

IN THE HIGH COURT OF FIJI
AT SUVA
[CRIMINAL JURISDICTION]

CRIMINAL CASE NO.HAC 99 of 2014

BETWEEN : **FIJI INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST** **PROSECUTION**
CORRUPTION (“FICAC”)

AND : **1. ANA LAQERE**
2. AMELIA VUNISEA
3. VACISEVA LAQAI
4. VILISI TUITAVUKI
5. LAISA HALAFI
6. TAVENISA TAVAGA
7. KINIVILIAME TAVIRAKI
8. SALESH BIKASH
9. ROSHNI LATA

ACCUSED

Counsel : Ms. F. Puleiwai with Mr. J. Work for FICAC
Mr. J. Daurewa for the 1st Accused
Ms. S. Hazelman for the 3rd, 4th and 6th Accused
Mr. A. Rayawa for the 7th Accused
8th and 9th Accused appeared in person

Sentence Hearing : 7 May 2019

Sentence : 16 July 2019

SENTENCE

[1] On 6 February 2017, the Fiji Independent Commission against Corruption (FICAC), filed Amended Information, containing a total of 42 charges, against the 9 Accused in this case. **Kiniviliame Taviraki**, the specific charges against you were the following:

COUNT 7

Statement of Offence

ABUSE OF OFFICE: Contrary to Section 139 of the Crimes Decree 2009.

Particulars of Offence

KINIVILIAME TAVIRAKI between 1st February 2010 and 31st May 2010, at Suva, in the Central Division, whilst being employed in the Public Service as an Acting Senior Technical Officer with the Public Works Department at Walu Bay, in abuse of the authority of his office did arbitrary acts for the purpose of gain, namely facilitating the processing of false payments to Crazy Office Supplies and Entire Office Supplies which was prejudicial to the rights of the Public Works Department.

COUNT 25

Statement of Offence

CAUSING A LOSS: Contrary to Section 324 (2) of the Crimes Decree 2009.

Particulars of Offence

ANA LAQERE, AMELIA VUNISEA, VACISEVA LAQAI, LAISA HALAFI, KINIVILIAME TAVIRAKI, between 1st February 2010 and 31st May 2010, at Suva, in the Central Division, whilst being employed in the Public Works Department, dishonestly caused a loss to the Public Works Department by falsely facilitating the process of payment of cheque number 656348 amounting to FJ\$2890.00 to Crazy Office Supplies and knowing that the loss will occur or a substantial risk of the loss will occur to the Public Works Department.

COUNT 35

Statement of Offence

CAUSING A LOSS: Contrary to Section 324 (2) of the Crimes Decree 2009.

Particulars of Offence

ANA LAQERE, AMELIA VUNISEA, VACISEVA LAQAI, LAISA HALAFI, TAVENISA TAVAGA, KINIVILIAME TAVIRAKI, between 1st February 2010 and 31st May 2010,

at Suva, in the Central Division, whilst being employed in the Public Works Department, dishonestly caused a loss to the Public Works Department by falsely facilitating the process of payment of cheque number 656403 amounting to FJ\$2981.00 to Entire Office Supplies and knowing that the loss will occur or a substantial risk of the loss will occur to the Public Works Department.

COUNT 39

Statement of Offence

CAUSING A LOSS: Contrary to Section 324 (2) of the Crimes Decree 2009.

Particulars of Offence

ANA LAQERE, AMELIA VUNISEA, VACISEVA LAQAI, LAISA HALAFI, KINIVILIAME TAVIRAKI, between 1st February 2010 and 31st May 2010, at Suva, in the Central Division, whilst being employed in the Public Works Department, dishonestly caused a loss to the Public Works Department by falsely facilitating the process of payment of cheque number 656396 amounting to FJ\$2967.24 to Entire Office Supplies and knowing that the loss will occur or a substantial risk of the loss will occur to the Public Works Department.

- [2] On 29 November 2017, all nine accused were ready to take their pleas and their pleas were taken. Accordingly, the 2nd Accused, Amelia Vunisea, and the 5th Accused, Laisa Halafi, both pleaded guilty to all the charges against them in the Amended Information. The other 7 accused pleaded not guilty to the charges against them.
- [3] Accordingly, on 27 September 2018, this Court sentenced Amelia Vunisea as follows:

Count 2 – Abuse of Office contrary to Section 139 of the Crimes Act – 7 years imprisonment.

