victim once in the nose. These actions caused the victim to suffer pain to her nose.

The public prosecutor charged the defendant for violating Article 145 of the Penal Code on simple offences against physical integrity as well as Article 2 of the Law Against Domestic Violence on the concept of domestic violence, Article 3 of the Law Against Domestic Violence on family relationships, Article 35 of the Law Against Domestic Violence on different types of domestic violence and Article 36 on domestic violence as a public crime.

Presentation of evidence

During the trial, the defendant stated that he did not punch the victim. The defendant responded that he suddenly moved his arm and accidentally stuck the victim in the nose. In addition, the victim also corroborated the defendant's statement.

Before progressing to the final recommendations, the public prosecutor requested for the court to replace Article 145 of the Penal Code with Article 148 on negligent offences against physical integrity. The public prosecutor believed that the defendant did not intend to punch the victim.

Final recommendations

The public prosecutor believed there was no intent to commit the crime but in order to prevent such crimes in the future the public prosecutor requested for the court to sentence the defendant to three months in prison, suspended for 1 year.

In addition, the defence agreed with the charges of the prosecutor and requested for the court to apply a fine against the defendant because the defendant did not intend to commit the crime, regretted his actions and was a first time offender.

Decision

After evaluating all of the facts, the Court agreed with the prosecutor's request to amend the charges and sentenced the defendant to 1 year in prison, suspended for 1 year and ordered him to pay court costs of US\$25.00.

9. Simple offences against physical integrity

Case No.	: 298/PEN/16/TDS
Composition of the court	: Single Judge
Judge	: Alvaro Maria Freitas
Prosecutor	: Bartoromeu de Araujo
Public Defender	: Albino de Jesus Pereira
Type of Penalty	: Withdrawal of complaint

On 17 February 2017 the Suai District Court attempted conciliation in a case of simple offences against physical integrity involving the defendant AB and LMA against the victim BA in Covalima District.

Charges of the Prosecutor

The public prosecutor alleged that on 1 April 2016 the victim and a friend tied up a chicken to take it for sale at the Suai market. Suddenly the defendant AB grabbed the victim by the neck and punched the victim once in the throat. The defendant LMA twice kicked the victim in the back and stomach causing the victim to fall to the ground. These acts caused the victim to suffer pain to his neck, back and stomach.

The public prosecutor alleged that the defendant violated Article 145 of the Penal Code on simple offences against physical integrity that carries a maximum penalty of three years in prison or a fine.

Presentation of evidence

Before progressing to the presentation of evidence, pursuant to Article 262 of the Criminal Procedure Code on attempted conciliation, the judge may seek to reach conciliation between the defendant and victim.

During the attempted conciliation the victim stated that the defendants apologised to the victim and promised not to repeat their behaviour in the future. Based on this request the victim wanted to withdraw the complaint against the defendants. The defendant also agreed with the victim's request to withdraw the matter.

Final recommendations

The prosecution and defence accepted the amicable agreement between the two parties and requested for the court to settle this process.

Decision

Based on the request of the victim's to withdraw the case and the amicable agreement between the defendants and the victim, the Court decided to validate the settlement.

10. Crime of making threats

Case No.	: 428/PEN/16/TDS
Composition of the court	: Single Judge
Judge	: Argentino Luisa Nunes
Prosecutor	: Bartoromeu de Araujo
Public Defender	: Fransisco Caetano Martins
Type of Penalty	: Withdrawal of complaint

On 17 February 2017 the Suai District Court announced its decision in a case of making threats involving the defendant BG who allegedly committed the offence against his aunty (RBM) in Covalima District.

Charges of the Prosecutor

The public prosecutor alleged that the defendant was unhappy with the behaviour of the victim's husband who did not share compensation from the State for family land that the State had appropriated to construct a highway. Therefore, on 28 August 2016 the defendant went to the home of the victim' neighbour and shouted out that he would kill the victim, her husband and all of their children. The victim felt afraid and ran to the home of a member of the Border Patrol Unit and the police were immediately contacted.

The public prosecutor alleged that the defendant violated Article 157 of the Penal Code on making threats with that carries a maximum penalty of 1 year in prison or a fine.

Presentation of evidence

Pursuant to Article 262 of the Criminal Procedure Code on attempted conciliation in cases involving semi-public crimes, the judge may seek to reach conciliation between the defendant and the aggrieved person before progressing to the presentation of evidence.

