



**IN THE COURTS OF MAGISTRATES (MALTA)  
AS A COURT OF CRIMINAL JUDICATURE  
Magistrate Dr. Monica Vella LL.D., M.Jur**

**The Police  
(Inspector Doriette Cuschieri)**

**VS**

**Maxwell Joe**

**Compilation number: 4839/2025**

**Today, 15th July 2025**

The Court;

Having seen the charges brought against:

**Maxwell Joe**, 54 years, born in Liberia on the 24<sup>th</sup> December 1970,  
without a fixed address, holder of Maltese ID Card 0041354A;

**Accused** of on the 13th April 2025 at around 22:30hrs in Zejtun:

1. Having wilfully commit any spoil, damage or injury to or upon any movable or immovable property for the amount less than Euro 250 belonging to any other person namely Theresa Farrugia property

being main door of her residence, when guilty will be sentenced to imprisonment;

2. And also with having, on the same date, place, time and in the same circumstances, wilfully disturbed the public good order or the public peace;
3. Also for leading an idle and vagrant life;
4. And also, with having on the same date, place and time and in the same circumstances rendered himself recidivist in terms of Article 49 and 50 of Chapter 9 of the Laws of Malta, and this in terms of judgement which are definitive and cannot be changed.

The Court was respectfully requested to apply Section 533 (1) of Chapter 9 of the Laws of Malta, with regards to the expenses incurred by the Court appointed experts.<sup>1</sup>

Having seen the conviction sheet of the accused presented by the prosecution<sup>2</sup>.

Having seen that the accused declared that he is not guilty of the charges brought against him.<sup>3</sup>

Having seen all the acts of the proceedings.

Having heard the witnesses who testified during the proceedings.

---

<sup>1</sup> Folio 2 of the proceedings.

<sup>2</sup> Folio 4 to 13 of the proceedings.

<sup>3</sup> Folio 14 of the proceedings.

Having seen and considered all the documents and evidence in the acts of the proceedings.

Having heard the submissions of the prosecution and of the defence made on the 18<sup>th</sup> June 2025.<sup>4</sup>

Having seen that the case was put off for judgement for today.

### **Considered:**

#### **Facts in Brief**

The case involves an act of alleged aggression by the accused whereby he damaged a door. This incident happened on the 13<sup>th</sup> April 2025 at around 22.30 hrs in Toni Zahra Street, Zejtun. The police apparently went on site and found the accused who had various injuries on his head. There were pieces of broken glass that had fallen from the said door.

The accused was arrested on site and these proceedings were instituted against him.

### **Considered:**

#### **Evidence**

**Godwin Borg** testified on the 29<sup>th</sup> April 2025 in the Maltese language. He stated that the incident happened on his birthday: “fil-birthday tieghi jigifieri 13 ta’ April 2025 omm il-mara dahlet gol-kamra taghha. Hija toqghod ma’ genbhom u semghet il-bieb ta’ barra jitrieghed. Harget gol-gallarija bil-walker. Rat zewg itfal u hasbithom huma li qed ikissru l-bieb u dawn qalulha li kien hemm persuna ta’ karnaggjon skur<sup>5</sup> li qed taghmel dan.<sup>6</sup> Hija marret tghid lilu u hu mar jinvestiga. It-tfal qalulu li l-persuna

---

<sup>4</sup> Folio 80 of the proceedings.

<sup>5</sup> Traduzzjoni tal-Qorti għall-kliem “sewda” uzat mix-xhud

<sup>6</sup> Folio 21 of the proceedings.

responsabbli kien fil-genb. Hu mar jiffacciah u qallu biex imur. Pero' ma riedx jiccaqlaq. Qal li ma kienx mija fil-mija (100%) f'sikktu. Qallu biex icempel lill-pulizija u hu hekk ghamel u gew. Qal li l-bieb ma fethux, pero' kisser il-hgieg. Il-hsara tammonta ghal tmenin Ewro (€80). Huwa qatt ma rah qabel. Hsara biss soffrew."

Cross-examined he stated that: "hu ra l-hgiega mkissra u kienu t-tfal li indikawlu l-aggressur. Kien qisu qed jistahba. Kellu mobile f'idejh. Qal li omm il-mara l-gara tieghu. Ma jaf lil hadd jghix go darhom bil-kunjom Spagnol. Hu ma rahx ikisser. Hu ma dahalx god-dar."