Counts 8-40 – Causing a Loss contrary to Section 324 (2) of the Crimes Act – 3 years imprisonment for each count.

I ordered that all the above sentences of imprisonment to run concurrently. Therefore, the final total term of imprisonment imposed was 7 years. Court determined not to fix a non-parole period, in terms of Section 18 of the Sentencing and Penalties Act No. 42 of 2009 (“Sentencing and Penalties Act”).

[4] On the same day, this Court sentenced Laisa Halafi as follows:

Count 5 – Abuse of Office contrary to Section 139 of the Crimes Act – 7 years imprisonment.

Counts 8-25 and 32-40 – Causing a Loss contrary to Section 324 (2) of the Crimes Act – 3 years imprisonment for each count.

Count 42 – Obtaining a Financial Advantage contrary to Section 326 (1) of the Crimes Act – 3 years imprisonment.

I ordered that all the above sentences of imprisonment to run concurrently. Therefore, the final total term of imprisonment imposed was 7 years. Court determined not to fix a non-parole period, in terms of Section 18 of the Sentencing and Penalties Act.

[5] Court also directed that the above sentence would be concurrent to any prison sentence the two accused, Amelia Vunisea and Laisa Halafi are currently serving.

[6] Kinivilame, when this matter was called before me on 28 November 2018, you pleaded guilty to all the charges against you in the Amended Information.

[7] Court was satisfied that you fully understood the nature of the charges against you and the consequences of your guilty plea. Court also found that you pleaded guilty on your own free will and free from any influence.

[8] Thereafter, on 27 March 2019, the State filed the Summary of Facts against you. The Summary of Facts were read out and explained to you and you understood and agreed to the same. Accordingly, Court found your guilty pleas to be unequivocal. I found that the facts support all elements of the several charges against you in the Amended Information, and found the said charges proved on the Summary of Facts agreed by you. Accordingly, I found you guilty on your own plea and I convicted you of the said charges.

[9] This matter was fixed for Sentencing on 12 June 2019. On that day Court was informed that the 1st Accused, 4th Accused and 5th Accused were all planning to take a progressive approach in this matter. However, this was on the undertaking that the State would file Amended Information against the said accused persons, whereby the Abuse of Office charges (Counts 1, 3 & 4) would be amended.

[10] Presently the Abuse of Office charges read thus: “Accused whilst being employed in the Public Service as an with the Public Works Department at Walu Bay, in abuse of the authority of her office did arbitrary acts *for the purpose of gain*

namely.....". [Emphasis is mine]. The 1st, 4th and 5th Accused have agreed to take a progressive approach if the phrase *for the purpose of gain* was omitted.

[11] The State filed Amended Information on 3 July 2019, whereby the three Abuse of Office charges (Counts 1, 3 & 4) have been amended accordingly.

[12] Kiniviliame, although you have pleaded guilty to the charge of Abuse of Office (Count 7) prior to this development, when sentencing you, I would grant you too the benefit that has now been afforded to the 1st, 4th and 5th Accused.

[13] Kiniviliame, I now proceed to sentence you.

[14] The Summary of Facts filed by the State against you record the following:

1. *The 7th Accused in this matter is Kiniviliame Taviraki (hereinafter referred to as "7th Accused"), 54 years old of Tamavua 4½ miles.*
2. *He held the position of "Senior Technical Officer" EDP No. 58042 at the Public Works Department (hereinafter referred to as "PWD") based at Walu Bay, Suva during the time period material to this case was therefore a person employed in the public service within the meaning of section 4(1) under the Crimes Decree No. 44 of 2009 (now Crimes Act).*
3. *The 7th Accused roles and responsibilities includes controlling, monitoring and reporting of technical issues, attend to sectional, divisional and project site meetings for the building section, ensure quality assurance and technical assistance to improve production in meeting timeline.*
4. *Furthermore, ensuring that standard works are carried out according to specifications and drawings, ensure that provision of healthy and safe work environment (OHS), ensure planning, programming and provide cost estimates for all building projects undertaken.*
5. *At all material times PWD was governed by the Finance Manual for Works & Energy 2005 ("FMWE") which specifically outlined the two different procurement procedures depending on the cost of goods and/or services procured whether it is less than \$100 or more irrespective whether it is procured locally or overseas.*

Procurement Procedures

6. *For any procurement of goods and/or services at PWD that is less than \$100 quotations may be received by telephone and the received quotations must be recorded and certified by the officer receiving them as outlined in Clause 2.3.3 under the FMWE.*

