

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MALAYA AT KUALA LUMPUR
IN THE FEDERAL TERRITORY OF KUALA LUMPUR
IN THE MATTER OF CRIMINAL APPEAL NO:
42 (S) -68-06 /2016 & 42 (H) -80-06-2016.

BETWEEN

LEE MAY LING

APPELLANT

AND

PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

RESPONDENT

(Cross-appeal)

BETWEEN

PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

APPELLANT

AND

LEE MAY LING

RESPONDENT

JUDGMENT

This appeal is by the appellant, Lee May Ling against the decision of the learned Sessions Court Judge, Kuala Lumpur (hereinafter called 'the learned SCJ') meted out whereby the appellant was found guilty for an offence under Section 4(1) (c) of the Sedition Act, 1948 and sentenced

to an imprisonment term of five (5) months and 22 days from 27.5.2016. There is also a cross-appeal by the prosecution against the inadequacy of sentence meted out by the learned SCJ.

Amended Charge:

'Bahawa kamu bersama-sama diantara 12.7.2013 jam lebih kurang 9 pagi di pautan <https://www.facebook.com/photo.php?Fbid+=617457598272144&set=a.512860642065174.123291.509820495702522&type=1&theatre> dengan niat bersaama telah menerbitkan satu penerbitan menghasut di laman muka buku (facebook) 'Alvin and Vivian-Alvivi' iaitu satu kandungan gambar dan komen iaitu kandungan gambar dan komen yang bertajuk 'selamat Berbuka Puasa (dengan Bak Kut Teh.wangi,enak, meyelerakan!!!' yang mengandungi logo Halal (kandungan sepenuhnya dilampirkan bersama peertuduhan ini sebagai Lampiran 'A' dan ayat-ayat yang mempunyai kecederungan menghasut digariskan) yang mana penerbitan tersebut telah dibaca oleh Mohammad Fakhri bin Mansor di Bahagian Kandungan Komunikasi Dan Perkhidmatan Pos, Kementerian Komunikasi dan Multimedia Malaysia, Presint 4, Putrajaya dan oleh yang demikian, kamu telah melakukan satu kesalahan dibawah subseksyen 4(1)(c) Akta Hasutan 1948 (Akta 15) yang boleh dihukum di bawah subseksyen 4(1) Akta yang sama dan dibaca bersama Seksyen 34 Kanun Keseksaan.'

Section 4(1) (c) states as follows:

'(1) Any person who:-

(c) prints, publishes, sells, offers for sale, distributes or reproduces any seditious publication;

shall be guilty of an offence and shall , on conviction be liable for a first offence to a fine not exceeding five thousand ringgit or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three years or both and for subsequent offence.....'

On 10.4.2018, the Court heard the appeal and after perusing the appeal record and reading the written submissions and hearing further oral submissions from both parties, dismissed the appeal on conviction but substituted the sentence of five months (5) and 22 days imprisonment with a fine in the sum of RM5, 000.00.in default, imprisonment of 6 months. The Court in the same vein dismissed the prosecution's appeal on inadequacy of sentence. Both the parties were disenchanted with the said decision and have since filed respective notice of appeal at the Court of Appeal against conviction and sentence.

Observation by the Court:

The Court observed that the appeal was against the amended charge pursuant to Section 4(1)(c) of the Sedition Act, 1948 and read together with Section 34 of the Penal Code. Initially the appellant was jointly charged with another co-accused, named Tan Jye Yee, however in the midst of the trial when the case was adjourned and then resumed, Tan Jye Yee had absconded. The trial resumed in the absence of Tan Jye Yee. Until the conclusion of the trial, Tan Jye Yee was absent. The Court found that the Notice of Appeal by the appellant was against conviction and sentence whereas the appeal by the prosecution was against adequacy of sentence. Both appeals were for the charge pursuant Section 4 (1) (c) of the Sedition Act, 1948 and not against Section 5 (1) Film Censorship Act, 2002. The learned SCJ nevertheless in his judgment at pages 63-64 of the Appeal Record Volume 1 had discussed the ingredients of the offence under Section 5(1) (c) of the Film

Censorship Act, 2002 which was not relevant. The learned SCJ need not discussed the ingredients of the offence under Section 5(1) (c) of the Act since there was no appeal by the prosecution against the acquittal and discharged of the appellant at the end of the prosecution's case.

One of the many issues raised by the counsel in this appeal, was the fact that the charge under Section 4(1) (c) of the Sedition Act and the charge under Section 5(1) of the Film Censorship Act were jointly tried. The learned counsel argued that the factual matrix of the two charges differed materially and they did not fulfil the requirement under Section 170 of the Criminal Procedure Code (hereinafter called the 'CPC') or Section 163 of CPC.

