



Case Summary
Suai District Court
February 2021

Affirmation: The following case summary sets out the facts and the proceedings of cases before the court based on JSMP's independent monitoring, and 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 the trial process at the Suai District Court

1. Total number of cases monitored by JSMP: 15

Article	Type of Case	Number of Cases
Article 145 of the Penal Code (PC) and Articles 2, 3 and 35 of the Law Against Domestic Violence (LADV)	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 (DV) and Article 36 on domestic violence as a public crime)	4
Article 172 of the PC	Rape	1
Article 154 of the PC & Articles 2, 3, 35 and 36 of the Law Against Domestic Violence	Mistreatment of a spouse	2
Article 171 of the PC	Sexual coercion	3
Articles 23, 24, 172 of the PC	Attempt, punishability of attempt, rape	1
Articles 177, 171 of the PC & Articles 2, 3, 35 and 36 of the	Sexual abuse of a minor and sexual coercion characterized as domestic violence	1

Law Against Domestic Violence		
Article 316 of the PC	Smuggling	1
Article 244 of the PC	Disobedience	1
Articles 23, 138 of the PC and Article 2.1 (f) and Article 20 of Law No. 5/2017	Attempted homicide and use of a bladed weapon	1
Total		15

2. Total number of decisions monitored by JSMP: 8

Type of penalty	Article	Number
Suspension of execution of a prison sentence	Article 68 of the PC	5
Fine	Article 67 of the PC	1
Prison sentence	Article 66 of the PC	2
Total		8

3. Total cases adjourned based on JSMP monitoring: 0

4. Total ongoing cases based on JSMP monitoring: 7

B. Short description of the trial proceedings and decisions in these cases

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

Case Number : 0014/16. BBCLC
Composition of the Court : Single Judge
Judge : Patricia de Araújo F. B. M. Xavier.
Prosecutor : Napoleão Soares da Silva
Defence : Domingos dos Santos
Decision : 6 months in prison, suspended for 1 year

On 1 February 2021 the Suai District Court announced its decision in a case of simple offences against physical integrity characterised as domestic violence involving the defendant MdS who allegedly committed the offence against NDS, his own daughter aged 10, in Bobonaro Municipality.

Charges of the Prosecutor

The prosecutor alleged that on 3 July 2016, at 12:00 pm, the defendant grabbed the victim's arm and slapped the victim twice on her right cheek. The defendant also took a piece of wood and struck the victim twice on her back. These acts caused the victim to suffer pain and redness. Prior to this assault the defendant was cooking rice in the kitchen and the defendant told the victim to wash the dishes but the victim did not want to and swore at the defendant and then the defendant committed the assault.

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 as well as Articles 2, 3 (c), 35 (b) and 36 of the Law Against Domestic Violence.

Examination of evidence

During the trial the defendant confessed to all of the facts alleged in the indictment and stated that he had no knowledge about the law prohibiting adults from hitting children. The defendant also stated that he regretted his actions and was a first time offender.

Meanwhile the court did not hear testimony from the victim because she has passed away. The court did not hear witness testimony because the defendant confessed the facts set out in the indictment.

Final recommendations

The public prosecutor stated that the defendant confessed to the acts he committed against the victim. The prosecutor stated that the defendant's actions fulfilled the elements of the crime of simple offences against physical integrity pursuant to Article 145 of the Penal Code. Based on these considerations, the public prosecutor requested for the court to sentence the defendant to 3 months in prison, suspended for 1 year.

The public defender requested for the court to consider the defendant's confession, and also that the defendant had a limited knowledge of the law that prohibited him from hitting his children. Therefore, the public defender requested for the court to impose a shorter suspended prison sentence than the one recommended by the public prosecutor.

Decision

After evaluating all of the facts, the court found that the defendant slapped the victim twice on her right cheek and took a piece of wood and struck the victim twice on her back. Based on the facts that were proven and consideration of the mitigating circumstances, namely that the defendant regretted his actions, was a first time

offender, and promised not to reoffend in the future, the court concluded this case and imposed a prison sentence of 6 months against the defendant, suspended for 1 year.