7. *As for goods and/or services more than \$100 up to \$20,000.00 competitive quotes from at least three (3) companies will need to be obtained via tender process.*
8. *The tender clerk is responsible in calling, receiving and recording of tender/quotations in the Tender Register.*
9. *Thereafter, the process of tender commence with the Quotation Clerk or the Supervisors preparing a request letter or memorandum for the items required for a particular project or for the section and then forward to the store man.*
10. *The request letter or memorandum will be signed by the Supervisor and forwarded to the store man to raise the Requisition as per the items requested.*
11. *The store man will then raise Requisition on the strength of the Request Letter or the Memorandum, but without putting down the Unit Cost or the Amount of the items since he/she has yet to verify its costs from Government Supplies if available or from other companies.*
12. *The store man will then take the Requisition to the Government Supplies and confirm if they have any of the items requested and if none of the items are in stock then the Government Supplies store man will put "NIL IN STOCK" stamp with his/her signature on it.*
13. *The store man based on the stamp from the Government Supplies he/she will then faxed the Request letter/memorandum to the reputable companies to forward its Quotations to PWD.*
14. *The companies will drop off their quotations in the Quotation Box that is placed inside the Divisional Engineer Central/Eastern ("DECE") Accounts office at PWD, Walu Bay.*
15. *Once Tender Box is closed then the Tender Committee will open the Quotation Box and the tender clerk will prepare the Quotation Evaluation Sheet where he/she will record all companies bid for the Committee to evaluate.*
16. *The tender committee shall consist of at least three (3) PWD staff and one tender clerk who will be nominated by the section head namely the Senior Accounts Officer, a Technical Officer, Personnel Officer and a Tender Clerk.*
17. *The duties of the Tender evaluation committee are to evaluate and recommend the award of the tender to the most competitive bidder after deliberating on the Quotation received which should be in*

accordance with the policies and guidelines set by the Ministry of Finance. With the recommendation from the Tender Committee, the store man will fill in the Unit price and amount in the Requisition Form.

- 18. Before the approval of the Supervisors, the Requisition Form will need to go through the Chief Clerk who will need to verify from the Expenditure & Commitment Ledger on the availability of the funds and then will place the Funds Committee stamp noting the amount left in the account depending on what job allocation number is put in the Requisition by the store man.*
- 19. Once the stamp is placed, it will need to go to the Supervisor for whichever section the request came from, to approve that Requisition and signed in the approved column.*
- 20. Thereafter, the store man will prepare the Authority for Local Purchase Order ("ALPO") and then again takes it to the Accountant to verify the availability of the funds by putting a "Funds commitment" stamp before approving the transaction with her signature.*
- 21. Once the Accountant placed her signature on the ALPO, the Requesting officer will need to sign on the ALPO and then the Supervisor or Section Head will need to sign before the DECE finally puts his/her signature.*
- 22. After all the signatures has been obtained in the ALPO, the store man will then prepare the Purchase Order ("PO") online and route it to the approving officer who has that approval limit depending on the amount noted in the PO, to release the order online and will thereafter follow the payment processes.*

Abuse of Office (Count 7)

- 23. Between the 1st day of February 2010 to the 31st day of May 2010, the 7th Accused whilst being employed as an Acting Senior Technical Officer with PWD did the following arbitrary acts, which resulted in the loss to the PWD but a gain to the company called Crazy and Entire Office Supplies, despite procedures in place to guide officers in terms of procuring goods and services within PWD.*
- 24. In summary, the various abuses done by the 7th Accused are as follows:*
 - i. The 7th Accused approved the Requisitions despite there being various discrepancies namely there was no NIL IN STOCK stamp placed on the Requisition to confirm that the Government Supplies were checked to verify whether it has the requested goods in stock, before proceeding to all for quotations;*

