

CIVIL COURT FIRST HALL

THE HON. MR. JUSTICE GIANNINO CARUANA DEMAJO

Sitting of the 5 th December, 2008

Rikors Number. 968/2008

Carmel sive Charles Busuttil

Versus

Stanley George Newbold and Antoinette Newbold

The Court:

Having seen the application, and the decrees of the 1 October 2008 and the 3 November 2008; having seen also the reply, all the acts and documents in the records and also the records of sworn application number 969/2008:

Having seen also the relevant provisions of art. 836 of the Code of Organisation and Civil Procedure:

Decrees as follows:

The present proceedings concern the request by Stanley and Antoinette Newbold ["Newbold"] for the court to revoke a garnishee order ["the Order"] issued at the request of Carmel Busuttil ["Busuttil"] on the grounds that

the debt secured by the Order is due not by Newbold but by a commercial company ["the Company"] in which both Newbold and Busuttil have an interest.

At this stage of the proceedings, conclusive proof of the existence of the debt is not required; *prima facie* evidence is sufficient, but also required, for the Order to be kept in force.

In the present case Busuttil failed to submit such There is no receipt or other documentary evidence. negotiated cheques or such as evidence. statements, showing the transfer of monies from Busuttil to Newbold *proprio*. The available evidence – in particular the private writing of the 12 February 2008 and the item "stamp duty" shown on "Document A" in the records of sworn application number 969/2008 - shows rather that any monies which passed were in the interest of the Company rather than in the private interest of Newbold. It is hardly conceivable that Busuttil would lend such a substantial sum as is claimed in the Order without requesting a proper receipt. The is no evidence of any such receipt.

The court therefore finds that the amount claimed is not *prima facie* justified and it therefore revokes the Order in terms of art. 836(1)(d) of the Code of Organisation and Civil Procedure.

The matter of costs will be determined in the judgment on the merits.

< Final Judgement >
END