2. Crime of attempt, punishability of attempt and rape

Case Number : 0013 /20. PDSUA
Composition of the Court : Panel
Judges : Naason Mário Armindo Marques Doutel, Jose Maria Araujo and Benjamin Barros
Prosecutor : José Elu
Defence : Albino de Jesus Pereira
Decision : Prison sentence of 3 years, suspended for 4 years

On 8 February 2021 the Suai District Court announced its decision in a case of attempt, punishability of attempt and rape involving the defendant AdC and the victim EdA, which allegedly occurred in Ainaro Municipality.

Charges of the Prosecutor

The public prosecutor alleged that on 29 November 2019, at 5:30pm, the victim left the house with the aim of buying some MSG at the kiosk of Ms. MA which is near the defendant's house. After buying the MSG, the victim was going to return home but when the victim passed the home of Mr. SA the defendant suddenly grabbed the victim from behind and took her into the home of Mr. SA. Inside the house the defendant started touching the victim on her chest, kissed her on the mouth and right cheek. The defendant also tried to touch the victim's sexual organs but the victim resisted and pushed the defendant's hand away. Also, the defendant told the victim *"I will marry you and will give you money"*. The victim felt afraid and yelled out in a loud voice *'I don't want to, I don't want to'*. Then Mr. SA entered the house and saw the defendant and the victim. Mr. SA said to the defendant and the victim *"What are you two doing here?"* The victim became afraid and leaped out of the window and ran back to her house. A report from Pradet stated that the victim felt afraid, ashamed and upset.

The public prosecutor alleged that the defendant violated Article 172 of the Penal Code on the crime of rape that carries a prison sentence of 5 to 15 years in prison and Articles 23 and 24 of the Penal Code on attempt and punishability of attempt.

Examination of evidence

During the trial the defendant stated that some of the facts were true and some facts were not true. The defendant acknowledged that he kissed the victim once on the mouth, but he denied the other alleged facts. The defendant also stated that after this incident they resolved the matter between the two families and he paid compensation to

the victim's family of US\$100.00, and gave a Billy goat, one case of bintang beer and a woman's *tais* (traditional woven cloth). The defendant also stated that he was a first time offender.

The victim confirmed the facts set out in the indictment and reinforced the defendant's statement that they resolved the issue between the two families and the defendant gave compensation to the victim's family with money and goods as described in the defendant's testimony. The victim also stated that the defendant at certain times suffers from a mental illness or is overcome by insanity.

The witness SA who is the owner of the aforementioned house testified that at 19:30 he saw two people walking in front of his house and suddenly the two of them went out of sight and he thought that maybe some kids were having a fight or urinating at the new house. Therefore, the witness took a lantern and went into the new house and shined it on the defendant and the victim. The witness said "*Hey, what are you two doing in this house?*", and after he spoke the victim stood up and jumped out of a window.

The witness also testified that after the victim jumped out of the window, the witness asked the defendant who had jumped out of the window and the defendant said that the child Edu had jumped from the window. The witness added that in the evening when this incident occurred, he did not hear anyone yell or any sounds. The witness added that the defendant and the victim have reconciled and perhaps the defendant suffered a bout of mental illness/insanity because in front of many people he said that he wanted to marry the victim.

Final recommendations

The public prosecutor stated that even though the defendant partially confessed to the facts in the indictment and the witness did not hear anyone yell, the victim confirmed the facts set out in the indictment. Based on these facts, the public prosecutor stated that the defendant committed the crime against the victim because they reconciled in accordance with East Timorese culture. The public prosecutor did not believe that the defendant suffers from a mental illness because there is no medical report. Based on these considerations, the public prosecutor requested for the court to sentence the defendant to 3 years and 6 months in prison.

The public defender stated that the defendant only acknowledged that he kissed the victim once on the mouth, but the victim and witness said that sometimes the defendant suffers from a mental illness/insanity and the defendant would say anything. Therefore, the public defender said that court had to carefully consider the defendant's condition and requested for the court to issue an admonishment against the defendant.

Decision

After evaluating all of the facts, the court found that the defendant touched the victim's chest, kissed the victim on the mouth and right cheek and tried to touch the victim's sexual organs but the victim tried to resist and pushed the defendant's hand away. Based on the facts that were proven during the trial, and after considering the circumstances, namely that the two families had resolved the matter in accordance with local custom, the court concluded the matter and sentenced the defendants to 3 years in prison, suspended for 4 years.