- ii. *There were no FUND COMMITMENT STAMP to indicate that there were funds available for purchase of the respective items;*
 - iii. *The requisitions did not have any Evaluation Form from the Tender Committee to show their recommendation on the suitable company to order the items from;*
 - iv. *The requisitions did not have any Evaluation Form from the Tender Committee to show their recommendation on the suitable company to order the items from;*
 - v. *That the allocation used was the wrong allocation which the Accused should have picked up and question the items being ordered;*
 - vi. *The items ordered were done in bulk orders within a short time frame which the Accused could have question as to why and who was wanting this orders to done for the items.*
25. *Despite all such discrepancies the 7th Accused proceeded to approve the requisitions and facilitating the processing of false payments to Crazy Office Supplies and Entire Office Supplies Limited, which was prejudicial to the rights of the Public Works Department.*
26. *Through the 7th Accused arbitrary act, in abusing the authority given to him as the Senior Technical officer, the company Crazy Office Supplies and Entire Office Supplies Limited had gained FJD\$8,838.24 by virtue of three Bank Cheque numbers namely 656348, 656403, 656396.*
27. *In respect of count 7 against the 7th Accused, PWD was prejudiced when the money was paid out to Crazy Office Supplies and Entire Office Supplies Limited without the proper procedures being followed and when no delivery was done in the 3 transactions.*

Causing a Loss - (Counts 25, 35 & 39)

28. *Between the 1st day of February 2010 to the 31st day of March 2010, the 7th Accused had dishonestly caused a loss to the PWD by falsely facilitating the process of payments to Crazy Office Supplies and Entire Office Supplies Limited and knowing that the loss will occur or a substantial risk of loss will occur to the PWD.*
29. *The 7th Accused dishonest act is the fact that he falsely facilitated the process of payments through:*

- i. *Approving 3 Requisitions despite there being various discrepancies namely there was no NIL IN STOCK stamp placed on the Requisition to confirm that the Government Supplies were checked to verify whether it has the requested goods in stock, before proceeding to call for quotations; Two transactions had missing source documents namely for Counts 35 & 39 no Request Memo was attached as per procedure;*
 - ii. *There were no FUND COMMITMENT STAMP placed on the Requisition Form for all three transactions (Counts 25, 35 & 39) to indicate that there were funds available for purchase of the respective items;*
 - iii. *The requisitions did not have any Evaluation Form from the Tender Committee to show their recommendation on the suitable company to order the items from;*
 - iv. *The requisitions did not have any Evaluation Form from the Tender Committee to show their recommendation on the suitable company to order the items from;*
 - v. *That the allocation used was the wrong allocation which the Accused should have picked up and question the items being ordered;*
 - vi. *The items ordered were done in bulk orders within a short time frame which the Accused could have question as to why and who was wanting this orders to be done for the items.*
30. *The 7th Accused dishonest act is the fact that despite such irregularities falsely facilitated the process of payments by approving the 3 requisitions, which therefore resulted in a total payment of FJD\$8,838.24 being made to Crazy Office Supplies and Entire Office Supplies Limited by virtue of Westpac Bank Cheque numbers 656348, 656403, 656396, knowing that a risk or substantial risk of loss would occur to PWD.*
31. *The 7th Accused given his knowledge and experience in his position as Senior Technical Officer at PWD, knew that all the source documents should be in order, apart from the fact that it should follow the proper tender procedures; prior to signing the approved column.*
32. *Summarily, the 7th Accused through his deliberate disregard for proper execution of his duties caused a loss to PWD and the Government of Fiji.*
33. *The 7th Accused was interviewed under caution on the 30/05/12, 20/12/12 and 12/11/13 and later charged on the 4th December 2013.*

[15] Section 4 of the Sentencing and Penalties Act stipulates the relevant factors that a Court should take into account during the sentencing process. I have duly considered these factors in determining the sentence to be imposed on you.

[16] Section 139 of the Crimes Act No. 44 of 2009 (“Crimes Act”) defines the offence of Abuse of Office in the following manner: *“A person commits an indictable offence which is triable summarily if, being employed in the public service, the person does or directs to be done, in abuse of the authority of his office, any arbitrary act prejudicial to the rights of another.”*

The maximum penalty for Abuse of Office in terms of Section 139 of the Crimes Act is 10 years imprisonment. However, if the act is done or directed to be done for gain the maximum penalty is enhanced to 17 years imprisonment.

[17] Section 324 of the Crimes Act defines Causing a Loss as follows:

324.—(1) A person commits a summary offence if he or she does anything with the intention of dishonestly causing a loss to another person.

(2) A person commits a summary offence if he or she—

(a) dishonestly causes a loss, or dishonestly causes a risk of loss, to another person; and

(b) person knows or believes that the loss will occur or that there is a substantial risk of the loss occurring.

The maximum penalty for the offence of Causing a Loss is 5 years imprisonment.

