



**QORTI TAL-MAGISTRATI (MALTA)
BHALA QORTI TA' GUDIKATURA KRIMINALI**

MAGISTRAT DR ELAINE MERECIECA LL.D

PULIZIJA

(Spettur Spiridione Zammit)

kontra

MAXIMILIAN CIANTAR

(I.D. No. 75690(M))

Kaz Nru.: 88/2017

Illum, 4 t'April 2022

Il-Qorti,

Rat l-akkuzi migjuba fil-konfront ta' **Maximilian Ciantar** ta' sitta u ghoxrin (26) sena bin Emanuel u Diane nee' Borg imwieded Pieta' fit-22 ta' Jannar 1990 u joqghod 43, Triq is-Sebh Marsa detentur tal-karta ta' l-identita' bin-numru 75690M, akkuzat talli;

Fit-3 ta' April 2016 u zminijiet qabel fil-Facilita' Korrettiva ta' Kordin u/jew f'dawn il-Gzejjer kellu fil-pussess tieghu d-droga **Herojina** specifikati fl-ewwel skeda tal-ordinanza dwar il-Medicini Perikoluzi Kap. 101 tal-Ligijiet ta' Malta,

meta ma kienx fil-pussess ta' awtorizzazzjoni ghal importazzjoni jew esportazzjoni mahrug mit-Tabib Principali tal-Gvern, skont id-disposizzjonijiet tar-4 u tas-6 taqsima tal-ordinanza u meta ma kienx bil-licenzja jew xort'ohra awtorizzat li jimmanifattura jew li jforni d-droga imsemmija u ma kienx b'xi mod iehor, bil-licenzja mill-President ta' Malta li jkollu fil-pussess tieghu din id-droga u naqas li jipprova li d-droga msemmija giet fornuta lilu ghall-uzu tieghu skont ir-ricetta kif provdut fir-regolamenti msemmija u dan bi ksur tar-regoli 1939 dwar il-Kontroll Interni tad-Drogi Perikoluzi (GN 292/1939) kif sussegwentement ammendati u bi ksur tal-Ordinanza Dwar il-Medicini Perikoluzi, Kap. 101 tal-Ligijiet ta' Malta.

Fix-xahar ta' April 2016 u xhur qabel f'dawn il-gzejjer kellu fil-pussess tieghu il-pjanta Cannabis kollha jew bicca minnha u dan bi ksur tal-artikolu 8(d) tal-Kapitolu 101 tal-Ligijiet ta' Malta.

Xhur qabel ix-xahar ta' April 2016 f'dawn il-gzejjer kellu fil-pussess tieghu ir-raza mehudha mill-pjanta Cannabis jew xi preparazzjonijiet li jkollhom bhala bazi din ir-raza u dan bi ksur tal-artikolu 8(a) tal-Kapitolu 101 tal-Ligijiet ta' Malta.

Bhala persuna li mhux impjegata fil-habs Facilita' Korrettiva ta' Kordin, minghajr l-awtorita' legittima, dahhal jew pprova idahhal f'xi parti tal-konfini tal-Habs xi oggett, ikun li jkun, li huma pprojbiti skont xi regolamenti maghmola skont dan l-Att jew igorr jew jipprova igorr xi oggett bhal daww barra minn xi habs u dan bi ksur ta' artikolu 7(2) tal-Kap. 260 tal-Ligijiet ta' Malta.

B'hekk sar recidiv b'diversi sentenzi tal-Qorti liema sentenzi saru definittivi u ma jistghux jigu mibdula jew imhassra u dan ai termini 49 u 50 tal-Kap. 9 tal-Ligijiet ta' Malta.

Il-Qorti giet mitluba sabiex barra milli tapplika l-piena skont il-Ligi, tordna li jithallsu l-ispejjez li ghandhom x'jaqsmu mal-hatra tal-esperti skont l-Artikolu 533 tal-Kap. 9 tal-Ligijiet ta' Malta.

Il-Qorti giet ukoll mitluba li f'kaz ta' sejbien ta' htija, tapplika l-provvedimenti tal-Artikolu 33 A tal-Kap. 9 tal-Ligijiet ta' Malta.