The prosecution in its submission did not touch on this issue at all and for the learned SCJ, it was stated that the order for the joint trial of the two charges was made by the previous learned SCJ and the learned SCJ who heard the matter as they were based on the decision of the earlier ruling made by the previous to have the two charges tried together.

The Court was of the view that even if the two charges were wrongly heard jointly, so long as the appellant was not prejudiced by the conduct of the case, the Court could invoke the provision of Section 422 of CPC in that if the joint trial was irregular, it did not vitiate the trial unless such irregularity has occasioned a miscarriage of justice. In the instant case, the Court failed to see that it has occasioned a miscarriage of justice. The appellant was represented by counsel and the appellant was not misled by having the two charges heard together.

The argument by the learned counsel was on the charge itself. The learned counsel submitted that the prosecution's case was that the

appellant had published a seditious publication on a Facebook page known as 'Alvin and Vivian-Alvivi' at the address <http://www.facebook.com/php?fbid=617457598272144&set=a5128606>

42065174.123291.509820495702522&type=1& theatre at 9.00am on 12.7.2013 in an apartment known as 568-14-18, Kompleks Mutiara, Jalan Ipoh, Batu 31/2, 51200, Kuala Lumpur. The alleged seditious photograph was a photograph with heading 'Selamat Berbuka Puasa (dengan Bak Kut The....wangi, enak, menyelerakan!! And containing the logo 'Halal' as well as the words underlined by the prosecution in the Annexure to the charge which were as follows:

'Selamat Berbuka Puasa (dengan Bak Kut The...wangi, enak, menyelerakan!!' [<http://www.alvivi.tv/>] *Izinkan kami memperkenalkan cara kami memupuk semangat 1Malaysia dengan bertukar-tukar makanan antara kaum –kaum Malaysia pada musim perayaan yang mulia ini. Hak untuk menikmati juadah enak tempatan seharusnya merentasi batasan bangsa dan juga agama. Kepada saudara-saudari yang beragama Islam, selamat berbuka puasa dan Salam Aidilfitri.'*

The learned counsel submitted that the prosecution has to prove that there has been a publication on the facebook page entitled 'Alvin and Vivian- Alviv' on the morning of 12.7.13 and the learned counsel conceded that there was a publication on the facebook page within the meaning of Section 2 of the Sedition Act, 1948.

As to the **2nd element of the offence**, the learned counsel submitted that there was no evidence that the facebook greeting was published or uploaded by the appellant or by Tan Jye Yee.

The Court has perused the evidence of SP9 who testified that the photographs were recovered from Samsung laptop (exhibit 19)

belonging to Tan Jye Yee. The learned counsel said there was no evidence that the photograph was uploaded or published by Tan Jye Yee. From the evidence SP12 (the complainant) who was attached to the Bahagian Kandungan Komunikasi dan Perkhimatan Post and conducted a surveillance on website. He saw through his computer a facebook alvivi.swinger showing two individuals with the words 'Selamat Berbuka Puasa' with 'Bak Kut Teh' and at the bottom of it there was a Halal logo. According to SP12 he knows that Bak Kut Teh contained pork. SP12 then reported the matter to MCMC and SP18 from MCMC investigated the complaint and was able to trace the facebook with facebook address [www.facebook AlvinSwinger](http://www.facebook.com/AlvinSwinger). SP18 also found that the Star online had conducted an online interview with an individual whom was the owner of the facebook named Alvin Tan. Through SP6 the Star online editor and SP6 gave SP18 the handphone number of Alvin Tan. SP18 then contacted Alvin Tan who admitted that he was the facebook account and had asked Alvin Tan to come MCMC to have his statement taken. SP13 Inspector Seelan had seized from the apartment rented by Tan Jye Yee and among the item seized was a notebook Samsung (P19). The said notebook Samsung (P19) was analysed by SP9 from MCMC and he found a few photographs kept the file 'bak kut teh png' which showed Tan Jye Yee and the appellant and a caption 'Selamat Berbuka Puasa dengan Bak Kut Teh... wangi , enak , menyelerakan' and the Halal logo. SP9 further stated that the facebook address was [urlhttp/www.facebook.com/alvivi.swingers](http://www.facebook.com/alvivi.swingers) as administrator. The facebook account address was registered under the name of 'Alvin & Vivian-Alvivi'.

The Court was of the considered view that although no one actually saw Tan Jye Yee or the appellant published or uploaded the facebook

greeting but from the testimonies of the prosecution witnesses all pointed to the fact that the photographs were kept in the file 'Bak kut teh png' in the notebook Samsung belonging to Tan Jye Yee and the facebook account was registered in Tan Jye Yee and the appellant. The necessary inference which could be drawn from the evidence by the prosecution witnesses that the publication was done Tan Jye Yee and the appellant and the photographs showed both Tan Jye Yee and the appellant together in the photo.. There was no evidence to suggest that the notebook Samsung (P19) was used by others. In fact it was kept by Tan Jye Yee at his rented apartment.

