

IN THE HIGH COURT OF FIJI

AT SUVA

CRIMINAL JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL CASE NO. HAC 148 OF 2017S

STATE

VS

- 1. JONE VONU**
- 3. WAISAKE LOABURE**
- 5. ROVERETO TAMANIVALU**

Counsels : Ms. L. Bogitini and Ms. S. Tivao for State
Ms. L. Ratidara for Accused No. 1
Ms. S. Daunivesi for Accused No. 3
Ms. A. Prakash for Accused No.5

Hearings : 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21 and 22 August, 2018

Summing Up : 23 August, 2018

SUMMING UP

A. ROLE OF JUDGE AND ASSESSORS

1. Madam and Gentlemen Assessors, it is my duty to sum up to you. In doing so, I will direct you on matters of law, which you must accept and act upon. On matters of fact however, what evidence to accept and what evidence to reject, these are matters entirely for you to decide for yourselves. So if I express my opinion on the facts of the case, or if I appear to do so, then it is entirely a matter for you whether you accept what I say or form your own opinions. You are the judges of fact.
2. State and Defence Counsels have made submissions to you, about how you should find the facts of this case. That is in accordance with their duties as State and Defence Counsels in this case.

Their submissions were designed to assist you, as the judges of fact. However, you are not bound by what they said. It is you who are the representatives of the community at this trial, and it is you who must decide what happened in this case, and which version of the evidence is reliable.

3. You will not be asked to give reasons for your opinions, but merely your opinions themselves and they need not be unanimous. Your opinions are not binding on me, but I will give them the greatest weight, when I deliver my judgment.

B. THE BURDEN AND STANDARD OF PROOF

4. As a matter of law, the onus or burden of proof rest on the prosecution throughout the trial, and it never shifts to the accuseds. There is no obligation on the accuseds to prove their innocence. Under our system of criminal justice, an accused person is presumed to be innocent until he is proved guilty.
5. The standard of proof in a criminal trial is one of proof beyond reasonable doubt. This means that you must be satisfied, so that you are sure of the accuseds' guilt, before you can express an opinion that they are guilty. If you have any reasonable doubt so that you are not sure about their guilt, then you must express an opinion, that they are not guilty.
6. Your decision must be based exclusively upon the evidence which you have heard in this court, and upon nothing else. You must disregard anything you might have heard about this case outside of this courtroom. You must decide the facts without prejudice or sympathy, to either the accuseds or the victims. Your duty is to find the facts based on the evidence, and to apply the law to those facts, without fear, favour or ill will.

C. THE INFORMATION

7. You have a copy of the information with you, and I will now read the same to you:

"... [read from the information]...."

D. THE MAIN ISSUES

8. In this case, as assessors and judges of fact, each of you will have to answer the following questions:

- (i) On count no. 1, did Accused no. 1, 3 and 5, in company of each other, between 1 and 2 May 2017, at Raiwaqa in the Central Division, broke into the complainant's (PW1) dwelling house, with intent to commit theft?
- (ii) On count no. 2, did accused no. 1, 3 and 5, in company of each other, between 1 and 2 May 2017, at Raiwaqa in the Central Division, steal the complainant's (PW1) properties, as itemized in count no. 2?

E. THE OFFENCES AND THEIR ELEMENTS

9. All three accuseds were charged with, first, "aggravated burglary", contrary to section 313(1)(a) of the Crimes Act 2009 (count no. 1); and second, "theft", contrary to section 291 (1) of the Crimes Act 2009 (count no. 2). It was alleged that the three accuseds, in company with each other, between 1 and 2 May 2017, at Raiwaqa in the Central Division, broke into the complainant's (PW1) dwelling house, and stole the properties itemized in count no. 2.
10. On count no. 1, for the accused to be found guilty, the prosecution must prove beyond reasonable doubt, the following elements:
 - (i) the accused;
 - (ii) in company with one or more persons;
 - (iii) enters or remains
 - (iv) in a building;
 - (v) as a trespasser;
 - (vi) with intent;
 - (vii) to commit theft
11. The key word in the above offence is the word "trespasser". A trespasser is someone who does not have permission, express or implied, to be in a building. In other words, if you don't have permission to enter or remain in a building, but nevertheless entered or remained in the building, you are a trespasser. You don't have authority to enter or remain in the building. For example, a thief who enters or remains in a building, to steal, is a trespasser

