MALTA

QORTI CIVILI

PRIM' AWLA

(GURISDIZZJONI KOSTITUZZJONALI)

ONOR. IMHALLEF

TONIO MALLIA

Seduta tas-16 ta' Mejju, 2014

Rikors Numru. 81/2013

Jeffrey Zammit

vs

L-Avukat Generali u l-Onorevoli Prim Ministru

Il-Qorti:

Rat ir-rikors li ressaq Jeffrey Zammit fl-24 ta' Ottubru, 2013, u li jaqra hekk:

Illi inharget fil-konfront tar-rikorrent, Jeffrey Zammit att ta' akkuza numru 008/13 fejn *inter alia* huwa gie mixli bit-traffikar tas-sustanza ecstasy. Dan il-guri kien appuntat ghal 4 ta' Novembru 2013 izda wara rikors da parti tal-Avukat Generali gie ddiferit *sine die* sakemm jinstema xhud iehor.

Illi r-rikorrent uzufruwixxa ruhu minn dak provdut fl-artikolu 46(3) tal-Kostituzzjoni ta' Malta, fejn talab referenza lill-Qorti Kriminali bbazata fuq id-diskrezzjoni tal-Avukat Generali.

Illi pero, l-Imhallef sedenti f'dik il-Qorti cahad it-talba wara li kif jirrizulta mill-istess digriet huwa ghamel ir-ragunament tieghu bbazat fuq l-artikolu 6 tal-Konvenzjoni Ewropeja ghad-Drittijiet tal-Bniedem u dan minkejja l-fatt lit-talba ghal referenza kienet ippernjata fuq l-artikolu 7 tal-istess.

Illi ghalhekk, ir-rikorrent hass il-htiega li jippromwovi l-azzjoni tieghu b'kawza *ad hoc*.

Illi dak li sejjer jinghad hawn isfel huwa partikolarment skoncernanti ghal dak li jirrigwarda l-fattispeci tal-kaz odjern. Dan qieghed jinghad ghaliex fil-kaz tal-esponent huwa mixli b'allegat traffikar ta' madwar elf (1000) pillola ecstasy, u cioé hawnhekk m'huwiex kaz fejn qeghdin nitkellmu fuq ammont ta' kilogrammi ezorbitanti. F'dan is-sens, l-esponent jaghmel referenza ghas-sentenza fl-ismijiet **Il-Pulizija Assistent Kummissarju (Neil Harrison) vs Spiridione Vella** (Nru: 616/2000) moghtija mill-Qorti tal-Magistrati (Malta) bhala Qorti

tal-Gudikatura Kriminali per Magistrat Dr. Audrey Demicoli nhar it-30 ta' Settembru 2010. F'dik il-kawza dak l-akkuzat kien akkuzat bi traffikar ta' sitt mitt (600) pillola. F'dik il-kawza l-Avukat Generali kien inizjalment harget att ta' akkuza izda sussegwentement kien hareg konto-ordni u b'hekk l-akkuzat temm il-process kriminali tieghu quddiem il-Qorti tal-Magistrati.

Illi ghalhekk, din il-lanjanza hija aktar applikabbli ghal kaz odjern.

Illi l-lanjanza tal-esponent tikkoncerna id-diskrezzjoni tal-Avukat Generali li jiddeciedi hu, minghajr ebda tip ta' kontroll jew dritt ta' appell mill-istess decizjoni, quddiem liema Qorti l-akkuzat ghandu jwiegeb ghall-akkuzi li bihom ikun qieghed jigi mixli.

Illi l-esponent jissottometti lid-diskrezzjoni nsindikabbli mhollija lill-Avukat Generali sabiex jiddeciedi hu jekk l-akkuzat ghandux jingieb quddiem il-Qorti Kriminali sabiex jghaddi guri jew jekk il-kaz tieghu ma jinstemax quddiem il-Qorti tal-Magistrati hija diametirkament opposta ghall-principju tac-certezza legali.

Illi dan il-poter gie diga enuncjat bhala leziv tal-artikolu 7 tal-Konvenzjoni Ewropeja fis-sentenza tal-Qorti Ewropeja fl-ismijiet **<u>"John Camilleri vs Malta"</u>** moghtija fit-22 ta' Jannar 2013 u li issa saret definittiva.

