



QORTI TA' L-APPELL

**ONOR. IMHALLEF
MARK CHETCUTI**

Seduta tad-9 ta' Ottubru, 2013

Appell Civili Numru. 125/2012

Joseph Attard

vs

L-Awtorita' ta' Malta dwar l-Ambjent u l-Ippjanar

Il-Qorti,

Rat ir-rikors tal-appell ta' Joseph Attard tal-10 ta' Awwissu 2012 mid-decizjoni ta' rifjut tal-applikazzjoni PA 2143/2009 decizja mit-Tribunal ta' Revizjoni tal-Ambjent u l-Ippjanar tal-31 ta' Lulju 2012 ghal zvilupp ta' 'zewg garages f'sit li jinsab fi Triq l-Assedju l-Kbir, Tarxien';

Rat ir-risposta tal-Awtorita li ssottomettiet illi l-appell ghandu jigi michud u d-decizjoni tat-Tribunal konfermata;

Rat l-atti kollha u semghet id-difensuri tal-partijiet;

Kopja Informali ta' Sentenza

Rat id-decizjoni tat-Tribunal li tghid hekk:
Ikkunsidra:

A. Il-Kummissjoni ghall-Kontroll ta' l-Izvilupp, fit-28 ta' Jannar 2011, irrifjutat l-applikazzjoni ghall-permess tal-izvilupp PA 2143/09 "Site at Triq l-Assedju l-Kbir, Tarxien: Construct 2 garages."

L-unika raguni ghar-rifjut kienet is-segwenti:

"1. The site falls within Il-Qalgha mixed development area as per Local Plan Policy SMTA 02, which requires comprehensive development consisting of a mix of residential, commercial, recreational and community facilities. The proposed single-plot development would compromise the implementation of the provisions of this policy."

B. In-nota tal-Perit Samuel Formosa ghall-Appellant, ipprezentata fit-22 ta' Frar 2011, senjatament il-punti segwenti:

"1. Land privately owned

The main reason for this refusal concerns the matter that the land was considered to pertain to the Joint Office and thus the proposed development would compromise the master plan of the area. My client explained that the site is privately owned and has a legal document to reflect this ownership [...] and is in fact declared in the certificate of ownership, B1. Consequently, since that part of the site which is privately owned has been substantially compromised and parcelled to individual plots as argued by the DPA report, my client is claiming that mutatis mutandis, the same reasoning should be applied (since it is also privately owned) and a permit issued similarly for this proposed development.

2. Comprehensive Development

MEPA is arguing that the site has been divided into two sections – part which should be developed comprehensively and the remaining part (which is privately owned) parcelled into individual plots. My client

has sought legal advice through this matter and has confirmed that the procedures for establishing this 'division' in the comprehensive plan were entirely not followed – no PA application was submitted, no notices in local newspapers, no information as to how the area was going to be partitioned was ever sent to the Owners of the Land as requested by the Development Planning Act. Consequently, this arbitrary partition/division does not have any legal status and should be ignored.”

C. In-nota risposta ta' Mario Scicluna ghall-Awtorita', ipprezentata fis-7 t'April 2011, inter alia l-hames punti segwenti:

"5.1.5 While it is correct that 3 plots of land were granted a permit in the southern part of this site, these permits were granted by the DCC since Policy SMTA 02 does not make a blanket prohibition for permits on individual plots in this specific area. However, the Authority had received queries from the Tarxien Local Council enquiring the rational of such permits when this policy favours comprehensive development. The Authority thus initiated an internal clarification process which would clarify the policy's principal intention. In fact, the LPU had proposed to MEPA Board an 'Interpretation of Policy SMTA 02 plan' for this particular area and which clarified which are the areas which are to be developed comprehensively and those which could be development on individual plots. The MEPA Board's decision as taken on 20th January 2010 established a formal interpretation of the same Policy SMTA 02 by which all undecided applications were to be assessed (copy attached). It is to be noted that applicant was in contact with LPU and was also given a copy of this approved 'Interpretation of Policy' document. A copy was also forwarded to the Tarxien Local Council which was very much interested in the planning designation of this undeveloped large piece of land.