Rat ix-xhieda;

Rat l-atti kollha tal-każ u d-dokumenti esebiti, inkluż l-Ordni tal-Avukat Ġenerali ai termini tas-sub-artikolu (2) tal-Artikolu 22 tal-Ordinanza dwar il-Mediċini Perikolużi (Kap. 101 tal-Liġijiet ta' Malta), sabiex din il-kawża tinstema' minn din il-Qorti bħala Qorti ta' Ġudikatura Kriminali¹,

Rat id-digriet tal-assenjazzjonijiet ta' kawzi u doveri tal-Prim Imhallef tat-28 ta' Lulju 2021²;

Rat l-ezenzjoni tal-partijiet għal-ismigh mill-gdid tax-xhieda mismugħa minn dina l-Qorti diversament preseduta³;

Semgħet is-sottomissjonijiet tal-partijiet;

Ikkunsidrat

Illi in sostenn tal-imputazzjonijiet miġjuba kontra l-imputat, il-Prosekuzzjoni ressqet is-segwent i xhieda u provi: (1) **l-ispettur Spridione Zammit u PS285 Jeffrey Cutajar** li xehdu dwar l-investigazzjoni kondotta minnhom; (2) **CO116 Helenio Galea u CO104 Ronald Caruana** li xehdu dwar il-vizita ta' Whitney Ciantar (oht l-imputat) fil-habs kif ukoll dwar it-tfittxija li huma għamlu; (3) gie ezebiet il-proċes verbal rigwardanti *sejba ta' sustanza kannella f'borza tal-plastik suspettata droga misjuba f'shorts mehud minn Whitney Ciantar gewwa l-Facilita' Korrettiva ta' Kordin nhar it-3 t'April 2016*⁴ u l-atti tal-inkjesta magisterjali relattivi. Fl-istess atti hemm ir-relazzjonijiet tal-esperti mahtura mill-Magistrat Inkwerenti – ta' **PS1331 Darren Debattista** li ha r-ritratti tal-imsemmija sustanza kif ukoll **tax-xjenzat Godwin Sammut** li kkonkluda li: *“estratti mehuda mit-trab ta' lewn kannella li hemm fid-dokument 152_16_01 instabet is-sustanza Eroina. Il-piż totali tat-trab kien ta' 0.80grammi u l-purita kienet ta' circa 12%. Din is-sustanza hija kkontrollata bil-ligi taht l-Erwel Skeda Taqsima I tal-Kapitolu 101 tal-Liġijiet ta' Malta.*”⁵

Min-naha tagħha d-difiza ezentaw lill-prosekuzzjoni milli tressaq ix-xhieda⁶ dwar il-volontarjeta' tal-istqarrija⁷ u tad-dikjarazzjoni⁸ rrillaxata mill-qua

¹ Ara fol. 10 tal-atti processwali.

² Fol. 155 tal-atti processwali.

³ Fol. 159 tal-atti processwali.

⁴ PV nru. 754/16 – Dok. CF.

⁵ Fol. 48 tal-atti processwali.

⁶ PC219 David Mizzi u PC310 A. Meli.

⁷ Fol. 56 tal-atti processwali.

⁸ Fol. 57 tal-atti processwali.

imputat⁹. Huma ressqu xhud wiehed, senjatament lil **David Mallors** (in rapprezentanza tal-Facilita' Korrettiva ta' Kordin) li xehed dwar il-kompartament tal-imputat gewwa l-Facilita' Korrettiva ta' Kordin kif ukoll dwar l-analizi ta' zewgt testijiet tal-urina li kienu rrizultaw fin-negattiv.

Il-proceduri odjerni jirrelataw fatti li sehew lura fit-3 t'April 2016 meta oht il-qua imputat marret il-habs tiehu xi hwejjeg lill-istess huha fuq struzzjonijiet ta' nannietha. Minn tfittxija li saret mill-ufficjali gewwa l-Facilita' Korrettiva ta' Kordin fil-hwejjeg li hija haddet lil huha instabet sustanza kannella suspettata eroina. Is-sustanza giet elevata mill-ufficjali u gew infurmati l-pulizija li min-naha taghhom bdew bl-investigazzjonijiet. Mill-investigazzjoni tal-pulizija jidher li rrizulta li oht l-imputat kienet giet mitluba min-nanna taghha sabiex tiehu xi hwejjeg lill-qua imputat gewwa l-habs. Hija marret u ghazlet xi hwejjeg u hadithom il-habs. Hemmhekk minn tfittxija li saret instabet is-sustanza fil-but ta' qalziet. Whitney Ciantar tinnega kategorikament li hija kienet taf li l-imsemmija hwejjeg kien fihom sustanza llecita. Mill-provi jirrizulta li l-imsemmija sustanza kienet qisha trab imxarrab. Mill-istqarrija rrillaxata mill-qua imputat jirrizulta li l-imsemmi Maximilian Ciantar ikkonferma li dik is-sustanza kienet tieghu u li kien insieha fil-but tal-qalziet. Jikkonferma li huwa kien jabbuza mill-eroina u mill-kannabis. Jikkonferma ukoll li gieli kkonferma l-istess sustanza meta kien bil-*police bail* qabel dahal il-habs. Huwa jikkonferma ukoll li dakinhar kien cempel lil nanntu u talabha tibghatlu l-hwejjeg.