Illi dik il-Qorti bdiet il-konsiderazzjonijiet taghha billi l-ewwel ghamlet illustrazzjoni ta' x'inhu l-principju tac-certezza legali. Fil-fatt insibu s-segwenti:

"34. The guarantee enshrined in Article 7 should be construed and applied, as follows from its object and purpose, in such a way as to provide effective safeguards against arbitrary prosecution, conviction and punishment (see S.W. v. The United Kingdom and C.R. v. The United Kingdom, 22 November 1995, §34 and § 32 respectively, Series A nos. 335-B and 335-C, and Kafkaris v. Cyprus [GC], no. 21906/04, § 137, ECHR 2008). Article 7 § 1 of the Convention sets forth the principle that only the law can define a crime and prescribe a peanlty (nullum crimen) nulla poena sine lege). It follows that offences and the relevant penalties must be clearly defined by law. This requirement is satisfied where the individual can know from the wording of the relevant provision and, if need be, with the assistance of the courts' interpretation of it, what acts and omissions will make him criminally liable (see Scoppola v. Italy (no. 2) [GC], no. 10249/03, §§ 93-94, 17 September 2009)."

Illi in oltre dik il-Qorti, dwar din id-diskrezzjoni enuncjat is-segwenti *dictum*:

43. While it may well be true that the Attorney General gave weight to a number of criteria before taking his decision, it is also true that any such criteria were not specified in any legislative text or made the subject of judicial clarification over the years. The law did not provide for any guidance on what would amount to a more serious offence or a less serious one (based on enumerated factors and criteria). The Constitutional Court (see paragraph 14 above) noted that there existed no guidelines which would aid the Attorney General in taking such a decision. Thus, the law did not determine with any degree of precision the circumstances in which a particular punishment bracket applied. An insoluble problem was posed by fixing different minimum penalties.

The Attorney General had in effect an unfettered discretion to decide which minimum penalty would be applicable with respect to the same offence. The decision was inevitably subjective and left room for arbitrariness, particularly given the lack of procedural safeguards. Neither, could such a decision be seen only or mainly in terms of abuse of power, even if, as the Government suggested without however substantiating their view, this might be subject to constitutional court (see paragraph 29 above). The Court is not persuaded by the Government's argument to the effect that it was possible that the minimum punishment before the Criminal Court would not be handed down. The Court considers that the domestic courts were bound by the Attorney General's decision as to which court would have been competent to try the accused. The Court observes that Article 21 of the Criminal Code provides for the passing of sentences below the prescribed minimum on the basis of special and exceptional reasons. However, section 120A of the Medical and Kindred Professions Ordinance, which provides for the offence with which the applicant was charged, specifically states in its subsection (7) that Article 21 of the Criminal Code shall not be applicable in respect of any person convicted of the offence at issue. On an examination of the provision, the Court finds that it would not be possible to interpret the wording of that provision otherwise. Moreover, this interpretation has been confirmed by the domestic courts, the most recent decision being that of 2008 in the above-mentioned case of The Republic of Malta v. Stanley Chircop, in which the Criminal Court considered that the application of Article 21 to the relevant offences was excluded and therefore the court could not impose a sentence below the minimum established by law. Furthermore, the Government have not provided any examples of decisions showing that a domestic court had actually done so. Thus, a lesser sentence could not be imposed despite any concerns the judge might have had as to the use of the prosecutor's discretion (ibid.).

44. In the light of the above considerations, the Court concludes that the relevant legal provision failed to satisfy the foreseeability requirement and provide effective safeguards against arbitrary punishment as provided in Article 7.

45. It follows that there has been a violation of Article 7 of the Convention.

Illi bid-decizjoni tal-Avukat Generali li johrog att ta' akkuza kontra l-esponent, l-esponent gie mqieghed f'sitwazzjoni fejn potenzjalment illum qieghed jirinfaccja piena ta' ghomor il-habs, parametri ta' piena ferm oghla minn dawk tal-Qorti tal-Magistrati.

Illi in oltre din id-diskrezzjoni ma tirrikjedix lir-ragunijiet tal-Avukat Generali jigu mfissra, b'mod li l-akkuzat qatt ma seta kien jaf jekk il-process kriminali tieghu ma kienx sejjer jintemm quddiem il-Qorti Kriminali jew le. Din hija propju l-lanjanza tal-esponent peress li din id-diskrezzjoni, kif sewwa qalet il-Qorti Ewropeja ma tissodisfax "l-forseeability test" ai finijiet tal-artikolu 7 tal-Konvenzjoni Ewropeja tad-Drittijiet tal-Bniedem.