5.1.6 Appellant had also produced his contract of purchase of the land under appeal (Red 26A) but which is dated 19th February 2009. This is by far after the issuing of Policy SMTA 02 which was published on August 2006

and which clearly stated that the whole area was encouraged to be developed comprehensively. Furthermore, at that time, the Government Property Division had informed the Authority that the Northern Part was Joint Office Property whilst the southern part was owned by third parties. Hence, Policy SMTA 02 was correct to encourage comprehensive development whilst permitting permits for individual plots in certain circumstances. Thus, when applicant purchased this piece of land subject to this appeal, the official land planning designation was still encouraging comprehensive development and that any permit issued in the southern part would not automatically enable further permits anywhere in this large piece of land when the policy itself states 'MEPA encourages the comprehensive development of this entire site.'

5.1.7 As regards to the alleged incomplete process of the interpretation exercise, the Authority disagrees that this process was somehow incomplete since in fact, there was no change to Policy SMTA 02 in that there was no change in the Use, Road alignment or Height Limitation to those which was published in August 2006 with the issue of the South Malta Local Plan. The 'interpretation plan' in fact clarified what was already declared in Policy SMTA 02 so that there would be a more 'clear' and 'consistent' planning framework for this particular area so that the deciding bodies would now take a more consistent approach and decisions.

5.1.8 The Authority also disagrees that this clarification was not forwarded to appellant since appellant and his architect met officials of the Local Planning Unit in a formal meeting held at MEPA on 12th April 2010 and a copy of the 'Interpretation Plan' was sent on 15th April 2010. Furthermore, the only official ownership document that had reached the LPU re this site was that from the Government Property Division which had declared that the 'northern part' was the property of the Joint Office. The Local Plan was formulated on this information and hence a 'comprehensive' development was in fact possible and feasible in this specific area.

5.1.9 Furthermore, the Tribunal is informed that in this particular file, petitions were received as objections to the proposed development by many neighbours who reiterated their objections since the proposed development is not for residential use as per policy and breaches the relevant policy.”

D. In-nota ta' sottomissjonijiet tal-Avukat Dott. Peter Borg Costanzi ghall-Appellant, ipprezentata fid-29 ta' Novembru 2011, senjatament il-punti segwenti:

“Huwa rilevanti li jinghad li din il-policy giet emendata fis-sens illi: ‘Policy also allows the development of site as plots provided a planning contribution is made as per policy SMTA 02.’

Fid-dawl ta' din l-emenda hargu numru ta' permessi:

PA 6257/06 – 14/04/2008

PA 5587/06 – 02/11/2006

PA 3798/06 – 24/11/2008

PA 4103/08 – 25/11/2008

PA 2630/07 – 26/06/2007

Il-klijent tieghi ghandu dritt li l-applikazzjoni tieghu tigi trattata bl-istess mod kif gew trattati l-imsemmija applikazzjonijiet.

Apparti dan il-fatt li hargu l-permessi fuq imsemmija, juru bic-car li l-emenda imsemmija giet anke applikata fl-area. Huwa rilevanti wkoll li sallum ma sarits l-allegata ‘comprehensive’ application.

Fis-sentenza ricenti Leonard Cassar vs Awtorita' ta' Malta dwar l-Ambjent u l-lppjanar moghtija fit-28 ta' Gunju 2011 gie kjarament kjarifikat mill-Qorit li l-principji ta' commitment u cerimus paribus ghandhom jigu applikati u ma jistghux jigu nrorati.

Vide wkoll sentenza ohra tal-istess Qorti li nghatat fl-24 ta' Frar 2011 – Appell Civili Numru 6/2010 “Joseph Tonna vs L-Awtorita' ta' Malta dwar l-Ambjent u l-lppjanar” u s-

sentenzi hemm citati fosthom “Alex Montanaro nomine vs il-Kummissjoni ghall-Kontroll ta' I-Izvilupp” (AC – 9 ta' Frar 2001); “Marie Louise Farrugia vs Kummissjoni ghall-Kontroll ta' I-Izvilupp” (AIC 24 ta' Marzu 2003); u “Michael Gatt vs. I-Awtorita' ta' I-Ippjanar” (AC – 19 ta' Novembru 2001); “Max Zerafa vs Kummissjoni ghall-Kontroll ta' I-Izvilupp” (A.I.C. (RCP) – 12 ta' Jannar 2004; “Santinu Gauci vs Kummissjoni ghall-Kontroll ta' I-Izvilupp” (A.I.C. (RCP) – 24 ta' Marzu 2003); “Jimmy Vella vs Kummissjoni ghall-Kontroll ta' I-Izvilupp”(A.I.C. (RCP) – 24 ta' Marzu 2003); “Iganatius Attard vs Kummissjoni ghall-Kontroll ta' I-Izvilupp” (A.I.C. (RCP) – 26 ta' Mejju 2004); “Andrew Mangion vs Kummissjoni ghall-Kontroll ta' I-Izvilupp” (A.I.C. (RCP) – 27 ta' Ottubru 2003); u dawk citati mill-appelat fl-ismijet “Joseph Muscat vs I-Awtorita' ta' Malta dwar I-Ambjent u I-Ippjanar” (A.I.C. (PS) – 18 ta' Mejju 2005);

