

Altantuya's can of worms opened long ago
MalaysiaKini.com
Jan 21, 2015

YOURSAY 'Did Kamarul continually scream 'motive' during the trial?'

Conviction opens can of worms, says Sirul's lawyer

Ferdan: It is too late for Sirul Azhar Umar's lawyer to lament when the Federal Court had already decided to hand down the death sentence on his client.

The trials and appeals up to the highest court have been completed and thus the only way to save Sirul's life is to appeal to the Yang di-Pertuan Agong for clemency. So we don't understand why his lawyer Kamarul Hisham Kamaruddin is revisiting the pertinent points of the trial.

Kamarul now claims it strange that the murder was without motive, and questioned why DSP Musa Safri was not called as witness when there were text messages made among political analyst Abdul Razak Baginda, Musa and the first accused Azilah.

If we remember well, defence lawyer Kamarul did not insist on that earlier in the trials. He seemed to go along with the prosecutors not to put Musa, Najib's aide, on stand as it may possibly indirectly implicate his boss.

Kamarul, it is no use to cry over spilled milk. Your statement of, "My client's conviction has opened a 'can of worms'" sounds ominous.

If not for your conscience in not doing the job well, was it an indirect warning to some 'higher authority' that the cans of worms be released if no suitable compromise is made?

From the onset of the trial, most believed that the defence lawyers of both accused and the prosecutors were on the 'same page'. So what gives? The guilty verdict?

Abasir: Did Kamarul continually scream "motive" during the course of the trial? Did he, together with Najib's defence team, i.e the prosecution, stop a witness, Altantuya's cousin, from speaking about a certain photo in Paris involving the Mongolian woman?

Did he ask his client pointed questions about who directed him to silence the woman? Did he get the sequence of events from his client and the phone calls that resulted in Sirul and Azilah going to Abdul Razak Baginda's house?

I guess the lawyer has more questions to answer than Sirul ever did during the trial.

Lim Chong Leong: What can of worms? There have been worms crawling everywhere from Day 1.

People have been asking these questions and many more since the first day and great care has been taken to see that these questions are not raised every step of the way.

Odin: Kamarul, the can of worms was not opened due to the conviction of your client. It was opened right at the first trial, but no one - from both the prosecution and defence - seems to have deemed it fit to go after the worms and squash them to paste. They were all playing with the can instead.

We all know who were behind the grisly murder by putting two and two together. The accuracy of our speculation is confirmed by the fact that one of our suspects was let off in a very unusual manner, while the rest were never called to testify in court.

Sirul did have a motive to kill Altantuya Shaariibuu; the motive was money. He revealed in his affidavit that he was offered between RM50,000 to RM100,000 to kill her, did he not? Why was he not asked who offered the money?

This is just one example of the questions that should have been asked. Why were they not asked? We out here know why: Sirul's answer or answers, if pursued, would have led to the key figures behind the murder.

Commentable: Mercenaries do not need motive to commit murder. They are the kind who will do anything for money and other things in kind.

Money and other incentives form the motive and it is obvious that these murderers got hold of what they had wanted. How else could they afford the huge legal fees to fight the case right up to the Federal Court?

How else could Sirul slipped out of Malaysia and lived happily ever after in Australia? If you find out who is the one giving out the instructions to get the job done, then there you have it, the MOTIVE in capital letters.

Oh Ya?: Is Sirul is smart enough to know the verdict beforehand and fled to Australia? And what about the mysteries surrounding the infamous PI (private investigator) and the making and unmaking of the statutory declaration for which a senior lawyer is still under investigation by the Bar Council?

Piece everything together and somebody's stepson could make a box office film on it.

Wira: Kamarul, you asked those questions everyone in this country wanted to know. Instead of defending your client against extradition, why not get your client to break his silence and spill the real story behind the Altantuya murder.

Maybe with that, he could get legal asylum in Australia. That certainly beats remaining a convicted fugitive Down Under.

Multi Racial: You do not need Alfred Hitchcock to help to solve this murder case. The fingerprints were all over the place.

Azilah and Sirul may not have the motive but they are equally guilty for the crime they committed. They committed a murder that both knew is wrong and evil, but they proceeded out of greed for money.

The 'fingerprints' are:

1) Both Sirul and Azilah claimed they were directed by DSP Musa Safri. Why wasn't Musa Safri called to the witness stand? Why was Musa Safri not charged with abetting in the murder of Altantuya?

2) It is obvious Razak Baginda is involved. To what extent, it can only be established once the mastermind has been identified. Why is it the prosecution did not appeal against the decision of the High Court, which acquitted Razak Baginda?

3) If Razak Baginda was innocent, why does he need to hide in the United Kingdom since his acquittal?

4) The immigration record of Altantuya was deleted from the computer system. This can only happen if it involved senior officers of the Immigration Department.

Why didn't the prosecutors and police probe into this to find out who were the people in Immigration involved in deleting Altantuya's records. The most senior person in the Immigration must have got the directive from the mastermind or someone close to the mastermind.

I believe God is great and those involved in the murder of Altantuya, whether directly or indirectly, will be punished. Good will prevail over the evil. Eventually, the truth will be out.

Hank Marvin: Simply put, all the judges, at the High Court, Court of Appeal and eventually the Federal Court, did not seem to know the basic nature of crime; namely the evil intent to commit a crime.

How could they allow conviction without bothering to establish intention?

Banzai: Sirul, be sympathetic to your comrade who will be going to the gallows. Search your conscience and don't let your partner die.