Illi indubjament l-istess jinghad ghad-diskrezzjoni tal-Avukat Generali li johrog jew ma johrogx kontro-ordni.

Illi finalment l-esponent jaghmel referenza ghas-sentenza fl-ismijiet **Camilleri Mario vs Avukat Generali** (Rikors Numru. 84/2011) moghtija mill-Prim Awla tal-Qorti Civili (Sede Kostituzzjonali) per Onor. Imhallef Anna Felice nhar id-9 ta' Lulju 2013. Dik il-Qorti abbraccjat kompletament ir-ragunament tal-

Qorti Ewropeja hawn fuq citat u sabet lezjoni kif qieghed jinghad mill-esponent.

Illi ghalhekk l-esponent jissottometti li gie lez id-dritt tieghu tac-certezza legali hekk kif sancit fl-artikolu 7 tal-Konvenzjoni Ewropeja u l-artikolu 39(8) tal-Kostituzzjoni ta’ Malta.

Rat ir-risposta tal-intimati li in forza taghha eccepew illi:

In linea preliminari, l-esponenti jirrilevaw li l-Prim Ministru mhux il-legittimu kontradittur fl-azzjoni odjerna ai termini tal-Artikolu 181B tal-Kap 12 u ghalhekk ghandu jigi liberat mill-osservanza tal-gudizzju;

Subordinatament u minghajr pregudizzju ghas-suespost, fil-mertu l-allegazzjonijiet u l-pretensjonijiet tar-rikorrent huma infondati fil-fatt u fid-dritt u ghandhom jigu michuda stante li c-cirkostanzi ma jirrapprezentaw l-ebda ksur tad-drittijiet fundamentali tar-rikorrent ai termini tal-Artikolu 39(8) tal-Kostituzzjoni u tal-Artikolu 7 tal-Konvenzjoni Ewropea u dan ghar-ragunijiet segwenti:

Il-kariga tal-esponent Avukat Generali stabbilita a tenur tal-Artikolu 91 tal-Kostituzzjoni ta’ Malta, hija wahda li taghtih is-setgha li jistitwixxi, jaghmel u jwaqqaf proceduri kriminali, oltre setghat ohrajn moghtija lilu b’xi ligi f’termini li jawtorizzawh li jezercita dik is-setgha fil-gudizzju individwali tieghu. Ghandu jinghad li din id-diskrezzjoni hija wahda direzzjonali u mhux kostituttiva tal-azzjoni penali, liema azzjoni hija prosegwibbli indipendentement mill-esponent;

Fil-kuntest tal-proceduri odjerni d-diskrezzjoni tal-esponent Avukat Generali dwar l-ghazla tal-forum li quddiemu l-imputat gie akkuzat sabiex jigi gudikat skond il-ligi giet ezercitata proprju f'dawn il-parametri in kwantu b'mod responsabbli u kuxjenzuz wasal ghad-decizjoni tieghu fid-dawl ta' kriterji li huma facilment rintraccabbli u identifikabbli fil-gurisprudenza nostrali partikolarment il-kwantità ta' droga, it-tip ta' droga, il-livell ta' partecipazzjoni tal-akkuzat fir-reat, l-istqarrija tieghu, il-fedina penali kif ukoll aggravanti u cirkostanzi ohra specifici ghall-kaz in kwistjoni;

L-esponenti jirrilevaw li anke jekk il-kriterji uzati mill-Avukat Generali fid-decizjoni dwar il-Qorti li quddiemha tintbaghat persuna m'humiex elenkati fil-ligi, dan il-fatt wahdu m'ghandux iwassal awtomatikament ghal sejbien ta' ksur ta' drittijiet fundamentali tar-rikorrent taht l-Artikolu 7 tal-Konvenzjoni Ewropea u/jew taht l-Artikolu 39 (8) tal-Kostituzzjoni ta' Malta;

Fid-decizjoni tieghu dwar liema Qorti ghandha tisma' l-kaz, l-esponent jista' jigi skrutinjat fil-Qrati, liema Qrati jiddeterminaw jekk id-decizjoni tieghu hijiex *ultra vires* jew le;