Apparti dan, 'il fuq imsemmija sentenza ta' Cassar vs MEPA ghamlet referenza ghal sentenzi Alex Montanaro nomine vs Kummissjoni ghall-Kontroll ta' I-Izvilupp (Appell 9 ta' Frar 2001) u Michelle Dingli vs Kummissjoni ghall-Kontroll ta' I-Izvilupp deciza fit-31 ta' Marzu 2006.

Apparti dan issir referenza anke ghal decizjoni tal-Planning Appeals Board fil-kaz fl-ismijiet George Farrugia vs MEPA deciz nhar id-29 ta' Lulju 2009 (PAB 89/09 RT. 1011/08).

Id-direttorat jaghmel referenza wkoll ghall-‘interpretazjoni’ maghmula mill-MEPA Board fil-kors ta' dawn il-proceduri. Jigi enfazzat li l-esponenti ma kienx parti f'dawn il-proceduri. Apparti dan, din hija biss fehma tal-MEPA Board minghajr ma din ghandha xi vinkolu legali jew jedd li tbiddel il-policy in kwistjoni.

L-opinjoni tal-MEPA Board hija biss semplici opijoni - xejn izjed u xejn inqas – pero m'ghandiex il-jedd li tvarja l-policy kif approvata.”.

E. In-nota second statement ta' Mario Scicluna ghall-Awtorita', ipprezentata fit-22 ta' frar 2012, inter alia l-punti segwenti:

“Whilst it is correct for appellant to quote that ‘Policy also allows the development of site as plots provided a planning contribution is made as per policy SMTA 02 this citation is to be made reference to that the document map ‘Interpretation of Policy SMTA 02’ as already attached to the Authority’s first statement and which is clearly relates to the ‘southern’ part of this site as identified by an orange border. However, as indicated in the screenshot in page 4 of the Authority’s first statement, appellant’s site is in fact well beyond the border between in south and north part of this site and is in fact located in the central part of the area bordered with a violet colour and which is in turn designated as “Comprehensive Area Development as per Policy SMTA 02, SMLP (2006)”

Ikkunsidra ulterjorment:

Il-mertu ta' dan l-appell jirrigwarda proposta sabiex jinbnew zewg garaxxijiet b' dawl, fond u gholi ta' 4.5, 8.0 u 3.7 metri rispettivament, f' sit li jinsab f' arja maghrufa bhala il-Qalgha f' Hal Tarxien u li skond il-policy SMTA 02 tal-Pjan Lokali (SMLP), hi ndikata bhala mixed (omprehensive) development area; cjoe' fejn jista' jigi permess zvilupp mhallat ta' natura residenzjali, kummercali, rikreattiva kif ukoll ta' facilitajiet komunitarji.

Ir-raguni tar-rifjut jistrieħu fuq il-fatt li propju peress li din iz-zona hi ndikata bhala mixed development area, din il-proposta għall-single plot b' zewg garaxxijiet, ser tikkomprometti l-implimentazzjoni (ulterjuri) tal-policy SMTA 02.

Iz-zona in kwistjoni tkopri firxa ta' 28,000 metru kwadru u hi ndikata fil-Mappa TA 1 bhala mixed development area, u skond il-policy SMTA 02 kellha tigi zviluppata bhala comprehensive development li jikkonsisti minn 65% ta' uzi residenzjali, kummercjali, etc., u 35% ta' spazji ghar-

rikreazzjoni, etc.; cjo' mixed use b' minimu ta' 350 unit residenzjali gewwa urban park.