Illi primarjament dina l-Qorti ser tindirizza l-ammissibilita' u l-validita' o meno tal-istqarrija rrillaxata mill-imputat fi stadju tal-investigazzjonijiet. L-imputat irrilaxxa l-imsemmija stqarrija fit-3 t'April 2016 skond il-ligi vigenti dak iz-zmien ghaldaqstant prima facie jidher li dina l-istqarrija bhala prova hija wahda ammissibli f'dawn il-proceduri penali. Fil-fatt mill-istqarrija jidher li l-imputat gie mwissi "*fil-prezenza ta' PC219 D. Mizzi li m'intix obbligata li titkellem sakemm ma tkunx tixtieq li titkellem, imma dak li tghid jista' jingieb bi prova, wara li gejt moghti d-dritt li stajt tikkonsulta jew tigi assistit mill-Avukat jew Prokuratur Legali tal-fiducja tieghek u int ghazilt li ma tixtieqx tikkonsulta jew tigi assistit*"¹⁰. L-qua imputat iffirma ukoll dikjarazzjoni fejn ikkonferma li "*gie mgharraf bid-dritt li jista' jikkonsulta privatament mal-Avukat jew Prokuratur Legali tal-fiducja tieghu wicc imb'wicc jew bit-telefon qabel ma jigi nterrogat u hu ghazel illi ma jixtieqx jikkonsulta jew jigi assistit.*"¹¹ Il-volontarjeta' tal-istqarrija u tal-imsemmija dikjarazzjoni ma

⁹ Ara fol. 192 tal-atti processwali.

¹⁰ Fol. 56 tal-atti processwali, Dok. SZ

¹¹ Fol. 57, Dok. SZ1

hijiex qed tigi kkontestata mid-difiza fil-fatt gew ezentati x-xhieda f'dan ir-rigward¹².

Madanakollu tibqa l-kwistjoni li l-qua imputat ma giex offrut id-dritt għall-assistenza legali waqt l-istqarrija u jekk dan jistghax iwassal sabiex jigi lez id-dritt tas-smigh xieraq tal-imputat.

Mill-atti processwali ma jirrizultax li kien hemm ragunijiet tajba li jzommu lill-imputat milli jkun assistiet permezz ta' avukat jew prokuratur legali waqt l-interrogazzjoni. Fil-fatt mill-istqarrija u d-dikjarazzjoni pprezentata jirrizulta li l-qua imputat gie offrut id-dritt għall-assistenza legali qabel (mhux waqt) l-interrogazzjoni u dana dejjem skond ma kienet il-ligi vigenti dak iz-zmien. Isegwi għalhekk li probabilment l-unika raguni l-għaliex l-imputat ma kienx mghejjun minn avukat waqt l-interrogazzjoni kienet l-għaliex il-ligi vigenti dak iz-zmien ma kinitx tippermettieha. Dak iz-zmien li fiha ttiehdet l-istqarrija odjerna (April 2016) il-ligi kienet tippermetti biss li l-imputat jkun jista' jikkonsulta ma avukat qabel ma tittiehed l-istqarrija sa massimu ta' siegħa. Id-dritt tal-assistenza legali waqt l-istqarrija gie ntrodott fil-Kodici Kriminali permezz ta' l-Att LI fit-28 ta' Novembru 2016.