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

Case Number : 0037/18. CVSUI
Composition of the Court : Single Judge
Judge : Benjamin Barros
Prosecutor : Napoleão Soares da Silva
Defence : Fransisco Caetano Martins
Decision : Fine of US\$60.00

On 9 February 2021 the Suai District Court read out its sentence in a case of simple offences against physical integrity characterized as domestic violence involving the defendant SRM who allegedly committed the offence against her husband in Covalima Municipality.

Charges of the Prosecutor

The public prosecutor alleged that on 2 July 2018, at some time in the afternoon the defendant took a machete and went to slash the victim but could not because the victim ran outside. The defendant chased after the victim and took a medium sized rock and threw it and it struck the victim on the head and caused an injury. The victim received treatment at the Suai Referral Hospital. Prior to this assault the victim told the defendant to go and cook at a wake and at that location the defendant was helping the victim's sisters, but the victim's sisters did not speak to the defendant. Then at 2.00 pm, the defendant went home and the victim followed the victim home and told the defendant to go back to the wake, but the defendant did not want to and told the defendant "*I don't want to go, when I was helping your sisters they did not speak to me*". Therefore, the defendant and the victim argued and the assault occurred.

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 as well as Articles 2(a), 3(a), 35(b) and 36 of the Law Against Domestic Violence.

Examination of evidence

During the trial, the defendant partially admitted the facts set out in the indictment that at the time of this incident the victim went outside and the defendant shut all of the doors and windows. Not long after that the victim grabbed a knife and told the defendant to open the door, but the defendant did not want to. The defendant also stated that the victim pushed hard on the door until he could open it so the defendant became afraid and jumped out of the window. The victim followed the defendant and when he caught up with her the defendant took a medium sized rock and threw it at the victim's head. The defendant added that it was not true that the defendant took a machete and tried to slash the victim. The defendant also stated that after one week they reconciled, the defendant regretted her actions, was a first time offender, and promised not to commit any further crimes in the future.

The victim maintained the facts in the indictment and stated that while they have been living together he never had a physical altercation with the defendant. The victim also reinforced the defendant's statement that they have reconciled.

Final recommendations

The public prosecutor stated that even though the defendant partially confessed, the victim confirmed the facts set out in the indictment. Therefore, the public prosecutor stated that the defendant's actions fulfilled the elements of the crime of simple offences against physical integrity pursuant to Article 145 of the Penal Code. Therefore, the public prosecutor requested for the court to impose a prison sentence of three months against the defendant, suspended for one year.

The public defender stated that that after victim and defendant argued, the victim went outside, and the defendant was inside the house and she closed all of the doors and windows. Therefore, the victim grabbed a knife and told the defendant to open the door but the defendant did not want to. The defendant pushed hard on the door until he could open it so the defendant became afraid and jumped out of the window. The victim ran after the defendant, so the defendant took a rock and threw it at the victim. The public defender said that if the defendant did not throw a rock at the victim, he could have killed the defendant. Therefore, the public defender said that the defendant's action where in legitimate self defence. Based on these considerations, he requested for the court to acquit the defendant.

Decision

After evaluating all of the facts, the court found that the defendant took a medium sized rock and struck the victim on the head. The court did not prove that the defendant took a machete to slash the victim. Based on the facts that were proven, and consideration of the mitigating circumstances, namely the defendant confessed her actions, was a first time offender and promised not to repeat her actions in the future, the court concluded the matter and ordered the defendant to pay a fine of US\$ 60 to be paid in daily instalments of \$ 1.00 for 60 days. The court also imposed an alternative penalty of 40 days in prison if the defendant does not pay this fine.

4. Crime of Sexual Coercion

Case Number : 0036/14. PDSUA
Composition of the Court : Panel
Judges : Jose Maria Araujo, Naason Mário Armindo Marques
Doutel and Benjamin Barros
Prosecutor : José Elu
Defence : Manuel Amaral
Decision : 4 years in prison

On 11 February 2021 the Suai District Court announced its decision in a case of sexual coercion involving the defendant MAB and the victim MG, which allegedly occurred in Covalima Municipality.