**PS 955 Christian Mangion** gave evidence on the 26<sup>th</sup> May 2025 and he described the stages which led to the arrest of the accused and the information he received from Godwin Borg.<sup>7</sup> He found the accused sitting on the pavement and he noticed him with blood coming out of his head. He stated that the person is known to the police and he could identify him. He noticed that the door was damaged and that there was a rock in front of the said door. The accused was taken to hospital after he was given his rights.

Under cross examination he stated that he only saw Godwin Borg and the accused. Borg's wife was in the balcony.

**Inspector Doriette Cuschieri** stated that her involvement in the investigation was that she took the statement of the accused after she ordered his arrest.

Cross examined she confirmed that she did not go on site.

---

<sup>7</sup> Folio 30 of the proceedings.

**Stephania Calafato Testa** on behalf of the Court Registrar presented court judgements in relation to the accused.

**Theresa Farrugia** gave evidence on the 14<sup>th</sup> May 2025 in Maltese. She stated that: “ semghet tahbit meta kienet fuq is-sodda.<sup>8</sup> Qalet li tfal rat u qalet lit-tfal fit-triq ‘kemm ser iddumu thabbtu mal-bieb’. Wiehed mit-tfal qalilha li kien hemm wiehed ta’ karnaggon skur qed jaghti bil-gebla. Hija marret tghid lil qrabha taghha li joqghodu fid-dar adjacenti imma li tinfed ghal ma taghha. Qalet li meta ratu l-bieb kellu daqqiet tal-gebel u hgieg imkissra. Qalet il-hgieg rrangatu pero’ d-daqqiet ghadhom hemm.”

Cross-examined she stated: “it-tfal kienu qed jilghabu bl-iscooter. Ma ratx min kien qed isabbat.”

**Maria Borg** gave evidence on the 14<sup>th</sup> May 2025 and recounted the incident. In substance her version of evidence corroborated what her husband Godwin Borg and her mother Theresa Farrugia stated.<sup>9</sup>

The accused **Maxwell Joe** gave evidence on the 18<sup>th</sup> June 2025 after being duly cautioned according to law and stated that a certain Spagnol engaged him to work in a house in Zejtun and during the works he used to live in a room in the house. He stated that there was a ‘gebla’ which was moving and as he tried to remove it he fell down. He does not know the exact address.<sup>10</sup> He cleaned the house and went out. In the evening the police came with an ambulance. He then stated that he was near the house and

---

<sup>8</sup> Folio 55 of the proceedings.

<sup>9</sup> Folio 59 of the proceedings.

<sup>10</sup> Folio 68 of the proceedings. The Court holds that she is having difficulties to understand.

someone hit him in his head.<sup>11</sup> He does not remember what happened after.

Under cross examination he confirmed that he did works for Spagnol. He was sitting on the pavement when the police arrived. According to him, the house on which pavement he was sitting was nearby to the one which belonged to Spagnol. He was living in that house while he was doing the works thereat.

Re-examined he stated that Spagnol instructed him to do works in a house in Zejtun and sleep in a house next to it. He does not know the victim. He stated that the police found him near the house where he was sleeping. That was not far away from where he was working. He did not bang on any door.

**“At the office he had told that (her) he lived in that house. He does not know if he was knocking on the door. He confirms that he was knocking on the door and an old man came out and then the police came. He was sitting on the front of the door he was trying to open.”<sup>12</sup>**

**Anthony Spagnol** gave evidence on the 18<sup>th</sup> June 2025 and confirmed that he asked the accused to do some works in a house in Zejtun and he offered him to sleep in another room nearby. The two are just two (2) minutes apart on foot.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Folio 69 of the proceedings.

<sup>12</sup> Folio 72- 73 of the proceedings.

<sup>13</sup> Folio 74 of the proceedings.

Cross-examined he states that the address of the room is No. 2, Sqaq Haz-Zabbar Zejtun. He gives a description of the location. He states that the room is not in a residential area and is accessible through a country lane.

**Considered:**

The accused is being charged with voluntary damages, breach of public peace and order, of leading an idle life and of being a recidivist.

The defence argues that there is no direct evidence linking the accused to the crimes and contraventions being attributed to him and adds that the circumstantial evidence does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that it was the accused that caused the damages.