The appellant and Tan Jye Yee were charged under Section 4(1) (c) of the Sedition Act, 1948 and read together with Section 34 of Penal Code which means that they were jointly charged with a common intention. Tan Jye Yee and the appellant were having a relationship as girlfriend and boyfriend and had stayed together in the rented apartment. The appellant's face and Tan Jye Yee appeared in the facebook photograph showed that the appellant was a willing participant when the facebook photograph was posted on facebook.

The learned SCJ on the issue of common intention held that to rely on direct evidence as proof of common intention was quite difficult but it could be inferred from the factual matrix of the case. In the instant case reliance by the learned SCJ was on inferences arising from the conduct of Tan Jye and the appellant in the photographs analysed by SP9 were kept in the file 'bak kut the png which showed Tan Jye and the appellant and the photographs with the caption 'Selamat Berbuka Puasa dengan Bak Kut Teh ...wangi, enak ,menyelerakan and with the Halal logo. The learned SCJ found this was sufficient evidence to prove that Tan Jye Yee and the appellant had the common intention to publish or upload the

facebook greetings. The Court could not have agreed more with the finding of the learned SCJ on this issue. There was sufficient evidence from the surrounding circumstances that Tan Jye Yee and the appellant had the common intention to publish the impugned facebook greetings.

As for the **3rd ingredient of the offence** that is 'seditious tendency'. In Section (1) (d) of the Act, a seditious tendency is a tendency to raise 'discontent' or 'disaffection' amongst the subjects of the Yang Dipertuan Agong or the Ruler of any State or amongst the inhabitants of Malaysia or of any state. In Section 3(1)(e) of the Act states that a seditious tendency is a tendency to 'promote feelings of ill-will and hostility' between different races or classes of the population of Malaysia.

The learned counsel submitted that there was no evidence from any of the prosecution's witnesses that:

- i) the facebook publication has any tendency to raise any discontent or disaffection amongst the subjects of the Yang Dipertuan Agong or the inhabitants of Malaysia or of any State; or
- ii) the facebook publication has any tendency to promote feelings of ill-will or hostility between the different races or classes of population in Malaysia.

The learned counsel submitted that the words used in the context of the said publication mean and has the effect of conveying the meaning of a festive greeting in which the writers sought for permission to introduce their way of fostering the 1Malaysia spirit by exchanging food amongst the races in Malaysia and that the right local delicacies should go beyond racial and religious boundaries. It was further contented by learned counsel that it was in this context the writers

greeted their readers with the words 'Selamat Berbuka Puasa with Bak Kut Teh ' together with the use of a Halal logo. The logo was used to denote the 'halal' (as oppose to haram) nature of the food on display in the facebook. The defence submitted that there was no evidence to show that the words could not have achieved one or more of the objects specified in Section 3(1) (a) to (f) of the Act.

The prosecution submitted that the publication has a tendency to raise any discontent or disaffection amongst the subjects of the Yang DiPertuan Agong or the inhabitants of Malaysia or has a tendency to promote feelings of ill-will or hostility between the different races or classes of population in Malaysia.

The learned SCJ held by reference to **Mat Shuhaimi Shafie v PP (2014) 5 CLJ 22** which stated that determination of what language is considered seditious is a mixed question of law and fact, which was up to the court to decide. To be seditious, the words published should have a tendency to achieve one or more of the objects specified in Section 3(1) (a) to (f) of the Act.

The Court was of the opinion that the publication has a seditious tendency to promote ill-will and hostility between the races or classes of the population of Malaysia. The evidence that the publication had caused feelings of ill-will or hostility between the different races or classes of population in Malaysia. This was evident from the testimonies of SP2 SP3, SP4, SP8 and SP12 who expressed their anger, frustration, hurt, regret on the action by Tan Jye Yee and the appellant. What was the motive of Tan Jye Yee and the appellant in publishing and uploading on facebook the photograph with the heading 'Selamat Berbuka Puasa (dengan Bak Kut Teh...wangi, enak, menyelerakan!!?'. The learned counsel submit that the words used in

the context of the said publication mean and has the effect of conveying the meaning of a festive greeting in which the appellant and Tan Jye Yee sought for permission to introduce their way of fostering the 1Malaysia spirit by exchanging food amongst the races in Malaysia and that the right to enjoy local delicacies should go beyond racial and religious boundaries. It was in context the 'writers' greeted their readers with the "Selamat Berbuka Puasa with Bak Kut The' together with the 'halal' logo.