12. Likewise, another key word in the offence is the word "building". A "building" includes "a part of a building", "a structure (whether or not movable), a vehicle, or a vessel, that is used, designed or adapted for residential purpose". A dwelling house is, of course, a building.
13. It must also be noted that for "aggravated burglary", when the accused enters or remains in a building as a trespasser, with intent to commit theft, he must do the same in cohort with one or more persons. In other words, when he enters or remains in the building as a trespassers, with intent to commit theft, he must do the same with the assistance of one or more persons.
14. Count No. 2 involved the offence of "theft", contrary to section 291(1) of the Crimes Act 2009. For the accused to be found guilty of the offence, the prosecution must prove beyond reasonable doubt, the following elements:
 - (i) the accused
 - (ii) dishonestly
 - (iii) appropriates
 - (iv) property belonging to another
 - (v) with the intention
 - (vi) of the permanently depriving
 - (vii) the other of the property
15. "Theft" is another word for "stealing". "Stealing" is basically to take something away, without the owner's permission, and with the intention of permanently depriving the owner of ownership of that property. For example, I saw \$1,000 in your wallet. I took your wallet, got the \$1,000 and spent it on myself, without your permission. What I did above is basically called "theft" or "stealing".
16. You will notice in count no. 1 and 2 of the information that, the prosecution, in their particulars of offence, began with the phrase, "...JONE VONU, ASaeli BULITAUTINI, WAISAKE LOABURE, IOSEFO LOMACA and ROVERETO TAMANIVALU, in company of each other, ...". The prosecution is alleging that the accuseds committed the above offences, as part of a group. To make them jointly liable, the prosecution is relying on and running it's case, on the concept of "joint enterprise".

17. "Joint enterprise" is "when two or more persons form a common intention to prosecute an unlawful purpose in conjunction with one another, and in the prosecution of such purpose an offence is committed, of such a nature that its commission was a probable consequence of the prosecution of such purpose, each of them is deemed to have committed the offence" (Section 46, Crimes Act 2009). In considering the accuseds' cases, you must ask yourselves the following questions: Did they form a common intention to trespass on the complainant's (PW1) dwelling house, with intent to commit theft, at the material time? If so, did they act together in trespassing in PW1's dwelling house, with intent to commit theft, at the material time? And did they commit theft therein? Was this a probable consequence of the trespass, with the intent to commit theft? If your answer is yes for the accuseds, then they are guilty as charged in counts no. 1 and 2.
18. Furthermore, in this case, there are three accuseds on trial. Each of the accused is entitled to be tried solely on the evidence that is admissible against him. This means that you must consider the position of each accused separately, and come to a separate considered decision on each of them. Just because they are jointly charged, does not mean that they must all be guilty or not guilty.
19. There are two counts in the information. When considering them, you must treat and consider each count separately, and apply the whole evidence to each count separately.

F. THE PROSECUTION'S CASE

20. The prosecution's case were as follows: The complainant (PW1) and her husband, a former British Army Soldier, on 1 May 2017, owned a flat at Lagilagi Housing, Gaji Road, Samabula. They lived in the same with their daughter. The flat is two storey, with 3 bedroom upstairs and a kitchen and sitting room downstairs. At about 5.30 am on 1 May 2017, PW1 locked her house and went to spend the day with other family members at Cunningham Road, Tamavua. On 2 May 2017, PW1 returned home at about 10.30 am to see that her flat had been burgled. Her husband previously told her about the same and she came with the police. Their properties, as itemized in count no. 2, had been stolen.