Illi l-guriprudenza lokali ricenti fir-rigward tal-assistenza legali waqt l-interrogatorju jidher li qed tistrieħ fuq l-insenjament mghoti fil-kaz **Beuze v il-Belgju** (App. Numru 71409/10) tad-9 ta' Novembru 2018, li kien jitratta ukoll sitwazzjoni fejn il-ligi domestika rilevanti ma kinitx tippermetti l-assistenza legali waqt l-interrogazzjoni u fejn ma kienx hemm ragunijiet impellenti għalfejn ma tigiex offruta l-assistenza tal-avukat. F'dan il-pronunzjament intqal:

*“120. The fairness of a criminal trial must be guaranteed in all circumstances. However, what constitutes a fair trial cannot be the subject of a single unvarying rule but must depend on the circumstances of the particular case (see Ibrahim and Others, ... § 250). The Court’s primary concern, in examining a complaint under Article 6 § 1, is to evaluate the overall fairness of the criminal proceedings
... “*

121. As the Court has found on numerous occasions, compliance with the requirements of a fair trial must be examined in each case having regard to the development of the proceedings as a whole and not on the basis of an isolated consideration of one particular aspect or one particular incident, although it cannot be ruled out that a specific factor may be so decisive as to enable the fairness of the trial to be assessed at an earlier stage in the proceedings. “

¹² Fol. 192

... .. “139. The stages of the analysis as set out in the *Salduz* judgment – first looking at whether or not there were compelling reasons to justify the restriction on the right of access to a lawyer, then examining the overall fairness of the proceedings – have been followed by Chambers of the Court in cases concerning either statutory restrictions of a general and mandatory nature, or restrictions stemming from case-specific decisions taken by the competent authorities.

“140. In a number of cases, which all concerned Turkey, the Court did not, however, address the question of compelling reasons, and neither did it examine the fairness of the proceedings, but found that systematic restrictions on the right of access to a lawyer had led, *ab initio*, to a violation of the Convention Nevertheless, in the majority of cases, the Court has opted for a less absolute approach and has conducted an examination of the overall fairness of the proceedings, sometimes in summary form ... and sometimes in greater detail ...

“141. Being confronted with a certain divergence in the approach to be followed, in *Ibrahim and Others* the Court consolidated the principle established by the *Salduz* judgment, thus confirming that the applicable test consisted of two stages and providing some clarification as to each of those stages and the relationship between them (see *Ibrahim and Others*, ... §§ 257 and 258-62).

“144. In *Ibrahim and Others* the Court also confirmed that the absence of compelling reasons did not lead in itself to a finding of a violation of Article 6. Whether or not there are compelling reasons, it is necessary in each case to view the proceedings as a whole (see *Ibrahim and Others*, ... § 262). That latter point is of particular importance in the present case, since the applicant relied on a certain interpretation of the Court’s case-law on the right of access to a lawyer ... to the effect that the statutory and systematic origin of a restriction on that right sufficed, in the absence of compelling reasons, for the requirements of Article 6 to have been breached. However, as can be seen from the *Ibrahim and Others* judgment, followed by the *Simeonovi* judgment, the Court rejected the argument of the applicants in those cases that *Salduz* had laid down an absolute rule of that nature. The Court has thus departed from the principle that was set out, in particular, in the *Dayanan* case and other judgments against Turkey.

“145. Where there are no compelling reasons, the Court must apply very strict scrutiny to its fairness assessment. The absence of such reasons weighs heavily in the balance when assessing the overall fairness of the criminal proceedings and may tip the balance towards finding a violation. The onus will then be on the Government to demonstrate convincingly why, exceptionally and in the specific circumstances of the case, the overall fairness of the criminal proceedings was not

irretrievably prejudiced by the restriction on access to a lawyer¹³ (see *Ibrahim and Others*, ... § 265).....

“147. Lastly, it must be pointed out that the principle of placing the overall fairness of the proceedings at the heart of the assessment is not limited to the right of access to a lawyer under Article 6 § 3 (c) but is inherent in the broader case-law on defence rights enshrined in Article 6 § 1 of the Convention

“148. That emphasis, moreover, is consistent with the role of the Court, which is not to adjudicate in the abstract or to harmonise the various legal systems, but to establish safeguards to ensure that the proceedings followed in each case comply with the requirements of a fair trial, having regard to the specific circumstances of each accused.....