Charges of the Prosecutor

The public prosecutor alleged that on 1 January 2017, at 15:30, the victim was sitting inside a minibus, suddenly the defendant put his hand through the window of the minibus and squeezed the victim on the left side of her chest. The victim undertook an examination at Pradet.

The public prosecutor alleged that the defendant violated Article 171 of the Penal Code on sexual coercion that carries a maximum penalty of 2-8 years in prison.

Examination of evidence

The defendant was absent. Therefore the court only heard the testimony of the victim. During the trial the victim confirmed the facts set out in the indictment and stated that after this incident the victim made a complaint to the police and she undertook an examination at Pradet. The victim added that she was not in a romantic relationship with the defendant.

The witness MdM, who is the victim's school friend, testified that when the incident occurred the witness and the victim were sitting inside the minibus, and suddenly the

defendant came from the market and put his hand inside the window of the minibus and grabbed the victim on her chest. The witness also testified that the victim and the defendant were school friends.

Final recommendations

The prosecutor stated that the defendant was guilty of committing the crime against the victim, and even though the defendant was absent, the victim and witness confirmed the facts set out in the indictment. Therefore, the public prosecutor stated that the crime was committed against the victim. Based on the facts that were proven, the public prosecutor requested for the court to convict the defendant pursuant to Article 171 of the Penal Code.

The public defender requested for the panel of judges to use their discretion to decide the matter.

Decision

After evaluating all of the facts, the court found that the defendant squeezed the victim on the left part of her chest. Based on the facts that were proven and considering the aggravating circumstances, namely that the defendant did not want to collaborate with the court (was absent), therefore the court concluded this matter and imposed an effective prison sentence of four years in prison against the defendant.

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

Case Number	: 0004/18 PDSUA
Composition of the Court	: Single Judge
Judge	: Benjamin Barros
Prosecutor	: Napoleão Soares da Silva
Defence	: Fransisco Caetano Martins
Decision	: Effective prison sentence of 2 months

On 15 February 2021 the Suai District Court read out its sentence in a case of simple offences against physical integrity characterized as domestic violence involving the defendant MA who allegedly committed the offence against his wife, which allegedly occurred in Covalima Municipality.

Charges of the Prosecutor

The public prosecutor alleged that on 30 March 2018, at 19:00, the defendant took a broom and struck the victim three times on the back and punched the victim three times on her right cheek. These acts caused the victim to suffer pain. Prior to this assault, the

victim came home after selling vegetables at the Suai Market at arrived home at approximately 19:00. The defendant was angry and said to the victim "*I told you to sell the vegetables and then quickly return home*". The victim told the defendant "*I can come home quickly, but I have to sell all of the vegetables first*". When the victim made this statement, the defendant committed the assault.

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 as well as Articles 2(a), 3(a), 35(b) and 36 of the Law Against Domestic Violence.

Examination of evidence

During the trial, the defendant confessed the facts set out in the indictment and stated that one week after the incident they reconciled. The defendant added that he used his own initiative to apologise to the victim, regretted his actions and promised that he will not repeat such acts in the future. The defendant also stated that he is serving a prison sentence in a case involving the sexual abuse of a minor.

The court did not require the statement of the victim because the defendant completely confessed all of the facts in the indictment.

Final recommendations

The public prosecutor stated that the defendant's actions fulfilled the elements of the crime as set out in the indictment of the public prosecutor because the defendant confessed these facts. Therefore, the public prosecutor requested for the court to impose a prison sentence of six months against the defendant.

The public defender stated that the defendant assaulted the victim because the victim came home at night, but the defendant regretted his actions, and promised that when he gets out of prison he will not repeat such acts in the future. Therefore, the public defender requested for the court to impose a suspended prison sentence against the defendant that is more lenient than the sentence recommended by the public prosecutor.

Decision

After evaluating all of the facts, the court found that the defendant took a broom and struck the victim on the back three times and punched the victim three times on her right cheek. Based on the facts that were proven, and consideration of all of the circumstances associated with this crime, the court concluded the matter and sentenced the defendant to an effective prison sentence of two months.