Tajjeb li jinghad li l-policy SMTA 02, minbarra li tispjega kif il-mixed development area ghandha tinqasam: theggeg li jigu sottomessi proposti ghal-comprehensive development u in ogni caso proposti li jkopru bcejec ta' art ta' mhux anqas minn 3,000 metri kwardi anke fl-ambitu ta' Floor Area Ratio (FAR); u dan sabiex jinholq zvilupp armonjuz, olistiku, etc., li jipprekludi l-izvilupp ta' plots individwali. Madankollu, il-policy mhix tassattiva u galadarba jigu sottomessi applikazzjonijiet ghal-plots individwali – propju bhal dan mertu tal-appell de quo – titlob li jsir 'appropriate planning contribution' li jaghmel tajjeb ghat-telf ta' spazju ghar-rikreazzjoni.

In oltre, fl-interpretation policy document SMTA 02, din l-istess mixed development area hi maqsuma fi tnejn; bl-ikbar parti - propju fejn jaqa' is-sit in ezami – indikata bhala 'comprehensive area development as per policy SMTA 02, SMLP (2006)' u l-parti iz-zghajra ndikata bhala 'area can be developed as per individual plot (planning gain of Euro 20/sqm floorspace to apply).'

L-aggravji tal-appellant huma bbazati fuq il-premessa li l-publikazzjoni tal-interpretation document tal-policy SMTA 02 kien ghal kollox illegittimu, ghax inter alia qatt ma' kien gie kkonsultat. Jargumenat wkoll li in ogni caso, dan id-dokument hu sempliciment opinjoni tal-Awtorita' u li f' ic-cirkostanzi ghandha tiehu s-sopravvent il-policy SMTA 02 per se; fejn ma' jsir l-ebda distinzjoni bejn parti u ohra fl-istess mixed development area kif rilevat supra, u li l-istess mixed development area ghandha tinqara bhala wahda w unika.

Jargumenat wkoll li f' iz-zona kienu diga' nhargu permessi allegatament simili ghall-applikazzjoni tieghu u li ghalhekk dawn diga' jxejnu l-possibilita' li titwettaq il-comprehensive development indikat mill-istess policy.

L-Awtorita' tirrileva li meta' l-interpretation document kien gie ppublikat, il-bicca art in ezami kienet ghadha f' idejn il-

Gvern. Tiskota tispjega li l-Government Property Division kienet ikkonfermat li din l-area tappartjeni lill-Gvern u fil-fatt, kif jidher mis-sottomissjonijiet tal-Appellant fil-file tal-applikazzjoni (red 26A), l-art inxtrat mill-istess Appellant f' April 2009, cjo' kwazi tlett snin wara li dahal fis-sehh il-Pjan Lokali u l-interpretation document sussegwenti. L-Awtorita' tikkontendi wkoll, li meta kkunsidrat li taqsam il-mixed development area fil-partijiet rilevati supra, ghamlet dan bl-intendiment car li l-area ndikata bhala 'comprehensive are development as per policy SMTA 02', kienet (dakinhar) tapparjeni lill-Gvern, u li l-'area [that] can be developed as per individual plot, etc.', hi dik f' idejn ta' terzi.

L-Appellant jiccita hames permessi li nhargu fil mixed development area, ghal-zvilupp allegatament simili ghal dan in ezami; kif ukoll ben sittax il-decizjoni tal-Qorti tal-Appell, bhala kazistika fir-rigward tal-principji ta' commitment u cerimus paribus. Jidher pero', li l-hames permessi citati, jaqghu f' dik l-area z-zghira li tista' tigi zviluppata bhala plots etc., mentre l-fond tieghu jaghmel parti mill-area l-aktar kbira, cjo' dik indikata ghall-comprehensive development.

Terga', mill-hames permessi citati, jirrizulta li minn dawn, tnejn minnhom jirrigwardaw emendi ghal permessi li kienu diga' nhargu precedentement, u ghalhekk, jista jinghad li l-kazistika citata mill-Appellant tapplika biss ghal-tlett siti. In ogni caso, il-hames permessi citati huma s-segwenti:

- PA 3798/06 - Proposed basement parking, ground floor showroom, workshop, store and overlying first floor office.
- PA 6257/06 - Elevated terraced house, including underlying garage at ground floor and basement level.
- PA 4103/08 - Amendments to permit PA 6257/06 due to change in plot dimensions for terraced house with underlying garage.
- PA 5587/06 - Construction of ground floor garage for private use and stairwell leading to airspace.

