



**COURT OF MAGISTRATES (MALTA)
AS A COURT OF CRIMINAL JUDICATURE
Magistrate Dr Astrid May Grima B.A. LL.D. Adv. Trib. Eccles. Melit.**

Today, 21st January 2025

**Police
(Insp. Janetta Grixti)**

vs

**Tehomir Angelov Georgiev
(256409L)**

The Court,

After having seen the charges brought against Tehomir Angelov Georgiev, holder of Identity Card number 256409L.

Being charged with having in the month of November 2020 and/or the months before in the Maltese Islands :

1. Without intent to steal or to cause any wrongful damage, but only in the exercise of a pretended right, should have, of his own authority, compelled Doriann (Maria Dolores) Georgieva to pay a debt, or to fulfil any obligation whatsoever, or should have disturbed the possession of anything enjoyed by Doriann (Maria Dolores) Georgieva, or demolished buildings, or diverted or took possession of any water-course, or in any other manner unlawfully interfered with the property of another person;
2. By means of an electronic communications network or apparatus made any other improper use.

Having seen all the documents presented in the acts of the proceedings.

Having heard the witnesses.

Having heard the final submissions by the party.

Considers

That Dorianna Georgieva testified that she was presently in separation proceedings with her husband, who she recognised in Court as the accused. She filed a report in 2020 against her husband about unauthorised withdrawal from Skypass, taking her children's pocket money amounting to between €1000 and €1200 and tools taken from their place which was undergoing renovation. In August 2020 her husband withdrew €500 from the Skypass account (Dok DG1) which was a debit card of €3500 in her name and he used her security key. He had withdrawn a total of €2000 as he had withdrawn before August 2020 and he transferred them to their joint account and then to his Revolut account. Dok DG2 shows transactions in their joint account and Dok DG3 shows the Skypass statement that she had to pay €2000. The three children used to keep their own money in their wallet, that they would have received as pocket money or Christmas gifts and before he left home, the accused took this money, which was between €1000 and €1200 as he said he needed them. The witness presented Doc DG4 which were messages she had sent to him to ask him to return the money, however he never replied. Regarding the tools, they had another property that was bought during marriage, and when they were separating she went and took photos of the things that were there as shown in Doc. DG5. In November 2020, while she was on a weekend break with the children for their birthday, she sent the accused an email so that he could go to visit the children on their birthday, and when she went back to her home in Zurrieq she found that he had taken the bicycle. She then went to their other place and she found that he had taken the tools. She was not aware of the value of the tools but estimated that they cost around €500. Whenever she requested that he returns the money or objects taken he ignored her so she went to file a police report. She had messages she sent him in 2021 where he would respond with emojis or funny faces in 2021. She did not have messages sent before November 2020. During cross examination the witness denied that in 2020 the Bank of Valletta code to access the account was sent on the mobile, but it was accessed with the security key. The witness said that she did not see the accused do the

transfers which were done from her personal Skypass account to their joint account. Only Tehomir used to use their joint account, and he transferred money from her account to the joint account, and then transferred it to his Revolut account, as she did not have a Revolut account and there is written Revolut Tehomir Angelov Georgiev on the statement. The bicycle was purchased during marriage, however she did not file a report about this, she filed a report and photos of the tools that were purchased by him during marriage and there was the community of acquets and were taken from the other house, but she did not have any receipts. The witness said that the accused was studying to be an architect and he didn't work and she earned the money as he didnt work.

Considers

That the defence contested all the accusations stating that these were not proven beyond reasonable doubt, since the Bank Statements exhibited had not been confirmed by a BOV representative and the address of the other residence owned by the parties was not even indicated.

That after having seen all the documents presented in the acts of the proceedings and having heard the witness, the Court is convinced that all the charges brought against the accused were not proven beyond reasonable doubt.

Decide

The Court is therefore declaring the accused **not guilty** of the charges brought against him and liberating him from them.

Dr. Astrid May Grima B.A. LL.D. Adv. Trib. Eccles. Melit.
Magistrate