6. Crime of smuggling

Case Number : 0008/19 CVSLL
Composition of the Court : Panel
Judges : Naason Mário Armindo Marques Doutel, Jose Maria Araujo and Benjamin Barros
Prosecutor : Napoleão Soares da Silva
Defence : Albino de Jesus Pereira
Decision : Prison sentence of 2 years, suspended for 2 years

On 19 February 2021 the Suai District Court announced its decision in a case of smuggling involving the defendant AX who allegedly committed the offence against the State of Timor-Leste in Covalima Municipality.

Charges of the Prosecutor

The public prosecutor alleged that on 7 February 2019, at 7.30pm, the defendant imported 214 litres of kerosene via an illegal pathway in the area of Mota Masin to be taken to Suai-Villa, but at the Tafara Bridge the police confiscated the kerosene and took the defendant to the Salele Police Station for investigation. The defendant's actions caused the State of Timor-Leste to suffer a loss.

The public prosecutor alleged that the defendant violated Article 316 of the Penal Code on smuggling that carries a maximum penalty of 2 - 6 years in prison or a fine.

Examination of evidence

During the trial the defendant confessed the facts set out in the indictment, the defendant also stated that he regretted his actions. The defendant also stated that previously the court ordered the defendant to pay a fine of US\$90.00 but because the defendant had no money to pay the fine the defendant repeated his behaviour to obtain money to pay the fine, even though previously in front of the court the defendant promised not to repeat this behaviour.

Final recommendations

The public prosecutor stated that the defendant was guilty of committing the crime of smuggling pursuant to Article 316 of the Penal Code. Also, the defendant has a criminal record, so the public prosecutor requested for the court to impose a sentence of three years imprisonment against the defendant, suspended for three years and for the confiscated goods to be given to the State.

The public defender stated that in front of the court the defendant stated that the court had ordered him to pay a fine of US\$90.00 but the defendant had no money to pay the fine so he brought the kerosene into Timor-Leste to obtain money so he could pay the fine. Therefore, the public defender requested for the court to impose a shorter suspended prison sentence than the one recommended by the public prosecutor.

Decision

After evaluating all of the facts, the court found that the defendant was engaged in the illegal importation and exportation of goods. Based on the facts that were proven during the trial, and after considering all of the circumstances surrounding this crime, the court concluded the matter and sentenced the defendant to 2 years in prison, suspended for 2 years and decided that the confiscated goods were to be given to the State.

7. Crime of mistreatment of a spouse

Case Number : 0137/19. PDSUA
Composition of the Court : Panel
Judges : Jose Maria Araujo, Naason Mário Armindo Marques
Doutel and Benjamin Barros
Prosecutor : Napoleão Soares da Silva
Defence : Albano Maia
Decision : Prison sentence of 2 years, suspended for 3 years

On 26 February 2021 the Suai District Court announced its decision in a case of mistreatment of a spouse involving the defendant AA who allegedly committed the offence against his wife in Covalima Municipality.

Charges of the Prosecutor

The public prosecutor alleged that on an unspecified day and month in 2013, the defendant slapped the victim twice on her right cheek and struck the victim five times on her back. Prior to this assault, the victim asked the defendant for some money to buy some clothes for their child, but the defendant said there was no money and therefore they argued and the defendant committed the assault against the victim. Then on 24 May 2019, at 9pm, the defendant slapped the victim once on her left cheek. Prior to this assault, the victim went to drink alcohol with her male friends. Since they have been living together in 2001, the defendant always hit the victim.

The public prosecutor alleged that the defendant violated Article 154 of the Penal Code on the mistreatment of a spouse that carries a prison sentence of 2 years to 6 years in prison together with Articles 2, 3(a), 35(b) and 36 of the Law Against Domestic Violence.

Examination of evidence

During the trial the defendant stated that some of the facts were true and some facts were not true. The defendant stated that since he has been living together with the victim since 2001 that was the first time that he hit the victim in 2019 because the victim went to drink alcohol with her male friends, so the defendant decided to leave the home and has not gone back to the victim. Meanwhile, the defendant denied the allegations regarding the incident in 2013, but he acknowledged that sometimes he got angry with the victim, but the defendant did not assault the victim. The defendant also stated that even though he has separated from the victim he has continued to give money for the children.

