

## **Court of Magistrates (Malta) As a Court of Criminal Judicature**

## Magistrate Dr. Doreen Clarke LL.D.

Today, the 7th July 2016

## The Police (Inspector Jonathan Ransley) vs Adrian Constantin Mandrila

The Court

Having seen the charges against Adrian Constantin Mandila, holder of Maltese Identity Card number 58414A.

Charged with having through several acts committed by him, even if at different times, constituting violations of the same provision of the law and committed in pursuance of the same design, during the months, between the year 2013 and 2015, from company Unibet Interational Limited:

By means of any unlawful practice or by the use of any fictitious name or the assumption of any false designation or by means of any other deceit, device or pretence calculated to lead to the belief in the existence of any fictitious enterprise or of any imaginary power, influence or credit, or to create the expectation or apprehension of any chimerical events, made gain of  $\notin$ 1,915 to the prejudice of Unibet International Ltd and/or other entities;

Converted to his own benefit or to the benefit of any other person the amount of  $\notin 1,915$ , which had been entrusted or delivered to him under a title which implied an obligation to return such thing or to make use thereof for a specific purpose, when he was employed with Unibet International Ltd.

Having seen the consent of the Attorney General for this case to be tried summarily by this Court as a Court of Criminal Judicature.

Having seen that the defendant had no objection to the case being so tried.

Having seen that the prosecuting officer withdrew the first charge.

Having seen that the defendant admitted the second charge brought against him and that he confirmed this admission of guilt even after having been given time to reconsider his plea.

Having heard the submissions of the parties regarding the penalty to be meted out.

Having seen the acts of the proceedings.

Having considered

That the first charge was withdrawn; the proceedings in relation t this first charge are consequently extinct.

That the defendant admitted the second charge brought against him; this is consequently sufficiently proven.

With regards to the penalty to be meted out the Court took into consideration the nature of the offence which the defendant is being found guilty of, his co-operation with the police, his admission at an early stage of the proceedings and his clean conviction sheet. The Court also took into consideration the fact that the defendant is willing to compensate the injured party. Wherefore, the Court, whilst declaring the proceedings in relation to the first charge extinct, after having seen sections 18, 293, 294 and 310(1)(b) of Chapter 9 of the Laws of Malta, on his admission finds defendant guilty of the second charge brought against him and by application of section 7 of Chapter 446 of the Laws of Malta places him under an order of probation for a period of two years with the conditions imposed in the order given separately. Furthermore and by application of section 24 of the said Chapter 446 the defendant is hereby ordered to pay the injured party (Unibet International Limited) the sum of six hundred and one Euros (€601) within two months.

The Court explained to the defendant in ordinary language the significance of this judgement and of the consequences should he commit an other offence in the period of two years and if fails to abide by the conditions imposed.

DR. DOREEN CLARKE MAGISTRATE