
CRIME TODAY

Wednesday,
March 31, 2021

Lastest Courts and Crime News From



GEETHAN RAM
ADVOCATES & SOLICITORS

Issue
#17



Ravindran a/l Balan (Left) and Sathia Tamil Siva a/l Murasoli Maran (Right) with their Defence Lawyer, Dato' Geethan Ram Vincent (Middle)

Cheang Sue Lyn

Two Men Escape The Death Penalty After Housemate Brought Police Team Home

SHAH ALAM:

Today, Ravindran a/l Balan, 26, and Sathia Tamil Siva a/l Murasoli Maran, 28, were found not guilty by the High Court here. They were charged under section 39B of the Dangerous Drugs Act 1952 and section 9(1) of the Poison Act 1952, the former of which carries a mandatory death penalty.

On 14 April 2017, police arrested then 40-year-old Balan a/l St Anthony under the Security Offences (Special Measures) Act 2012 on suspicion of gang related activities. The suspect was asked to lead the police to his home which he duly did. Upon arrival at his unit located in Damansara Foresta, police raided the home and arrested Ravindran, Sathia, and three other Indian women then aged 24, 22, and 15 respectively. Sathia had allegedly admitted that the keys to a Mercedes Benz, Proton Preve and Honda belonged to him, but later alleged that they belonged to the other accused. Ravindran, who was wanted for murder under section 302 of the Penal Code and also on suspicion of gang related activities under the Security Offences (Special Measures) Act 2012, denied this and the true ownership of the keys remained contested and uncertain.

The ownership of the Mercedes Benz was an important issue in this case as methamphetamine amounting to 1423.5g were seized from the luxury car. The prosecution called 18 witnesses to testify in their case. YA Datuk Noorin binti Badaruddin laid out the 3 elements the prosecution needed to prove to make out a prima facie case, the first being the identity of the drugs; second, that the drugs were in the possession of the accused, and the third that the accused was trafficking said drugs. In her judgment, YA held that "the prosecution's case is tainted with doubts" and "if the accused persons were to be called to enter their defence and they choose to remain silent, this court would not find it safe to convict them" and thus, "there was no necessity for this court to hear rebuttal evidence from the accused persons".