- PA 2630/07 - Amendments to permit PA 5587/06 due to change in plot dimensions (garage).

Dan ifisser li anke fil-kuntest ta' planning commitment, minn dawn it-tlett siti, l-ewwel tnejn jirrigwardaw kemm mixed commercial development u residential development precizament kif trid il-policy SMTA 02, fil-waqt li l-ahhar wiehed jirrigwarda garaxx b'access separat ghall-fuq il-bejt, u cjoe' b' intiza cara li fil-futur, l-izvilupp jista' jigi estiz ghall-mixed development, ukoll in linja ma' dak stabbilit mill-istess policy SMTA 02.

Fil-kaz in ezami pero', peress li ma' giex (per ezempju) provdut access separat ghal-ajra fuq il-garaxxijiet, johrog car li fuq is-sit ma hemmx lok li jista jsix xi zvilupp (ulterjuri) ta' natura mhallta; ghax permezz tal-applikazzjoni in ezami, gie a priori eskluż kwalsiasi access ghall-arja sovrastanti l-garaxxijiet proposti. Ghalhekk, ma' jistax isir paragun bejn il-permessi citati u l-applikazzjoni in ezami.

F' ic-cirkostanzi dan it-Tribunal hu til-fehma kkunsidrata li lanqas ma' jezisti l-allegat commitment kif dikjarat mill-Appellant; la minn aspekk ta' commitment in kwantu cerimus paribus u lanqas fil-kuntest ta' planning commitment; ghax il-permessi li nhargu fl-area – kuntrarju ghall-applikazzjoni odjerna - ma jipprekludux l-izvilupp ta' din iz-zona skond dak li hu indikat permezz tal-policy SMTA 02, u di konsegwenza dan l-appell ma jimmeritax kunsiderazzjoni favorevoli.

Ghalhekk, in vista tal-konsiderazzjonijiet kollha hawn fuq maghmula, u fuq kollox sabiex ikun konformi mal-policies tal-ippjanar vigenti, dan il-Tribunal qed jiddisponi minn dan l-appell billi jichad l-istess u jikkonferma ir-rifjut ghall-PA 2143/09 mahrug mill-Kummissjoni ghall-Kontroll ta' l-izvilupp, fit-28 ta' Jannar 2011.

Ikkunsidrat

L-aggravji tal-appellant huma s-segwenti:

1. Id-decizjoni tikkontjeni zbalji ta' fatt meta intqal li parti mill-art in kwistjoni u cioe fejn tinstab l-art tal-appellant kienet tippartjeni l-Gvern u inxtrat mill-applikant f'April 2009 cioe tlett snin wara l-pjan lokali u l-interpretation document. Jirrizulta li l-applikant xtara l-art fi Frar 2009 u l-interpretation document sar fl-20 ta' Jannar 2010;
2. It-Tribunal ma indirizzax il-lanjanzi tal-appellant jekk jistax isir zvilupp ta' single plotes jew le u jekk l-interpretation document ghandux validita legali li jvarja jew ibiddel policy;
3. La darba terzi inghataw permess fuq parti ohra tal-istess art l-appellant kellu l-istess dritt u kien hemm commitment.

L-ewwel aggravju

Kuntrarjament ghal dak li qalet l-Awtorita fis-sottomissjonijiet taghha ghal dan l-appell, it-Tribunal ikkostata bhala fatt fl-ewwel paragrafu ta' pagna 7 tad-decizjoni tieghu illi l-Awtorita ssottomettiet li z-zona in kwistjoni kienet tappartjeni lil Gvern. It-Tribunal zied ma' dan illi mis-sottomissjonijiet tal-appellant fil-file tal-applikazzjoni l-art inxtrat mill-appellant f'April 2009 kwazi tlett snin wara li dahal fis-sehh il-pjan lokali u l-interpretation document sussegwenti.

Ghalkemm il-Qorti ma taghtix wisq importanza dwar l-izball ovvju dwar ix-xahar meta nxtrat l-art li tiffirma l-mertu tal-applikazzjoni cioe jekk hux Frar jew April 2009, pero ma tistax tinjora bhala zball dattilografiku l-istatment car tat-Tribunal illi l-art tal-appellant inxtrat wara li sar l-interpretation document meta jirrizulta li sar wara li kien applika, cioe fl-2010.