“150. When examining the proceedings as a whole in order to assess the impact of procedural failings at the pre-trial stage on the overall fairness of the criminal proceedings, the following non-exhaustive list of factors, drawn from the Court’s case-law, should, where appropriate, be taken into account (see *Ibrahim and Others*, ... § 274, and *Simeonovi*, ... § 120):

“(a) whether the applicant was particularly vulnerable, for example by reason of age or mental capacity;

“(b) the legal framework governing the pre-trial proceedings and the admissibility of evidence at trial, and whether it was complied with – where an exclusionary rule applied, it is particularly unlikely that the proceedings as a whole would be considered unfair;

“(c) whether the applicant had the opportunity to challenge the authenticity of the evidence and oppose its use;

“(d) the quality of the evidence and whether the circumstances in which it was obtained cast doubt on its reliability or accuracy, taking into account the degree and nature of any compulsion;

“(e) where evidence was obtained unlawfully, the unlawfulness in question and, where it stems from a violation of another Convention Article, the nature of the violation found;

“(f) in the case of a statement, the nature of the statement and whether it was promptly retracted or modified;

¹³ Emfazi ta’ dina I-Qorti

“(g) the use to which the evidence was put, and in particular whether the evidence formed an integral or significant part of the probative evidence upon which the conviction was based, and the strength of the other evidence in the case;

“(h) whether the assessment of guilt was performed by professional judges or lay magistrates, or by lay jurors, and the content of any directions or guidance given to the latter; “

(i) the weight of the public interest in the investigation and punishment of the particular offence in issue; and

“(j) other relevant procedural safeguards afforded by domestic law and practice”.

Fil-kaz odjern li jirrizulta huwa li l-qua imputat irrifjuta l-assistenza legali qabel it-tehid tal-istqarrija u ma kienx offrut id-dritt għall-assistenza legali waqt l-istqarrija. L-istqarrija tal-imputat ittiehdet fi sfond fejn oht il-qua imputat kienet qed tigi ukoll investigata in konnessjoni mal-fatti hawn fuq imsemmija. Fl-istess stqarrija il-qua imputat kjarament inkrimina lilu nnifsu tant li l-imsemmija stqarrija hija l-unika prova fir-rigward tal-ewwel, it-tieni u t-tielet imputazzjoni imputazzjoni dedotti fil-konfront tieghu. Din il-Qorti tinnota ukoll li d-dikjarazzjonijiet inkriminanti li saru mill-qua imputat fl-imsemmija stqarrija kienu f'istanzi generali ferm minghajr ma gew mgħotija bizzjed dettalji bil-ghan li jigu kkonfermati l-parametri mgħotija fl-imputazzjonijiet. Hawnhekk issir referenza għaz-zmien u għall-abbuz tal-Cannabis, fejn għalkem il-qua imputat ikkonferma li kien jabbuza mill-Cannabis minn imkien mill-istqarrija ma jirrizulta jekk din kinitx il-pjanta Cannabis jew ir-raza Cannabis. Konsegwentament l-imputat gie akkuzat biz-zewgt imputazzjonijiet. B'hekk dina l-Qorti ma hijiex konvinta mill-precizjoni tal-informazzjoni mgħotija fl-imsemmija stqarrija.

Għaldaqstant dina l-Qorti, wara li hadet konjizzjoni tal-provi migbura u l-gurisprudenza relatata mal-valur probatorju li hija għandha tagħti l-istqarrija mehuda f'cirkostanzi simili għal dawk tal-kaz odjern, partikolarment il-fatturi stabbiliti sabiex isir l-analizi tal-*overall fairness* tal-proceduri, ma thossx li jkun opportun li tistrieħ interament fuq l-istqarrija sabiex tistabillixi r-reita o meno tal-imputat għall-imputazzjonijiet odjerni. Dana fic-cirkostanzi imsemmija fil-paragrafu precedenti kif ukoll fid-dawl tan-natura u c-cirkostanzi tar-reati (hekk kif ser jingħad aktar ‘il quddiem f'din is-sentenza). Il-Qorti qieset ukoll l-interess pubbiku fl-isfond tal-emendi introdotti permezz tal-Att LXVI ta-sena 2021.

Isegwi għalhekk li għar-ragunijiet suesposti u fid-dawl tal-principju tal-*overall fairness*, dina l-Qorti ma hijiex ser tikkunsidra l-istqarrija rrillaxxata mill-imputat meta tigi sabiex tikkunsidra ir-reita' tieghu o meno għall-imputazzjonijiet dedotti fil-konfront tieghu.

Illi stabbilit dan, il-Qorti ser tghaddi sabiex tevalwa l-bqija tal-provi mressqa mill-prosekuzzjoni bil-ghan li tistabilixxi r-responsabilita' tal-imputat fir-rigward tal-imputazzjonijiet dedotti fil-konfront tieghu.