**Considered:**

With regards to circumstantial evidence, it is well known, that if that evidence leads to the accused, then the Court can find guilt. The following is some of the jurisprudence in relation to circumstantial evidence:

In the case **Il-Pulizija (Spettur Frank Tabone) vs John Vella** decided on the 03<sup>rd</sup> August 2017, Court of Appeal per Honourable Chief Justice Dr. Silvio Camilleri (App. No. 62/2016) the Court declared:

**“16.** L-uniċi provi prodotti li jistgħu jinċidu fuq l-imputazzjoni ta’ serq tal-mutur huma unikament ċirkostanzjali kif anki jidher mis-sentenza appellata. Din il-qorti, iżda, hi tal-fehma li l-indizji ċirkostanzjali ma humiex tali li jwasslu sabiex l-imputat jinstab ħati tad-delitt in kwistjoni mingħajr dubbju dettat mir-raġuni. Biex il-provi ċirkostanzjali jistgħu iwasslu għal sejbien ta’ ħtija jridu jkunu tant elokwenti li l-interpretazzjoni loġika u naturali tagħhom neċessarjament u raġjonevolment twassal għall-

prova fi grad sodisfaċenti ta' dawk il-fatti li jiformaw l-elementi tar-reat imputat. Cioe' jridu jkunu univoċi u mhux ekwivoċi." (Page 8)

In the case **Il-Pulizija (Spettur Michael Mallia) vs Yilmaz Azlan** decided on the 19<sup>th</sup> June 2019, Court of Appeal per Honourable Madame Justice Dr. Consuelo Scerri Herrera (App. No. 438/2014) the Court embraced the following jurisprudence:

"In the judgment in the names **Il-Pulizija v Joseph Gauci et**<sup>14</sup> the Court held that:

*"Circumstantial evidence is often the best. It is evidence of surrounding circumstances which by undersigned coincidence is capable of proving a proposition with the accuracy of mathematics."*

In the case in the names **Il-Pulizija vs Graham Charles Ducker**<sup>15</sup> the Court reiterated that :

*"it is true that conflicting evidence per se does not necessarily mean that whoever has to judge may not come to a conclusion of guilt. Whoever has to judge may, after consideration of all circumstances of the case, dismiss one version and accept as true the opposing one."*

It is the duty of the prosecution to bring forward the best evidence to be able to convince the court of the charges it has brought forward in that they subsist and that on the evidence brought forward the court is in a position

---

<sup>14</sup> Court of Appeal decided on the 5<sup>th</sup> October 1998

<sup>15</sup> Court of Appeal decided on the 19<sup>th</sup> May 1997



to establish guilt of the accused. As explained by -**Manzini** in his book entitled **Diritto Penale**<sup>11</sup>:-

*“il cosi’ detto onero della prova, cioe’ il carico di fornire, spetta a chi accusa - onus probandi incumbit qui osservit”.*

The Court also makes reference to another judgment in the names **II-Pulizija vs Martin Mark Ciappara** where the court explained what happens in those eventualities when it is faced with two conflicting theories as to what had happened. Two situations may arise either that the Court is of the opinion that the prosecution failed to prove its case on a level that is required by criminal law, and thus has to acquit the same accused or is morally convinced that the correct version of events is that put forward by the prosecution then it must convict and give the opportune punishment.

The court is guided by article 637 of the Criminal code when appreciating the evidence given by a witness namely that regard being must be given to the demeanor, conduct, and character of the witness, to the probability, consistency, and other features of his statement, to the corroboration which may be forthcoming from other testimony, and to all the circumstances of the case. (Page 19 and 20)

In the case **II-Pulizija vs Kevin Psaila** decided by the Court of Appeal (App. No. 234/2017) per Honourable Madame Justice Dr. Edwina Grima the Court embraced the following principles:

“Ukoll, skond is-sentenza fl-ismijiet **Ir-Repubblika ta’ Malta vs George Spiteri**<sup>16</sup> mogħtija mill-Qorti tal-Appell Superjuri nhar il-5 ta’ Lulju 2002 gie ddikjarat is-segwent:

**Huwa principju fundamentali fil-process kriminali li l-ligi tesigi li kull min jrid jipprova xi haga, għandu jressaq l-ahjar prova, u dan jista' biss jaqa' fuq prova sekondarja kemm il-darba din l-ewwel jew l-ahjar prova mhiex disponibbli. Hu veru wkoll, izda, li min għandu jiggudika jista', skond il-ligi, u minkejja dan il-principju fundamentali appena msemmi, joqghod fuq ix-xhieda anke ta' persuna wahda jekk b'dak li tghid din il-persuna, jikkonvinci lill-gudikand sal-grad tal-konvinciment morali mill-htija tal-persuna akkuzata.**