L-esponenti isostnu li kull kaz ghandu c-cirkostanzi partikolari tieghu u l-ordni moghtija mill-Avukat Generali sabiex l-imputat odjern jitressaq quddiem il-Qorti Kriminali inghatat b'mod responsabbli u kuxjenzuz skond ic-cirkostanzi specifici tal-kaz tieghu;

Dwar ir-referenza ghad-decizjoni tal-Qorti Ewropea ghad-Drittijiet tal-Bniedem fl-ismijiet *Camilleri John v Malta*[1] li fuqha jidher li kienet ibbazata t-talba tal-imputat odjern, l-esponent jeccepixxi li

[1] Ref. App. 4293/10 [22.01.2013]

hemm distinzjoni netta bejn il-kaz odjern u dak ta’ John Camilleri;

Fl-ewwel lok, meta John Camilleri intavola l-applikazzjoni tieghu quddiem il-Qorti Ewropea huwa kien digà gie issentenzjat mill-Qorti Kriminali ghal hmistax-il sena prigunerija, piena li taqa’ biss fil-kompetenza tal-Qorti Kriminali. Madankollu, il-proceduri fil-konfront tal-imputat odjern ghadhom mhux konkluzi u, minghajr pregudizzju ghall-ezitu tal-imsemmija proceduri penali, f’dan l-istadju tibqa’ l-possibilità li, jekk l-imputat jinstab hati, jinghata piena anqas minn ghaxar snin liema piena tista’ ugwalment tinghata mill-Onorabbli Qorti tal-Magistrati (Malta) bhala Qorti ta’ Gudikatura Kriminali. Ghalhekk isegwi li l-paragun mad-decizjoni tal-Qorti Ewropea fil-kaz ta’ *Camilleri* huwa inapplikabbli;

Inoltre, fl-imsemmija decizjoni tal-Qorti Ewropea fl-ismijiet *John Camilleri v Malta*, il-lezjoni fir-rigward tal-Artikolu 7 nstabet biss fil-kuntest ta’ dak li l-Qorti Ewropea iddefiniet bhala *lack of forseeability* tal-imsemmija dispozizzjoni tal-Ordinanza dwar il-Professjoni Medika u l-Professjonijiet li ghandhom x’jaqsmu maghha fic-cirkostanzi partikolari ta’ dak il-kaz. A kuntrarju, fil-kaz odjern l-esponent huwa tal-umli fehma li r-rikorrent kellu l-possibilità kollha li janticipa u jipprevedi liema Qorti kienet ser tkun qed tisma’ u tiddeciedi l-kaz tieghu mhux biss mill-mument meta tressaq quddiem il-Qrati izda minn ferm qabel u dan kif ser jigi ippruvat waqt it-trattazzjoni tal-kawza;

Finalment u minghajr pregudizzju ghas-suespost, l-esponent ma jaqbilx mal-konkluzjonijiet tal-Qorti Ewropea fil-kaz fl-isminijiet *John Camilleri v Malta* u jabbraccja izda d-*dissenting opinion* tal-Onorevoli Imhallef Lawrence Quintano f’dik l-istess decizjoni, liema opinjoni fl-umli fehma tal-esponent tirrifletti l-

interpretazzjoni korretta kemm tal-Artikolu 7 tal-Konvenzjoni Ewropea kif ukoll tal-ligijiet u gurisprudenza nostrali;

D*ato ma non concesso* li din l-Onorabbli Qorti jidrilha li fic-cirkostanzi odjerni, hemm xi ksur tad-drittijiet fundamentali tar-rikorrent, fl-umli fehma tal-esponent dikjarazzjoni ta' ksur ghandha tkun sufficjenti;

Salv eccezzjonijiet ulterjuri, jekk ikun il-kaz.

Ghaldaqstant ghar-ragunijiet premessi, l-esponenti jitolb u bir-rispett li din l-Onorabbli Qorti joghgboha tichad it-talbiet kif dedotti fir-Rikors Promotur; bl-ispejjez kontra r-rikorrent.