L-ewwel imputazzjoni tirrigwarda l-pussess semplici tal-eroina fil-Facilita' Korrettiva ta' Kordin jew fil-gzejjer Malti fit-3 ta' April 2016 u fi zmien ta' qabel. Mill-provi mressqa mill-prosekuzzjoni stess kjarament jirrizulta li l-qua imputat fl-ebda hin ma kien fil-pussess tad-droga eroina fl-ammont ta' 0.80 grammi gewwa l-Facilita' Korrettiva ta' Kordin. Ghal kull bon fini jigi ddikjarat ukoll li mill-provi lanqas ma jirrizulta li l-qua imputat setgha kien xjenti jew ta' xi struzzjonijiet sabiex huwa jinghata l-imsemmija sustanza gewwa l-Facilita' Korrettiva ta' Kordin.

Illi galadarba giet skartata l-istqarrija rrillaxata mill-qua imputat ghar-ragunijiet hawn fuq imsemmija (fejn il-qua imputat ha r-responsabilita' ta' din is-sustanza illecita), ma jibqa' l-ebda prova sal-grad rikjest mill-ligi, ta' lil hinn minn kull dubbju dettat mir-raguni, li l-imsemmija sustanza kienet effettivament tal-*qua* imputat. Fil-fehma ta' din il-Qorti, l-fatt wahdu li l-imsemmija sustanza nstabet fi hwejjgu ma jfissirx li dik kienet tieghu, speċjalment meta huwa ma kienx fil-pussess tal-istess hwejjeg.

Fir-rigward tat-tieni Imputazzjoni (Pussess semplici tal-pjanta Cannabis) u **t-tielet imputazzjoni** (pussess semplici tar-raza Cannabis), jinghad ukoll li galadarba giet skartata l-istqarrija rrillaxata mill-imputat ghar-ragunijiet suesposti, dawn iz-zewgt imputazzjonijiet (hekk kif gia inghad) huma ghal kollox infondati.

Permezz **tar-raba' imputazzjoni** l-qua imputat jinsab akkuzat talli huwa dahhal jew prova jdahhal fil-habs xi oggett projbit. Huwa minnu li mill-provi jirrizulta li fil-hwejjeg intizi ghall-imputat instabet is-sustanza eroina. Madanakollu, fizikament, ma kienx hu li prova jdahhalhom izda ohtu. Lanqas ma jista' jinghad li l-qua imputat kien komplici f'dan ir-reat galadarba mill-atti processwali odjerni assolutament ma tirrizultax pruvata x-xjenza u/jew l-konsapevolezza tal-imputat odjern li l-imsemmija sustanza llecita kienet ser tiddahhal fil-Facilita' Korrettiva ta' Kordin. Lanqas ma jirrizulta li hu ta' struzzjonijiet ghal dan. Ghaldqstant din l-imputazzjoni ukoll ma tirrizultax pruvata skond il-ligi.

Il-hames imputazzjoni tirrigwarda r-ricidiva. Fid-dawl ta' dak li nghad fir-rigward tal-ewwel erba' imputazzjonijiet, din l-imputazzjoni ukoll ma tirrizultax pruvata.

Decide

Ghal dawn il-mottivi, dina l-Qorti, wara li rat l-Artikoli 22(1)(a), 22(2)(b)(ii) tal-Kap. 101 tal-Ligijiet ta' Malta, ir-Regolamenti 4 u 9 tal-Legislazzjoni Sussidjarja

101.02, l-artikolu 7(2) tal-Kap. 260 tal-Ligijiet ta' Malta u l-artikoli 49 u 50 tal-Kodici Kriminali, **qeghda tillibera lil qua imputat Maximilian Ciantar mill-imputazzjonijiet kollha dedotti fil-konfront tieghu.**

Finalment, il-Qorti tordna d-distruzzjoni tad-droga esebieta hekk kif din is-sentenza tghaddi in gudikat, u dan taht il-harsien tar-Registratur li ghandu jirredigi proces verbal li jiddokumenta l-procedura tad-distruzzjoni, liema dokument ghandu jigi nserit fl-atti ta' din il-kawza mhux aktar tard minn hmistax-il jum minn tali distruzzjoni.

MAGISTRAT DR. ELAINE MERCIECA BA. LL.D.

Christine Farrugia

Deputat Registratur