21. According to the prosecution, accused no. 1, 3, 5 and two others were seen coming out of PW1's flat on 2 May 2017 after 2 am in the morning. They were seen carrying items out of PW1's house at the time. According to the prosecution, accused no. 1, 3, 5 and the two others carried the items to one Diana's house at Jittu Estate, Raiwaqa. According to the prosecution, accused no. 1, 3, 5 and the two others stole the items from PW1's flat. In Diana's house, it was alleged that accused no. 1, 3, 5 and the two others, were heard discussing on how to sell the stolen items.
22. According to prosecution, the police searched Diana's house on 2, 3 and 4 May 2017, with the aid of search warrants. They found PW1's stolen properties in the same. The properties were seized by police, and the details thereof are contained in search lists, Prosecution Exhibit No. 2 (A), 2(B), 2(C), 2(D), 2(E) and 4. The photos of these stolen properties are shown in Prosecution Exhibit No. 1. PW1's recovered stolen items were later taken to Raiwaqa Police Station. According to prosecution, Mr. Serupepeli Rawataka (PW2) saw Accused No. 1, 3, 5 and two others, stealing the above items and others from PW1's house on 2 May 2017, after 2 am in the morning. PW2 also saw them take the items to Diana's house thereafter.
23. Because of the above, the prosecution is asking you, as assessors and judges of fact, to find accused no. 1, 3 and 5 guilty as charged on counts no. 1 and 2. That was the case for the prosecution.

G. THE ACCUSED'S CASES

24. On 14 August 2018, the first day of the trial, the information was put to all accuseds, in the presence of their counsels. They pleaded not guilty to the charges. In other words, they denied the allegations against them. When a prima facie case was found against them, at the end of the prosecution's case, wherein they were called upon to make their defence, they all chose to give sworn evidence, in their defence. In addition, accused no. 1 called his mother (DW2) as his witness. Accused no. 3 called three additional witnesses; his mother (DW4), his younger brother (DW5) and accused no. 4 (DW6), as his witnesses. Accused no. 5 called his cousin sister's husband (DW8) as his witness. The above were the accuseds' rights.

25. The accuseds' cases were simple. On oath, they denied the allegations against them. Accused no. 1 (DW1) said, he was at home at Jittu Estate between 5 pm on 1 May 2017 to 5 am on 2 May 2017. He said, he was lying in bed at home with an injured feet, as he stepped on a nail. He said, he did not commit the offences alleged in count no. 1 and 2, as he was at home, at the material time. He called his mother (DW2) to verify what he said. DW2 said, Accused No. 1 was at home, at the material time.
26. As for accused no. 3 (DW3), he said, he was at home at Jittu Estate, at the material time. He said, on 1 May 2017, he went to work from 8 am, and finished at 3 pm. He said, he returned home at 4 pm, had his dinner at 7 pm, and went to sleep at 10 pm. He said, he woke up at 4 am on 2 May 2017. He called his mother (DW4) and younger brother (DW5) to verify that he was at home, at the material time. He also called Accused no. 4 (DW6) as his witness. Accused no. 4 had pleaded guilty and being convicted of count no. 1 and 2 on 13 August 2018. In his evidence, DW6 said, accused no. 3 was not at the crime scene, at the material time.
27. As for accused no. 5 (DW7), he said he was at Navesau between Wainibuka and Ra from March to November 2017. He said, he was assisting Mr. Neil MacDonald (DW8) at his farm at the time. He said, he was not at the crime scene at the material time. He called DW8 to verify the above in court as his only witness.
28. Because of the above, accused no. 1, 3 and 5 are asking you, as assessors and judges of fact, to find them not guilty as charged, on both counts. That was the case for the defence.

H. **ANALYSIS OF THE EVIDENCE**

(a) **Introduction:**

29. In analyzing the evidence, please bear in mind the directions I gave you in paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 hereof on the burden and standard of proof. In the acceptance and/or rejection of the evidence presented at the trial and your role as assessors and judges of fact, please bear in mind the directions I gave you in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 hereof. In analyzing the evidence, we will first discuss the Prosecution Exhibits and their significance, then the state's case against each of the accused; then the accuseds' cases, and finally, the need to consider all the evidence.

(b) The Prosecutions Exhibits:

30. The following prosecution exhibits were tendered by consent of the parties, during the trial:

1. Prosecution Exhibit No. 1 - Booklet of photos
2. Prosecution Exhibit No. 2A - Search List, dated 02.05.2017;
3. Prosecution Exhibit No. 2B - Search List, dated 02.05.2017;
4. Prosecution Exhibit No. 2C - Search List, dated 02.05.2017;
5. Prosecution Exhibit No. 2D - Search List, dated 02.05.2017;
6. Prosecution Exhibit No. 2E - Search List, dated 02.05.2017;
7. Prosecution Exhibit No. 3 - Search List, dated 03.05.2017;
8. Prosecution Exhibit No. 4 - Search List, dated 04.05.2017;
9. Prosecution Exhibit No. 5 - Search List, dated 12.05.2017;
10. Prosecution Exhibit No. 6A - Search Warrant, dated 02.05.2017;
11. Prosecution Exhibit No. 6B - Search Warrant, dated 03.05.2017;
12. Prosecution Exhibit No. 6C - Search Warrant, dated 12.05.2017;