[18] In ***Fiji Independent Commission Against Corruption (FICAC) v. Ana Laqere and Others*** [2017] FJHC 337; HAC 56.2014 (10 May 2017); His Lordship Justice Rajasinghe held:

“All of these offences are founded on the ground of corrupt activities of public officers. Undoubtedly, offences of this nature committed by the public officers adversely and seriously affect the very fundamental fabric of the society. Public officers are the intermediary link between the State and Public. They are appointed to implement and provide the duties, responsibilities and the protection undertaken by the State towards the public. In pursuant of a collective social contract between the State and the Public, the public hand over their individual and collective rights to the State, entrusting the State the responsibility and duty to provide and protect those rights of the public. This Social Agreement, provides the legitimacy for the functioning of the State. Hence, it is paramount to the State to maintain high standard of transparency and integrity in performing its duties and responsibilities through the public

officers. Otherwise, the trust and the confidence entrusted by the public on the State would erode, leading to a catastrophic end of the State and the society.

.....

In view of the seriousness of the offences of this nature and its adverse effects on the public and the State, it is my view that the court in sentencing offenders of this nature must impose heavy and severe punishment. Accordingly, the main purpose of this sentence is founded on the principle of deterrence and protection of the community.”

[19] In determining the tariff for Abuse of Office, having discussed previous authorities, His Lordship Justice Rajasinghe opined: *“In view of above sentencing precedents, it appears that the courts of Fiji have considered the level of authority and trust reposed in the position held by the accused, and the level of prejudice caused to the victim in sentencing. If the level of authority and trust, and the prejudice caused are high, the court could go to the higher starting point and vice versa.”*

[20] Accordingly, His Lordship held:

I would like to adopt the same approach in setting an appropriate tariff, allowing the sentencing court to determine the appropriate starting point based on the level of culpability and the prejudice/ harm caused. Accordingly, I find a tariff limit of one (1) year to twelve (12) years would adequately serve the above purpose. The sentencing court could consider the following ranges of starting point based on the level of culpability and the harm caused:

	High Level of Culpability	Medium Level of Culpability	Lesser Level of Culpability
High Level of Harm/ Prejudice with gain	8-12	6-10	4-8
Medium Level of Harm/Prejudice either with medium level gain or without gain	6-10	4-8	2-6
Lesser Level of Harm/ Prejudice either with less gain or without gain	4-8	2-6	1-4

[21] I too agree with this tariff and the basis for same.

[22] In *Fiji Independent Commission Against Corruption [FICAC] v Feroz Jan Mohammed & 3 Others* [2015] FJHC 479; HAC 349.2013 (24 June 2015); His Lordship Justice Madigan sets out the tariff for Causing a Loss in the following terms:

“Causing a loss is again a mirror image of obtaining a financial advantage in a case of corruption; then as with that obtaining offence the tariffs for this offence can be split between causing a loss (simpliciter) and causing a loss where there is bribery or corruption involved.

The tariff for general dishonesty for causing a loss could be fixed at between suspended sentence to 4 years with suspended sentences to be passed for very small losses caused unwittingly.

Causing a loss when proved in conjunction with a generating corruption offence will attract the higher tariff of 4 to 5 years.”

[23] In determining the starting point within a tariff, the Court of Appeal, in *Laisiasa Koroivuki v State* [2013] FJCA 15; AAU 0018 of 2010 (5 March 2013); has formulated the following guiding principles:

“In selecting a starting point, the court must have regard to an objective seriousness of the offence. No reference should be made to the mitigating and aggravating factors at this time. As a matter of good practice, the starting point should be picked from the lower or middle range of the tariff. After adjusting for the mitigating and aggravating factors, the final term should fall within the tariff. If the final term falls either below or higher than the tariff, then the sentencing court should provide reasons why the sentence is outside the range.”

[24] Kiniviliame Taviraki, in terms of the Summary of Facts which you have admitted to, in the year 2010, you held the position of Senior Technical Officer, EDP Number 58042, at the Public Works Department (“PWD”), at Walu Bay, Suva.

[25] You have now been convicted of one count of Abuse of Office and 3 counts of Causing Loss. The total loss you have caused to the PWD amounts to FJD\$8,838.24.

[26] For the said reasons I find that you had a medium level of culpability and that you had caused a lesser level of prejudice/harm to the State. Therefore, I determine that your conduct falls within the range of 2-6 years of the tariff limit. In view of that I select 3 years as the starting point for the offence of Abuse of Office (Count 7).