Rat li fl-udjenza tat-22 ta' Novembru, 2013, quddiem din il-Qorti, ir-rikorrent irrinunzja ghat-talbiet tieghu fil-konfront tal-Onorevoli Prim Ministru;

Rat l-atti tal-Att tal-Akkuza numru 8/2013 fil-konfront ta' Jeffrey Zammit, pendenti quddiem il-Qorti Kriminali;

Semghet il-provi li ressqu l-partijiet;

Rat li ma gewx ipprezentati noti tal-osservazzjonijiet mill-partijiet;

Rat l-atti kollha tal-kawza u d-dokumenti esebiti;

Ikkunsidrat:

Illi r-rikorrent jinsab akkuzat fost affarijiet ohra, bit-traffikar tas-sustanza ecstasy, u skond ordni tal-Avukat Generali, il-kaz tieghu sejjer jigi mismugh mill-Qorti Kriminali. Il-ligi taghti fakultà jew ahjar diskrezzjoni lill-Avukat Generali jiddeciedi, skond ic-cirkostanzi tal-kaz, jekk persuna akkuzata bi traffikar tad-droga ghandhiex ikollha l-kaz taghha mismugh quddiem il-Qorti tal-Magistrati (Malta) bhala Qorti ta' Gudikatura Kriminali (fejn il-massimu tal-piena hija prigunerija ghal 10 snin più multa) jew quddiem il-Qorti Kriminali (fejn akkuzat, jekk jinstab hati ta' traffikar ta' droga, jista jehel sa ghomru l-habs) u qed jghid li din id-diskrezzjoni, kif kontemplata mill-ligi, tikser id-drittijiet fundamentali tieghu kif sanciti fl-artikolu 7 tal-Konvenzjoni ghad-Drittijiet Fundamentali tal-Bniedem, u l-artikolu 39(8) tal-Kostituzzjoni ta' Malta; fi ftit kliem, qed jallega li tali deskrizzjoni jilledi d-dritt fundamentali tieghu ghac-certezza legali.

Din il-Qorti tibda biex tghid li hawn mhux il-forum adettat fejn isir stharrig <u>tal-uzu</u> tad-diskrezzjoni f'dan il-kaz. L-uzu tad-diskrezzjoni huwa ezercizzju amministrattiv li, bhal kull decizjoni amministrattiva, <u>jista'</u> jkun sindakabbli mill-qrati ordinarji bis-sahha tal-poteri generali taghhom ta' stharrig gudizzjarju tal-ghemil tal-gvern. Din il-Qorti la hija kompetenti u lanqas ma giet mitluba mill-Qorti tal-Kriminali li tissindika d-diskrezzjoni uzata mill-Avukat Generali fil-konfront ta' Jeffrey Zammit, izda trid tara biss jekk id-diskrezzjoni moghtija bil-ligi lill-Avukat Generali jilledix id-dritt tar-rikorrent skont l-artikolu 7 tal-Konvenzjoni Ewropea dwar id-Drittijiet tal-Bniedem u l-artikolu 39(8) tal-Kostituzzjoni.

Din il-materja giet diskussa mill-Qorti Ewropea dwar id-Drittijiet tal-Bniedem fil-kawza "<u>Camilleri vs Malta</u>", deciza fit-22 ta' Jannar

2013, u anke mill-Qorti Kostituzzjonali fil-kaz "Camilleri vs Avukat Generali", u dan fid-decizjoni fuq talba preliminari li tat fl-1 ta' Lulju 2013. F'dan l-ahhar kaz, il-Qorti Kostituzzjonali ghamlet dawn l-osservazzjonijiet in materja.

"*Wiehed ifakkar li ilment simili, in kwantu bazat fuq l-Artikolu 6 (dritt ghal smiegh xieraq), ma kienx gie accettat mill-Qorti Ewropeja, u l-ilment gie accettat taht l-Artikolu 7, in kwantu din id-diskrezzjoni tal-Avukat Generali setghet thalli f'mohh l-akkuzat incertezza dwar il-piena li seta' jehel. Kif, pero`, osservat il-Qorti Ewropeja fid-decizjoni taghha* ***Camilleri v. Malta****.*

"Further, the Court cannot speculate as to the tribunal to which the applicant would have been committed for trial had the law satisfied the requirement of foreseeability. Indeed, the present case does not concern the imposition of a heavier sentence than that which was applicable at the time of the commission of the criminal offence or the denial of the benefit of a provision prescribing a more lenient penalty which came into force after the commission of the offence (see, inter alia, Alimucaj v. Albania, no. 20134/05, 7 February 2012; Scoppola (no. 2), cited above, and K v. Germany, no. 61827/09, 7 June 2012) and therefore the Court does not consider it necessary to indicate any specific measure".