**Il-prova indizzjarja trid tkun wahda assolutament univoka, li tippona biss minghajr dubju dettat mir-raguni lejn fatt jew konkluzzjoni wahda. Ovvjament jekk fatt jew cirkostanzi jistghu ragjonevolment jinghataw aktar minn tifsira jew interpretazzjoni wahda, tkun li tkun, allura dik ma tkunx prova indizzjarja tajba, skond il-ligi, sabiex in bazi tagħha tista' tinstab htija. Kif tghid u titlob il-ligi, biex prova indizzjarja tigi ammessa bħala prova valida fis-sens li wiehed jista' ragjonevolment jasal għall-konkluzzjoni tiegħu ta' htija in bazi tagħha bla ebda dubju dettat mir-raguni, irid ikun moralment konvint minn dan ir-rekwizit ta' l-univocita' tagħha, cioe' li dik il-prova tfisser biss u xejn aktar li l-akkuzat huwa hati ta' dak addebitat lilu w, allura, kull dubbju ragjonevoli fir-rigward għandu jmur favur l-akkuzat skond il-ligi.**

---

<sup>16</sup> As presided by Honourable Justice Dr. Arrigo Noel V., Filletti Joseph A., Vella Patrick.

Wiehed ghandu jkun ferm attent fl-apprezzament u interpretazzjoni tal-prova indizzjarja ghaliex ghalkemm din hi prova ferm importanti, u kultant anke aktar mill-prova diretta, pero', din hi prova li facilment tista' tqarraq lil dak li jkun qed jghamel l-interpretazzjoni w apprezzament taghha.

Madankollu skond is-sentenza tal-Qorti tal-Appell Inferjuri fl-ismijiet Pulizija vs Cyrus Engerer gie ppuntwalizzat ukoll illi:

‘...Biex wiehed jistabilixxi jekk l-provi cirkostanzjali huma univoci wiehed irid jara l-assjem ta’ dawn ic-cirkostanzi migjuba bhala prova u li dan il-konvinciment morali huwa wiehed ibbazat sal-grad rikjest tal-prosekuzzjoni tac-certezza morali (u mhux dik assoluta) jew il-prova lil hinn minn kull dubbju dettat mir-raguni. In oltre il-konkluzjoni biex tkun univoka mhux necessarjament trid tkun l-uniku xenarju li jista jintlahaq izda trid tkun l-unika wahda li tista twassal ghal htija b’mod ragonevoli kontra dak li jkun. Fi kliem iehor jekk jinholoq dubbju dwar l-univocita tal-provi cirkostanzjali liema xenarju alternattiv ma jkunx wiehed ragonevoli, dan ma jistax iwassal sabiex il-Qorti tillibera a bazi tan-nuqqas ta’ univocita’.<sup>17</sup> (Page 9 u 10)

In the case **Il-Pulizija (Spettur Carmelo Magri u Spettur Joseph Mercieca) vs Pierre Buttigieg** (App. No. 27/2008) decided by the Court of Appeal on the 17<sup>th</sup> of September 2008 per Honourable Justice Dr. Joseph Galea Debono, the Court declared:

“Mill-banda l-ohra lanqas hu korrett l-appellant meta jghid fir-rikors tal-appell li: *"Fi kliem semplici irid ikun hemm aktar minn prova*

---

<sup>17</sup> Decided on the 08<sup>th</sup> May 2014 per Honourable Justice Michael Mallia.

*cirkostanzjali wahda.*" Prova indizjarja wahda, jekk tkun univoka w ma taghti lok għall-ebda spjegazzjoni ohra ghajr dik tal-htija tal-akkuzat, tista' tkun bizzejjed biex fuqha biss tinstab dik il-htija."