Also, the victim confirmed the facts set out in the indictment and also confirmed the defendant's statement that they have separated, and he does provide money for the children, but not much, only US\$1-5.

Final recommendations

The public prosecutor stated that the defendant committed the crime against the victim based on the facts set out in the indictment according to the victim's statement. For this reason even though the defendant partially confessed, the public prosecutor requested for the court to impose a prison sentence of 3 years, suspended for 3 years against the defendant.

The public defender stated that the defendant only slapped the victim once and did not commit the other alleged offences. For this reason, the defence requested for the court to amend the charge from Article 154 of the Penal Code to Article 145 of the Penal Code on simple offences against physical integrity. Based on these considerations, the public defender requested for the court to impose a suspended prison sentence against the defendant.

Decision

After evaluating all of the facts, the court found that the defendant's actions fulfilled the elements of the crime of mistreatment of a spouse pursuant to Article 154 of the Penal Code. Even though the defendant denied the facts, the court believed the victim and was of the opinion that the defendant committed the acts against the victim. Based on the facts that were proven and consideration all of the circumstances, the court concluded the matter and sentenced the defendant to 2 years in prison, suspended for 3 years.

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

Case Number : 0001/20. SVSUI
Composition of the Court : Single Judge
Judge : Patricia de Araujo Fatima Barreto Magno Xavier
Prosecutor : Napoleão Soares da Silva
Defence : Domingos dos Santos
Decision : 6 years in prison, suspended for 1 year

On 22 February 2021 the Suai District Court read out its sentence in a case of simple offences against physical integrity characterized as domestic violence involving the defendant Ods who allegedly committed the offence against his wife, in Covalima Municipality.

Charges of the Prosecutor

The public prosecutor alleged that on 22 May 2020, at 12:00 midday, the defendant slapped the victim twice on her right cheek and kicked the victim once in the stomach which caused the victim to suffer pain to her right cheek and stomach. The victim did not receive treatment in hospital and only purchased medicine for US\$2.00 to take at home. Prior to this assault the defendant told the victim to inform her father to come and resolve a problem because the victim suspected the defendant of having a child with another woman, but the victim did not want to and she argued with the defendant and then the assault occurred.

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 as well as Articles 2, 3 (a), 35 (b) and 36 of the Law Against Domestic Violence.

Examination of evidence

During the trial the defendant testified that all of the charges were true. The defendant acknowledged that at the time of this incident the defendant told the victim to inform her father to come and resolve their problem, but the victim did not want to and argued with the defendant so the defendant pushed the victim. The defendant denied the other facts such as the allegation that he slapped the victim twice on her right cheek and kicked the victim once in the stomach. The defendant also stated that now the defendant has separated from the victim.

The victim confirmed the facts set out in the indictment and added that after this incident the defendant asked the victim to leave the home and until now the defendant has not

gone home. The victim further stated that since she left the home the defendant never gave her money for the children.

The witness FFC who is the child of the defendant and the victim, refused to testify in this case pursuant to Article 125.1 of the Penal Code.¹

Final recommendations

The public prosecutor stated that the defendant denied the facts set out in the indictment, but the prosecutor believed that the defendant committed the crime against the victim. Therefore, the public prosecutor requested for the court to impose a prison sentence of one year against the defendant, suspended for one year and six months.

The public defender stated that the defendant and the victim gave differing testimony, therefore the public defender requested for the court to use its conviction to decide the matter.

Decision

After evaluating all of the facts, the court found that the defendant slapped the victim twice on her right cheek and kicked her once in the stomach. Based on the facts that were proven and consideration of the circumstances, namely that the defendant was a first time offender, the court concluded this case and imposed a prison sentence of 6 months against the defendant, suspended for 1 year.

For more information please contact:

Ana Paula Marçal
Executive Director of JSMP
Telephone: 3323883/77040735
Email: ana@jsmp.tl
info@jsmp.tl
Website: <http://jsmp.tl>

¹ Article 125 of the Criminal Procedure Code on lawful refusal to give a deposition. (1) The persons below may refuse to give a deposition as witnesses: a) progenitors, siblings, descendants, relatives up to the second degree, adopters, adoptees, and the spouse of the defendant.