Ghalhekk, il-process tas-smiegh tal-guri mhux per se jmur kontra d-drittijiet tal-bniedem, anke taht ic-cirkostanzi lamentati mir-rikorrent, dejjem jekk jitmexxa b'mod gust u jaghti lill-akkuzat smiegh xieraq. Ir-rimedju f'kaz ta' sejbien ta' ksur mhux it-twaqqif jew it-thassir tal-process kriminali, cioe`, ta' dak li jkun sar bl-ezercizzju tad-diskrezzjoni tal-Avukat Generali, u kwindi l-guri f'dan il-kaz m'ghandux jitwaqqaf. Il-Qorti Ewropeja ghamlitha cara illi dak li sabet kien biss nuqqas ta' forseeability prevvist mill-Artikolu 7 tal-Konvenzjoni Ewropeja, liema nuqqas certament ma jfissirx li l-process kriminali ghandu jieqaf u ma

ghandux iservi sabiex igib bhala konsegwenza l-paralizi tas-sistema gudizzjarja. Il-fatt li, skont il-Qorti Ewropeja (b'dissenting opinion tal-Imhallef Malti), l-akkuzat li allegatament wettaq ir-reat seta' ma kienx jaf il-massimu tal-piena li seta' jkun soggett ghalih jekk jinqabad u jinstab hati, ma ghandux izomm is-smiegh innifsu tal-kaz, li hija haga indipendenti mill-prevedibbilita` o meno tal-piena. Il-piena hi dik stabbilita fil-ligi fil-mument li allegatament twettaq ir-reat, u n-nuqqas ta' forseeability jista' jaghti lok ghal xi rimedju iehor, izda mhux li jitwaqqaf il-process gudizzjarju fil-konfront tal-persuna implikata."

Din il-Qorti taqbel ma dan il-pronunzjament, izda bhala rimedju ma tarax li tista' tordna lill-Avukat Generali johrog kontro-ordni fil-konfront tar-rikorrent, apparti l-fatt li ma jidhirlix li hu opportun, f'dan il-kaz, li din il-Qorti taghti tali ordni.

Jibqa' l-fatt però li l-proceduri fil-konfront tal-akkuzat odjern ghadhom mhux konkluzi, u ghalkemm f'dan l-istadju hemm il-possibilità li, jekk l-akkuzat jinstab hati, jinghata piena ghola minn ghaxar snin, sa issa ma hemmx sejbien ta' htija, u kif jinghad fil-ktieb ta' Harris O'Boyle & Warbrick, "Law of the European Convention on Human Rights" (pagna 332):

"The wording of article 7 (1) is limited to cases in which a person is ultimately 'held guilty' of a criminal offence. A prosecution that does not lead to a conviction or has not yet done so, cannot raise an issue under article 7 – at least not by means of an individual application".

Hekk ukoll il-Kummissjoni Ewropea tad-Drittijiet tal-Bniedem, fil-kaz "Lukanov v. Bulgaria", deciza fit-12 ta' Jannar 1995, osservat a propozitu illi:

"6. Under Article 7 (Art. 7) of the Convention the applicant complains that criminal proceedings were instituted against him on the basis of acts which did not constitute a criminal offence at the time when they were committed.

The Commission notes that the proceedings instituted against the applicant have not yet been terminated. He has not, therefore, been "held guilty of any criminal offence" as set out in Article 7 para. 1 (Art. 7-1) of the Convention.

The applicant cannot, therefore, be regarded as a victim of a violation of Article 7 (Art. 7) of the Convention. This part of the application is therefore manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 27 para. 2 (Art. 27-2) of the Convention."

L-azzjoni attrici hi, ghalhekk intempestiva u ma tistax tigi milqugha u dan anke taht id-dispost tal-artikolu 39(8) tal-Kostituzzjoni.

Ghaldaqstant ghar-ragunijiet premessi, tiddisponi mir-rikors ta' Jeffrey Zammit billi tiddikjara t-talbiet tieghu intempestivi, u tillibera lill-intimat mill-osservanza tal-gudizzju.

Bl-ispejjez jithallsu mir-rikorrent.

< Sentenza Finali >

--------------------------------TMIEM--------------------------------