31. The significance of the above exhibits were as follows. All the accuseds did not challenge the evidence of Mrs. Tarusila Bulai Ladiniwasa (PW1). She is the wife of Mr. Metuisela Luvuitacileka Ladiniwasa. Mr. Ladiniwasa had previously been in the British Army as a soldier for 12 years. The couple owned the flat that was allegedly burgled in this case. The parties, during the trial, did not dispute that the items shown in the booklet of photos (Prosecution Exhibit No. 1), belonged to the couple, and were stolen from their flat, at the material time. The parties did not dispute the nature and contents of the search list and search warrants mentioned in the above prosecution exhibits. The parties did not dispute that the majority of the items in the search list were recovered by police from Di Ana's home – see Prosecution Exhibit No. 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D, 2E and 4

32. Note that in Mr. Serupepeli Rawataka's (PW2) evidence, he said, he saw the accuseds carry the stolen items from the couple's flat to Di Ana's house, soon after the burglary at the couple's home. Accused no. 1 (DW1), in his evidence, said he knew Di Ana's home. When cross – examined by prosecution, he said, he knew all his co-accuseds. He said, on 2 May 2017, he was drinking liquor

with all the other accused, at Di Ana's house from 12 midday to 4 pm. Accused no. 3 (DW3), in his evidence, said he knew Di Ana. However, he said, he was not drinking liquor at Di Ana's house, as alleged by Accused no. 1. As for accused no. 5 (DW7), he said, in his evidence, that Di Ana was his sister. He said, accused no. 2 was Di Ana's defacto – husband. He said, he is related to accused no. 4 (DW6). Accused no. 4 had pleaded guilty and being convicted on count no. 1 and 2 on 13 August 2018. It would appear that all the accuseds were somewhat related to each other and knew Di Ana well, although she was not call to give evidence.

33. The significance of the couple's stolen properties and where some of the same were recovered from, does raise a lot of questions. Who took the couple's recovered stolen items to Di Ana's house, after their house was burgled on 2 May 2017 after 2 am? The question must be uppermost in your minds when we discuss the state's case.

(c) **The State's Case Against the Accuseds**

34. The State's case against each of the accused depends on whether or not you accept the evidence of Mr. Serupepeli Rawataka (PW2). PW2 said, he saw all the accuseds prior to the offendings, during the offendings and after the offendings. PW2 said, he was asleep at home in Jittu Estate on 2 May 2017 in the early morning. PW2 said Mr. Iosefo Lomaca (Accused No. 4 and DW6) came to his house, and called him at 2 am on 2 May 2017. PW2 said, accused no. 4 asked him for them to stroll down Lagilagi Road. PW2 said, he listened to Accused no. 4 and they strolled down Lagilagi Road. PW2 said, accused no. 4 told him, some people were waiting for them. PW2 said, he didn't know what he meant by this.
35. In any event, PW2 felt some people were following them as they strolled along the road. PW2 said, he looked back. PW2 said, he saw accused no. 1 (DW1), accused no. 2, accused no. 3 (DW3) and accused no. 5 (DW7). PW2 said, he observed them for 10 seconds. PW2 said, they were about 10 footsteps away from him. PW2 said, the lights from nearby houses assisted him see their faces. PW2 said, there were no impediments when he saw them. PW2 said, he had seen accused no. 1 before, as they went to the same school together for a year, and he was his friend. PW2 said, he had seen accused no. 3 many times before as they went to the New Methodist Church and were in

the same youth church group. PW2 said, he had seen accused no. 5 many times before as they were cousins from his mother's side, and had known him for 2 years.