During the attempted conciliation the victim stated that she wanted to withdraw the complaint against the defendant because the defendant had apologised and promised not to repeat such behaviour in the future. The defendant also agreed with the victim's request to withdraw the matter.

Final recommendations

The prosecution and defence accepted the amicable agreement between the two parties and requested for the court to settle this process.

Decision

Based on the amicable agreement between the defendant and victim and the victim's request to withdraw the complaint, the Court validated the settlement.

11. Crime of simple offences against physical integrity characterized as domestic violence

Case No.	: 225/PEN/16/TDS
Composition of the court	: Single Judge
Judge	: Argentino Luisa Nunes
Prosecutor	: Bartoromeu de Araujo
Public Defender	: Albino de Jesus Pereira
Type of Penalty	: 6 months imprisonment, suspended for 1 year

On 17 February 2017 the Suai District Court announced its decision in a case of simple offences against physical integrity involving the defendant ALM who allegedly committed the offence against his wife in Covalima District.

Charges of the Prosecutor

The public prosecutor alleged that on 5 December 2015 the defendant mistreated the victim when he heard information that the victim slept with another man. The victim did not accept the defendant's statement and followed the defendant to the home of the sub-village chief. At that place the victim pushed the defendant off his chair. The defendant stood up and punched victim three times on the back of the neck and slapped her twice on the cheek. These acts caused the victim to suffer pain to the back of her neck and cheek.

The public prosecutor charged the defendant for violating Article 145 of the Penal Code on simple offences against physical integrity as well as Article 2 of the Law Against Domestic Violence on the concept of domestic violence, Article 3 of the Law Against Domestic Violence

on family relationships, Article 35 of the Law Against Domestic Violence on different types of domestic violence and Article 36 on domestic violence as a public crime.

Presentation of evidence

During the trial the defendant totally confessed to the facts set out in the indictment of the prosecution and stated he did regretted his actions. In addition, the victim maintained the charges of the prosecutor.

Final recommendations

The public prosecutor requested for the court to sentence the defendant to 3 months in prison suspended for 1 year to prevent the defendant from repeating his actions in the future.

On the other hand, the defence requested for the court to apply an admonishment against the defendant after considering the mitigating circumstances, namely the defendant's confessed, regretted his actions, collaborated with the court and was a first time offender.

Decision

After evaluating the facts during the trial, the court found the defendant guilty of committing the crime as set out in the indictment of the public prosecutor and sentenced the defendant to six months in prison, suspended for 1 year.

12. Simple offences against physical integrity

Case No.	: 342/PEN/16/TDS
Composition of the court	: Single Judge
Judge	: Constância Barros Basmerly
Prosecutor	: Matias Soares
Public Defender	: Manuel Amaral
Type of Penalty	: Withdrawal of complaint

On 22 February 2017 the Suai District Court, through the mobile court in Manufahi District, attempted conciliation in a case of simple offences against physical integrity involving the defendant JdC, AdC, FG, CC, DdS and MSS against the victim IdS in Manufahi District.

Charges of the Prosecutor

The public prosecutor stated that on 16 May 2016 the victim purchased water from a kiosk when he was waiting for his sick grandfather at the hospital. Upon returning from the kiosk the defendants chased the victim down the road, caught up with him and grabbed him by the shirt and kicked him on the left side of the head, on his brow, forehead, mouth and ear. These acts caused the victim to suffer pain to his ears, forehead and head, as well as injuries to his mouth and brow.

The public prosecutor alleged that the defendant violated Article 145 of the Penal Code on simple offences against physical integrity that carries a maximum penalty of three years in prison or a fine.

Presentation of evidence

During the attempted conciliation the victim wanted to withdraw the complaint against the defendants but the defendants would have to pay US\$ 600 for his suffering, whereby each defendant would have to pay US\$ 100. The defendants apologised to the victim, regretted their actions and promised not to repeat such crimes in the future and agreed with the request of the victim to withdraw the complaint and they were willing to pay the aforementioned amount of money.

Previously the defendants and the victim met to resolve this case but because two defendants did not appear (were overseas studying) so they did not reach an agreement.

Final recommendations

The prosecution and defence accepted the amicable agreement between the two parties and requested for the court to settle this process.

Decision

Based on the amicable agreement between the defendants and the victim and the victim's request to withdraw the complaint, the Court validated the settlement.

For more information, please contact:

Luis de Oliveira Sampaio
Executive Director of JSMP
Email: luis@jsmp.tl