In the case **Il-Pulizija vs Domenico Savio Micallef** (App. No. 409/2017) decided by the Court of Appeal on the 26<sup>th</sup> November 2019 per Honourable Justice Dr. Aaron Bugeja, the Court held:

"14. L-akbar sfida li jkollu kull Ġudikant hi li huwa jkun jixtieq dejjem jasal li jiskopri l-verita storika. Dan peress li l-evidenza li jkollu quddiemu kemm dik diretta, kif ukoll u, *a maggior ragione*, dik indiretta, mhux dejjem neċessarjament iwasluh għall-dik il-verita'. Xhud jista' jkun konsistenti kemm fil-veritajiet li jgħid kif ukoll fil-gideb li jista' jkun qiegħed jgħid. U huwa għalhekk li jeżisti wkoll ir-reat ta' sperġur għaliex il-Qrati mhux dejjem ikunu f'qagħda li jikxfu l-verita storika mix-xiehda tax-xhieda li jixhdu quddiemhom. U f'kull każ, il-Qorti ma għandhiex il-fakulta u s-setgħa li tidhol fil-profondita' tal-moħħ, qalb u kuxjenza tax-xhud li jkun xehed quddiemha b'mod li tkun tista' tistabbilixxi ċ-ċertezza assoluta ta' dak li jkun qed jaħseb u jgħid billi taqralu moħħu u qalbu.

15. Mill-banda l-oħra l-evidenza indiretta, dik li tistrieħ prinċipalment fuq iċ-ċirkostanzi u li tkun bażata fuq l-analiżi taċ-ċirkostanzi partikolari tal-każ, għalkemm mhix giddieba, tista' tkun qarrieqa. Huwa għalhekk li dawn il-Qrati dejjem straħu fuq il-massima li biex l-evidenza ċirkostanzjali tkun is-sies ta' sejbien ta' htija, din trid tkun inevitabbilment univoka. Ċjoe li tippona biss u esklussivament lejn direzzjoni waħda biss. U xejn hliet. Ghax altrimenti, din it-tip t'evidenza tista' tiżvija lil Ġudikant mir-riċerka tiegħu tal-verita.

16. Il-Liġi penali **ma teħtieġ** li biex persuna tiġi misjuba ħatja tkun trid tiġi stabbilita s-suffiċjenza probatorja taċ-ċertezza assoluta, u dan għaliex Qorti rari ħafna tista' tkun konfrontata b'dan il-livell ta' prova. Fil-Liġi Maltija, bħal dawk li jsegwu l-proċedura penali imnisla mis-sistema Anglo-Sassoni, huwa biżżejjed li Qorti ta' Ġustizzja Kriminali tkun konvinta lil hinn minn kull dubju dettat mir-raġuni mill-provi imresqa mill-Prosekuzzjoni, u li ma jkunux ġew newtralizzati fuq bażi ta' probabbiltà mid-Difiża, sabiex tkun tista' ssib ħtija.

17. Dawn il-provi pero jridu qabel xejn ikunu jirrispettaw ir-regoli stabbiliti tal-evidenza fi proċedimenti penali, ċjoe l-*Law of Evidence*. Jekk dawk il-provi jkunu jikkonsistu prinċipalment fuq il-verżjoni ta' xhud waħdieni, il-Qorti xorta waħda tista' tasal sa' dak il-grad ta' prova, jekk dak ix-xhud ikun ġie emnut, in kwantu f'din l-eventwalita, din ix-xieħda ssir biżżejjed biex tagħmel prova shiħa u kompluta minn kollox, daqs kemm kieku l-fatt ġie ippruvat minn żewġ xhieħa jew aktar u tkun tista' ssib ħtija fl-akkużat. (Page 21-22)

In the case **Ir-Repubblika ta' Malta vs George Xuereb** decided by the Court of Appeal on the 31<sup>st</sup> October 2018 per Honourable Chief Justice Dr. Joseph Azzopardi, Honourable Justice Dr. Joseph Zammit Mckeen and Honourable Madame Justice Dr. Edwina Grima, the Court held:

**“81. Illi kif ġie ritenut:**

**“It is true that conflicting evidence per se does not necessarily mean that whoever has to judge may not come to a conclusion of guilt. Whoever has to judge may, after consideration of all circumstances of the case, dismiss one version and accept as true the opposing one.”**

**82.** Dan ukoll ghalixx apparti dawn il-verzjonijiet konfliggenti l-gurati kellhom provi ohra indizzjarji u cirkostanzjali li setghu jindikaw illi verzjoni wahda kienet iktar verosimili minn ohra.