In the instant case the Court agreed with the finding of the learned SCJ that the publication on the facebook has a seditious tendency to promote feelings of ill-will or hostility between the different races or classes of population in Malaysia.

The learned counsel submit that the learned SCJ had taken into account a provision relating '*to promote feelings of ill will, hostility or hatred between persons or groups of persons **on the ground of religion.***' This according to the learned counsel was evident from the judgment written which made reference to the feelings of the Muslim community rather than races or classes of population in Malaysia such as Malays, or Indian Muslim. The charge against the appellant was pursuant to Section 4(1) (c) of the Act and for purposes seditious tendency is as stated *in Section 3(1) (e) 'to promote feelings of ill-will and hostility between the races or classes of the population of Malaysia'*. The learned counsel further submit that Section 3(1)(c) of the Act does not refer to religion. In the amended Act which came into force on 28.5.2015 an amendment to Section 3 (1) (c) was made to specifically made reference to religion which amended Section 3 of the principal Act by inserting after paragraph (e) the following paragraph:

“(ea) to promote feelings of ill-will, hostility or hatred between persons or group of persons on the ground of religion or”

This issue was not raised in the petition of appeal by the appellant but nevertheless the Court will state that perusing the judgment of the learned SCJ, reference was made to races or classes of the population of Malaysia as it could be gleaned from the judgment at page 52 of the appeal record Jilid 1 which state as follows :

‘Saya mendapati paparan beserta catatan yang terdapat dalam P5 tersebut boleh mengundang dan mengembangkan niat jahat dan permusuhan antara golongan penduduk yang berlainan di Malaysia khusus nya umat Islam.’ The Court was of the view that the reference to ‘khususnya umat Islam’ did not vitiate or nullify the finding of the learned SCJ.

The Court upon reading the appeal record and the ground of judgment on conviction and also read the written submissions and after hearing further oral submissions from both parties , found that the learned SCJ had considered the correct principle of law based on the testimonies of the prosecution and the defence witnesses and hence no appellate intervention on conviction was necessary. The Court dismissed the appeal on conviction and affirmed the decision on conviction by the learned SCJ.

Appeal on sentence:

The appeal on inadequacy of sentence was by the prosecution. In the petition of appeal on sentence the prosecution stated that the learned SCJ had erred in law and fact in failing to take into account the seriousness of the offence committed by the appellant. The prosecution further submit that the term of imprisonment meted out on

the appellant of 5 months and 22 days was not deterrent enough to prevent similar offence being committed by others. The learned SCJ in his judgment on sentence had considered that the offence committed by the appellant was a serious offence which could promote feelings of ill-will or hostility between the different races or classes of population in Malaysia. Having acknowledged the seriousness of the offence committed by the appellant, the learned SCJ went on to considered the punishment provided for as stated in Section 4(1)(c) of the Act, that '***Any person whoshall be guilty of an offence and shall , on conviction be liable for a first offence to a fine not exceeding five thousand ringgit or to imprisonment for a term exceeding three years or both and for subsequent offence....***'

The learned SCJ was of the view that since the offence committed by the appellant was serious, an imprisonment sentence would be an appropriate punishment meted out on the appellant. The Court would think that an appropriate sentence to be meted out on the appellant would be to impose a maximum fine of RM5000.00 taking into account that the appellant was a first offender as far as the charge was concerned. It would be more appropriate to sentence the appellant to an imprisonment sentence if she commits a subsequent offence. Furthermore Tan Jye Yee, the co-accused in the charge had absconded while the appellant appeared in court to answer the charge. In this respect, the Court would tamper justice with mercy by setting aside the imprisonment sentence and substituting it with a maximum fine of RM5000.00 in default 6 months imprisonment. The appeal on sentence by the prosecution is dismissed and the Court invoked its inherent power to set aside the sentence of imprisonment

and substituted it with a maximum fine of RM5000.00 in default 6 months imprisonment.

Dated: 12.10.2018


Dato' Indera Mohd Sofian bin Tan Sri Abd Razak
Judge

High Court of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur

For the Appellant:

Mr. Chong Joo Tian;
Advocate & Solicitor,
Messrs: TJ Chong Associates;
No: N-4-10, Gamuda Biz Suites;
No: 12, Jalan Anggerik Vanilla 31/99;
Kota Kemuning Seksyen 31,
40460 Shah Alam, Selangor DE.

For the Respondent:

En: Wan Shaharudin bin Wan Ladin;
Jabatan Peguam Negara;
Unit Pendakwaan
Aras 5, No.45, Lot AG7;
Persiaran Perdana, Presint 4;
Pusat Pentadbiran Kerajaan Persekutuan;
62100. Putrajaya.

Case cited: **Mat Shuhaimi Shafie v PP (2014) 5 CLJ 22.**