



## ODPP MEDIA UPDATE

**Date:** 18 September 2015

**Name of Matter:** State-v-Ratu Inoke Tasere & Ors

**Names of Accused Persons:**

- |                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| 1. Ratu Inoke Tasere      | 9. Ratu Tevita Khaikhainabokolawale    |
| 2. Jimi Koroibete         | Makutu                                 |
| 3. Seru Kunalagi          | 10. Mosese Navaci                      |
| 4. Adi Cuvu Gavidi Atama  | 11. Eroni Rikoriko                     |
| 5. Ulaiasi Rabua Tuivono  | 12. Alifereti Nakuinivou               |
| 6. Peniasi Naqau          | 13. Alifereti Gonewai                  |
| 7. Semi Tanikili          | 14. Raicula Rokovou                    |
| 8. Ratu Osea Bolawaqatabu | 15. Adi Vasemaca Veikunekibulu Gonewai |
|                           | 16. Jorama Ratulevu                    |

**Charges:** One count, each, of sedition under section 67 (1) (a) and one count, each, of inciting communal antagonism under 65(2) (a) of the Crimes Decree 2009.

**Update:**

This matter was called at the Lautoka High Court today for the bail review hearing in relation to the decision of the Nadi Magistrates' Court refusing bail to all accused persons.

Defence informed the Court that the Magistrate refused bail by considering the test of appearance. However, the Court informed the Defence that the Magistrate had refused bail on the issue of public interest as was stated in the bail ruling that was delivered.

The State highlighted to the Court that a bail review was to test whether there was a change in the circumstances surrounding the case or whether there was a special fact since the bail ruling of the Magistrate in order to allow the Court to review the decision of the Magistrate.

Defence also stated that the State had not served the first phase of disclosures to his clients and that was a breach of their rights according to the Constitution.

The Court informed the Defence that there was no law requiring the State to serve full disclosures at the very first instance and that the Constitution only required the State to ensure that accused persons were served with a copy of their charge sheets.

Defence was then asked to confirm whether his clients were charged in a language that they understood and Defence agreed that his clients were aware of the charges they faced.

This matter has been adjourned to 23 September 2015 for a bail review ruling.

**-Ends-**