**83.** Illi guristi Inglizi bhal per eżempju Pollock C.B (Criminal Evidence (3rd Edition) [1995], Richard May (Sweet and Maxwell Criminal Practice) dahlu fl-interpretazzjoni tal-apprezzament tal-prova cirkostanzjali u t-tifsira tal-univocita`:

**“It has been said that circumstantial evidence is to be considered as a chain, and each piece of evidence as a link in the chain, but that is not so, for then, if any one link broke, the chain would fall. It is more like the case of a rope comprised of several cords. One strand of cord might be insufficient to sustain the weight, but three stranded together may be quite of sufficient strength. Thus it may be in circumstantial evidence – there may be a combination of circumstances, no one of which would raise a reasonable conviction or more than a mere suspicion; but the whole taken together may create a conclusion of guilt with as much certainty as human affairs can require or admit of. .” (Page. 44-45)**

**Considered:**

This Court, thus, has to collectively analyse the indirect evidence and then see if such evidence will, beyond reasonable doubt, lead to the result that the accused has caused the damages.

**Considered:**

The Court read carefully the testimony of the accused and also had the opportunity to read the statement given by the accused to the police on the 15<sup>th</sup> April 2025, two days after the incident. The defendant on both

instances denied that he broke the glass and damaged the door but on the 15<sup>th</sup> April 2025 he **did not mention anything** about the ‘gebla’ incident or that he was working and living nearby, that is near the site of the incident.

The Court agrees with the defence that no one saw the accused damaging the door of Theresa Farrugia. The accused was on site and two children, who were never identified, told complainants that it was the accused who did the damage. The prosecution did not make an effort in this investigation. They did not take any photos and they did not establish if the injuries sustained in the head of the then suspect were in any way compatible with what was being alleged. There are no medical certificates in the acts of the case although the then suspect was taken to hospital. The Court expects better, especially from the officers who went on site.<sup>18</sup> Although the Court is very well aware of the workload that the district police have, one cannot assume that if a person is seen injured in front of a door then it was he who did the damages.

From the evidence in the acts, thus, the Court still has a ‘*lurking doubt*’ about what happened that evening, if truly it was the accused who damaged the door or if the children did it and pinpointed to the accused or if it was done by unidentified third parties. The Court already commented on the poor and superficial level of investigations made. In the studied opinion of this Court, the level of proof that the accused did it which results from the acts of the proceedings has been reached only **up to a level of probability** and thus the first charge has not been proved according to law and beyond reasonable doubt as requested by law in the criminal field.

---

<sup>18</sup> The Court is referring to PS 995 Christian Mangion who carried very superficial investigations.

**The Court believes that it is high time that district police sergeants and constables are given adequate training on evidence gathering and investigations. Otherwise precious work will go down the drain once a case is instituted before the Court. The Court also suggests that a check list or aid memoir is structured so that it will help and guide the junior investigating officers on what to look for and what to preserve as evidence.**

**Considered:**

With regards to the second charge the witnesses did not hear the accused make loud noises or any particular gestures. It does not result that the neighbourhood was particularly alerted. The police did not find him in a state that in any way indicated any public disturbance.

Consequently, the Court deems that the accused cannot be found guilty of the second charge.

**Considered:**

The Court believes that the third charge has also not been proven. The investigating officers and the prosecution did not bring forward any proof in this regard. On the contrary, the accused and Mr. Spagnol testified that the accused had been engaged to work in Mr. Spagnol's property. This militates against this contravention.

Thus, the third charge does not result and the Court deems that the accused is to be acquitted of this charge.

**Considered:**



With regard to the fourth charge, since the first, second and third charges have not been proven, the fourth charge which is a charge of recidivism does not result.

**Decides:**

Thus, the Court, having seen Articles 49, 50, 325(1)(c), 338(w), 338(dd) of Chapter 9 of the Laws of Malta finds the accused **MAXWELL JOE NOT GUILTY** of the charges brought against him and consequently acquits him of the same.

The Court explained this judgement to the accused in clear language.

The Court orders that this judgement be communicated to the Commissioner of Police in view of the suggestions being made.

The Court orders that a copy of this judgement be immediately given to the parties and that this judgement be immediately uploaded on the website of the Court Services Agency.

Delivered today the 15<sup>th</sup> July 2025, in the Court of Justice, Valletta.

Dr. Monica Vella LL.D., M. Jur.

Magistrate

Annalise Mifsud

Deputy Registrar