[27] Similarly, in the light of the above guiding principles, and also taking into consideration the objective seriousness of the offence, Kiniviliame Taviraki, I commence your sentence at 2 years for each of the 3 counts of Causing a Loss.

[28] The aggravating factors are as follows:

- (i) There was a serious breach of trust. You were an employee of the PWD and was holding a responsible and senior position. As a senior employee you owed a duty towards your employer to be honest and loyal in the performance of your functions. By your actions you have breached this trust.
- (ii) The repetitive and systematic breaches of procurement procedures, which establishes the fact that there was prior planning and a deliberate attempt by you to defraud public funds.
- (iii) The relatively large amounts of public funds defrauded.
- (iv) You are now convicted of multiple offending.

[29] In mitigation you have submitted as follows:

- (i) You are a first offender and that you have no previous convictions to date (prior to being convicted for the connected High Court of Suva Case No. HAC 56 of 2014). The State also confirms that there are no previous convictions recorded against you, other than for the aforementioned case.
- (ii) You have submitted that you are truly remorseful of your actions. You have sought forgiveness from this court and have assured that you will not re-offend.
- (iii) That you entered a guilty plea in these proceedings prior to the matter being fixed for trial.

[30] You have further submitted in mitigation that:

- (i) You have maintained your position from day one that you admitted breaching procedures, but with the motive to speed up the delivery of services to the civil service and Government Departments;
- (ii) You admit that you should have followed procedures. However, you submit that you were always reprimanded if you held up the flow of delivery of supplies, and you state, that is the only reason why you failed to follow the procedures in this case. You submit that you did so to

facilitate the swift delivery of goods and services to the Government Departments that were demanding for them;

- (iii) You have never conspired or colluded with any of the other accused persons to breach the procedures for the purpose of defrauding the Government;
- (iv) In this case you submit that you had no intention to defraud the Government and that you did not benefit in any way from these transactions.

[31] Kiniviliame, you are now said to be 54 years of age and married with 3 children. However, these are all personal circumstances and cannot be considered as mitigating circumstances.

[32] Kiniviliame, considering the aforementioned aggravating factors, I increase your sentence by a further 3 years for the offence of Abuse of Office and 2 years for each count of Causing a Loss. Now your sentence for Abuse of Office is 6 years and your sentence for Causing a Loss is 4 years.

[33] Kiniviliame, I accept that you are a person of previous good character. I also accept your remorse as genuine. Accordingly, considering these factors and other mitigating factors submitted by you, I deduct 2 years from your sentences. Now your sentence for Abuse of Office is 4 years and for each count of Causing a Loss is 2 years.

[34] I accept that you entered a guilty plea in these proceedings, prior to the matter being fixed for trial. In doing so, you saved precious time and resources of this Court. For your early guilty plea I grant you further discount of 12 months in respect of the offence of Abuse of Office. Since I propose to make your sentences concurrent I do not deem it necessary to grant you any further discount for Causing a Loss in lieu of this factor.

[35] In the circumstances, your sentence are as follows:

Kiniviliame Taviraki

Count 7 – Abuse of Office contrary to Section 139 of the Crimes Act – 3 years imprisonment.

Counts 25, 35 and 39 – Causing a Loss contrary to Section 324 (2) of the Crimes Act – 2 years imprisonment for each count.

I order that all the above sentences of imprisonment to run concurrently. Therefore, your final total term of imprisonment will be 3 years. I will not fix a non-parole period in terms of Section 18 of the Sentencing and Penalties Act.

[36] In the result, Kiniviliame Taviraki, your final sentence will be 3 years imprisonment. I direct that this sentence would be concurrent to any prison sentence you are currently serving.

[37] You have 30 days to appeal to the Court of Appeal if you so wish.



A handwritten signature in blue ink, which appears to read "Riyaz Hamza".

Riyaz Hamza
JUDGE
HIGH COURT OF FIJI

AT SUVA

Dated this 16th Day of July 2019

Solicitors for the State : Fiji Independent Commission Against Corruption (FICAC).

Solicitor for the 1st Accused : R. Vananalagi, Barrister and Solicitor, Suva

Solicitor for the 3rd Accused : Office of the Legal Aid Commission, Suva

Solicitor for the 4th Accused : Office of the Legal Aid Commission, Suva

Solicitor for the 6th Accused : Office of the Legal Aid Commission, Suva

Solicitor for the 7th Accused : Rayawa Law, Suva

Solicitor for the 8th Accused : Accused in Person

Solicitor for the 9th Accused : Accused in Person