Il-Qorti tqis li statement simili mhux negligibbli fid-dawl tal-kontenzjoni u l-aggravji tal-applikant u anqas ma tista din il-Qorti tkun konvinta li hu zball dattilografu billi t-Tribunal ma jsemmi xejn aktar fuq il-punt u jdur fuq argumenti ohra.

Kopja Informali ta' Sentenza

Dan hu zball sostanzjali speċjalment meta jitqies li din il-konstatazzjoni seta' kellha effett fuq il-valur u portata tal-interpretation document u ser jigi trattat fit-tieni aggravju.

Jekk wiehed jara l-argumenti tal-Awtorita riportati mit-Tribunal verbatim jinduna li l-izbalji saru mit-Tribunal ghax l-Awtorita ssenjalat il-fatti saljenti b'mod korrett kif imsemmija mill-appellant f'dan l-ewwel aggravju.

Dan l-aggravju ghalhekk qed jigi milqugh u wahdu jaghti incertezza ghal dak kollu li kkunsidra t-Tribunal sussegwentement ghal din l-enuncjazzjoni zbaljata ta' fatti saljenti.

It-tieni aggravju

It-Tribunal li jidher li beda fuq zball ta' fatt sostanzjali dwar kif u meta saru l-policy, u l-interpretation document b'referenza ghal applikazzjoni in kwistjoni, ma ha ebda konjizzjoni tal-ilment tal-appellant dwar kemm l-interpretation document kellha validita ghal mod kif saret u jekk setghetx interpretation document anki jekk validu ghandux jedd li jbidel policy. Dawn huma lanjanzi li tressqu quddiem it-Tribunal u kienu importanti li jigu indirizzati ghax l-ezitu tal-appell fuq il-mertu kien dipendenti fuq ir-risposta ghal dawn l-aggravji.

Hu pacifiku illi aggravji li jistghu jaffettwaw decizjoni ghandhom jigu indirizzati, kunsidrati b'mod serju tali li jaghtu risposta cara ghall-aggravju. Il-Qorti mhix ser tikkunsidra hi dawn l-aggravji ghax din hi mansjoni tat-Tribunal li kellu u messu indirizzhom. Pero dan ma ghamlux u ghalhekk il-Qorti tqis li d-decizjoni hi serjament mankranti fuq l-aspett legali tal-kwistjoni u ghalhekk kellha tigi indirizzata b'mod diligenti u responsabbli.

Ghalhekk din hi raguni ohra ghaliex id-decizjoni hi monka u l-aggravju ghandu jigi milqugh.

A bazi ta-konkuzjonijiet tat-Tribunal fuq din il-kwistjoni, jinsorgi mbaghad konsiderazzjoni dwar dik il-parti tal-aggravju dwar il-kontenut tal-policy u cioe jekk plots

Kopja Informali ta' Sentenza

singoli humiex permissibbli pero tali konsiderazzjoni tidhol fi-sehh wara li t-Tribunal ikun iddecieda fuq il-portata u effetti tal-interpretation document.

Ghalhekk il-Qort qed tastjeni milli tippronunzja ruhha fuq dan l-aggravju f'dan l-istadju.

It-tielet aggravju

Ghall-istess raguni moghtija fil-paragrafu precedenti din il-Qorti tqis li ma ghandhiex tippronunzja ruhha fuq dan l-aggravju billi hu dependenti fuq dak li ser jerga' jikkunsidra t-Tribunal dwar l-aggravji msemmija aktar il-fuq u hu prematur f'dan l-istadju li jigi trattati kwistjonijiet ta' trattament ugwali u commitment qabel mal-kwistjoni principali fuq l-interpretation document tigi kunsidrata sew u deciza mit-Tribunal.

Decide

Ghalhekk ghar-ragunijiet imsemmija aktar il-fuq, il-Qorti qed tilqa' l-appell ta' Joseph Attard u tirrevoka u thassar id-decizjoni tat-Tribunal ta' Revizjoni tal-Ambjent u l-Ippjanar tal-31 ta' Lulju 2012 u tirrinviija l-atti quddiem it-Tribunal biex jerga' jisma' l-kaz u jiddeciedi. Spejjez ghall-Awtorita.

< Sentenza Finali >

-----TMIEM-----