IN THE HIGH COURT OF FIJI AT SUVA MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION MISCELLANEOUS CASE NO. HAM 201 OF 2012S

KUNAL EDWIN PRASAD

VS

THE STATE

Counsels	:	Accused in Person
		Mr. Y. Prasad for State
Hearing	:	2 nd November, 2012
Ruling	:	2 nd November, 2012
Written Reasons:		3 rd May, 2013

WRITTEN REASONS FOR REFUSAL OF BAIL APPLICATION

1. When the accused first appeared in the Suva Magistrate Court on 24th September, 2012, he was charged with the following offences:

COUNT ONE

Statement of Offence

AGGRAVATED ROBBERY: Contrary to Section 311(1)(a) of the Crimes Decree No. 44 of 2009.

Particulars of Offence

DESHWAR KISHORE DUTT, KUNAL EDWIN PRASAD and MAIKA MATEYAWA, on the 19th day of Septmber, 2012, in Suva, in the Central Division, committed robbery in company with other persons at the Samabula branch of the Bank of the South Pacific and stole the total sum of FJD\$70,000.00 belonging to the said Bank of the South Pacific.

COUNT TWO

Statement of Offence

HARBOURING PRISONERS AT LARGE: Contrary to Section 52(3)(c) of the Prisons and Corrections Act No. 2 of 2006.

Particulars of Offence

DESHWAR KISHORE DUTT, KUNAL EDWIN PRASAD and MAIKA MATEYAWA, on the 19th day of September, 2012, in Suva, in the Central Division, knowingly and without lawful excuse assisted prisoners illegally at large namely TEVITA SUGU, ISOA WAQA, SOLOMONI QURAI, EPELI QARANIQIO and JOSAIA USUMAKI.

- 2. He has been remanded in custody since then. On 23rd October, 2012, he applied for bail in the Standard High Court bail application form. The State replied with an affidavit from Detective 3036 Amani Satuwere. I have carefully read the papers filed by the parties. On 2nd November, 2012, I heard the parties. I refused bail, and I said I would give my written reasons later. Below are my reasons.
- 3. It is well settled that, an accused person is entitled to bail pending trial, unless the interest of justice requires otherwise (section 3(1) of the Bail Act 2002). It is also well settled that, the primary consideration in deciding whether to grant bail is the likelihood of the accused person turning up in

court to take his trial on the date arranged (section 17(2) of the Bail Act 2002). It is also well settled that, in order for the court to decide the above issue, it is mandatory for it to consider each of the factors mentioned in section 19 of the Bail Act 2002, that is, the likelihood of the accused surrendering to custody, the interest of the accused and the public interest and protection of the community.

Factor No. 1: The Likelihood of Accused Surrendering to Custody:

4. The accused is 27 years old, and reached Form 4 level education. He resides at Bau Road, Nausori and earns his living selling firewood. He earns about \$100 per week. He has been residing at Bau Road all his life. The allegation against the accused is very serious. It is alleged that he, with others robbed Bank of South Pacific (Samabula) of \$70,000 on 19th September, 2012. If found guilty, the accused faced a possible sentence between 12 to 14 years imprisonment. According to the prosecution, he allegedly confessed to been part of the crime. Under this head, the accused's chances of getting bail are slim.

Factor No. 2: The Interest of the Accused:

5. The trial for this case will occur sometimes next year. The accused had been remanded in custody since September, 2012. So, he had been in custody for 7 months. Time spent in custody while on remand will be deducted from the final sentence, if he's found guilty. I understand he has waived his right to counsel, and wishes to represent himself. He is not incapacitated, and it appeared there is no reason for him to be at liberty for other lawful reasons. A new remand centre is about to be open in Suva, thus giving him the opportunity to enjoy new facilities. Under this head, the accused's chances of bail are slim.

Factor No. 3: The Public Interest and the Protection of the Community:

6. The allegations against the accused are very serious. The Bank of South Pacific (Samabula) was violently robbed of \$70,000 on 19th September, 2012. The alleged escape of 5 prisoners at the time caused great alarm among the public. According to the prosecution, the accused allegedly provided the transport for the prisoners to escape from Naboro Prison, and 4 of them to be involved in the above bank robbery. In my view, although the accused is presumed innocent until proven guilty beyond reasonable doubt in a court of law, it is in the public interest and the

protection of the community that he be remanded in custody. Under this head, the accused's chances of bail are slim.

Conclusion:

7. Because of the above, I refused the accused's bail application on 2nd November, 2012.

Salesi Temo JUDGE

Solicitor for Accused:In PersonSolicitor for the State:Office of the Director of Public Prosecution, Suva.