36. PW2 said, accused no. 4 told him to wait near a water tank. PW2 said, he sat down, put on his ear piece, and listened to music from his mobile phone. PW2 said, he was observing the movement of people around the place. PW2 said, he did not know what the boys had planned earlier. PW2 said, he was at the water tank for about 15 minutes. PW2 said, he later saw accused no. 1 (DW1), accused no. 3 (DW3), accused no. 4 (DW6) and accused no. 5 (DW7) came out of the complainant's (PW1) house. PW2 said, he saw the boys bringing out various items from PW1's house. PW2 said, he saw them carrying bags and items out of PW1's house. PW2 said, he observed the boys for 10 to 11 seconds, and they were 12 to 14 footsteps away. The outside lights from nearby houses enable him to see them. PW2 said, his view of the boys were not impeded in any way. PW2 said, he knew the boys as previously explained.
37. PW2 said, he saw the boys load some of the items into a taxi, and accused no. 4 later went in the taxi. PW2 said, he saw accused no. 1, 2, 3 and 5 carrying the items along the road. PW2 said, he later followed the boys as instructed by accused no. 4. PW2 said, they went to Di Ana's house. PW2 said, they kept the items at Di Ana's house. PW2 said, accused no. 4 later arrived at Di Ana's house and gave him some of the items. PW2 said, he refused to take it, as it was stolen property. PW2 said, he observed accused no. 1, 3 and 5's faces at Di Ana's house between 3 to 5 minutes. They were 4 to 5 footsteps away from him. PW2 said, there was a 4 feet tube light in Di Ana's house, and his enabled him to see the boys' faces clearly. PW2 said, there was no impediment in the way, and he had met them before as previously described. PW2 said, he heard the boys discussing how to sell the items.
38. In considering PW2's identification evidence abovementioned, I must direct you as follows; First, whenever the case against an accused depends wholly or substantially on the correctness of one or more identification of the accused which the defence alleged to be mistaken, I must warn you of the special need for caution before convicting in reliance on the correctness of the identification because an honest and convincing witness could be mistaken. Second, you must closely examine the circumstances in which the witness made the identification. How long did the witness have the

accused under observation? At what distance? In what light? Was the observation impeded in any way? Has the witness ever seen the accused before? If so, how often? Has the witness any special reasons for remembering the accused? Was a police identification parade held? Thirdly, are there any specific weaknesses in the identification evidence? The answers to the above questions will determine the quality of the identification evidence. If the quality is good, you may rely on it. If it's otherwise, you must reject it.

39. In this case, PW2 observed the accuseds before, during and after the commission of the offences alleged in count no. 1 and 2. Prior to the offences, PW2 observed the accuseds for about 10 seconds each from a distance of 10 footsteps. It was after 2 am on 2 May 2017. Outside lights from nearby houses exposed the accuseds' faces to PW2. PW2 knew the accuseds, as he had seen them before, and there was no impediment in the way. During the offending, PW2 observed the accuseds carrying out the complainant's items from their house. PW2 said, he observed them for about 10 to 11 seconds from a distance of 12 to 14 footsteps away. The lights from nearby houses exposes their faces to PW2, and he said, he knew them as previously mentioned. PW2 said, there was no impediment when he was observing the accuseds. PW2 said, he followed the accuseds taking the stolen items to Diana's house. PW2 said, he further observed them in Diana's house under a 4 feet tube light. PW2 said, he observed the accuseds for 3 to 5 minutes, and they were 4 to 5 footsteps away from him. There was no impediment. PW2 said he knew the accuseds previously. This appeared to be a case of recognition, and a police identification parade would be prejudicial to the accuseds, as they knew each other. This was also not a case of one fleeting glance, but a case of repeated observation over a period of time before, during and after the alleged offending. In my view, it would appear that, PW2's identification of the accuseds was of a high quality, and you are at liberty to use it against the accuseds. However, it is a matter entirely for you.

40. Furthermore, whether or not Mr. Serupepeli Rawataka (PW2) was an accomplice in this case, or whether or not he was an innocent bystander, is a matter for you to decide on the facts of the case. You heard, he was asleep at home on 2 May 2017, when accused no. 4 called him. He said, he went with accused no. 4 to the water tank and was told to sit there and watch people. PW2 said, he did not know what the accuseds were up to at the time. Was he a look out for the other

accuseds or not? PW2 said, he observed the accuseds prior to the alleged crime, during the alleged crime and after the alleged crime. PW2 said, he was offered an alleged stolen item at Di Ana's house by Accused no. 4, but he refused to take it, as it was stolen property. PW2 was also arrested in this case and investigated by police. If you think he was an accomplice to the accuseds in this alleged crime, then I must warn you to be cautious in accepting his evidence against the other accuseds, because he may want to shift the blame to the others, but him. You must look at independent evidence coming from independent sources to support PW2's version if you are to accept his evidence. The couple's recovered items at Di Ana's house that were seized by police may amount to independent evidence from independent sources to support PW2's version of events. However, bearing in mind the above warning, and if you think PW2 was telling the truth, you may accept his evidence. If otherwise, you may reject his evidence. It is a matter entirely for you.

41. If you accept PW2's evidence as credible, and you accept the same, you must find all accuseds guilty as charged on both counts. If otherwise, you must find all accused not guilty as charged on both counts. It is a matter entirely for you.

(d) **The Accuseds' Case**

42. I have briefly explained to you the accuseds' cases from paragraphs 24 to 28 hereof. I repeat the same here. All the accuseds are denying the allegations against them. They are also relying on alibi evidence to say that they are not liable for the alleged crimes. Accused no. 1 and 3 said, they were at their homes fast asleep, at the material time. The alleged crime occurred after 2 am on 2 May 2017. Accused no. 1 called his mother (DW2) to verify the above. Accused no. 3 called his mother (DW4) and his younger brother (DW5) to verify that he was asleep at home at the material time. Accused no. 3 also called accused no. 4 (DW6), who said accused no. 3 was not at the crime scene, at the material time. Accused no. 5 said, he was at Navesau at the material time. He called his cousin sister's husband (DW8) to verify the above. If you accept the accuseds' alibi evidence, you must find the accused not guilty as charged on both counts.
43. However, if you do not accept the accuseds' alibi evidence, you must still consider the prosecution's case as a whole. This is because the burden to prove the accuseds' guilt beyond

reasonable doubt still remains on the prosecution, even if you reject their alibi defence. If you are not sure about the accuseds' guilt after considering the whole of the prosecution's case, then you must find the accuseds not guilty as charged. If otherwise, you must find them guilty as charged. It is a matter entirely for you.

(e) **The Need to Consider All the Evidence:**

44. Five witnesses gave evidence for the prosecution, 2 civilians and 3 police officers. The prosecution tendered seven exhibits. The defence called a total of 8 witnesses, the three accuseds themselves and 5 civilians' witnesses. Altogether, you have 13 witnesses, on whose evidence, you will have to make a decision.
45. You must carefully consider and compared all the evidence. You must analyze them. If you think I haven't mentioned a piece of evidence you consider important, please take it on board in your deliberation. If you find a witness credible, you may accept the whole or some of his/her evidence, in your deliberation. If you find a witness not credible, you may reject the whole or some of his/her evidence in your deliberation. You are the judges of facts.

I. **SUMMARY**

46. Remember, the burden to prove the accuseds' guilt beyond reasonable doubt lies on the prosecution throughout the trial, and it never shifts to the accuseds, at any stage of the trial. The accuseds are not required to prove their innocence, or prove anything at all. In fact, they are presumed innocent until proven guilty beyond reasonable doubt. If you accept the prosecution's version of events, and you are satisfied beyond reasonable doubt so that you are sure of the accused's' guilt, you must find them guilty as charged. If you do not accept the prosecution's version of events, and you are not satisfied beyond reasonable doubt so that you are not sure of the accuseds' guilt, you must find them not guilty as charged.
47. Your possible opinions are as follows:
- | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|------------|---|-----------------|----------------------|
| (i) | Count No. 1: | Aggravated | : | Accused No. 1 : | Guilty or Not Guilty |
| | | Burglary | | Accused No. 3 : | Guilty or Not Guilty |
| | | | | Accused No. 5 : | Guilty or Not Guilty |

(ii) Count No. 2: Theft : Accused No. 1 : Guilty or Not Guilty
Accused No. 3 : Guilty or Not Guilty
Accused No. 5 : Guilty or Not Guilty

48. You may now retire to deliberate on the case, and once you've reached your decisions, you may inform our clerks, so that we could reconvene, to receive your decisions.



Salesi Temo
JUDGE

Solicitor for State : Office of the Director of Public Prosecution, Suva
Solicitor for Accused No. 1 : Legal Aid Commission, Suva
Solicitor for Accused No. 3 : Legal Aid Commission, Suva
Solicitor for Accused No. 5 : Legal Aid Commission, Suva