

Perhaps PM can ask for summary judgment in WSJ case, too

MalaysiaKini.com

Oct 29th, 2015

Yoursay

YOURSAY | 'Najib should file his case in US to take the Speech Act out of the equation.'

Najib's lawyer waiting for reply from WSJ

Res Ipsa: *The Wall Street Journal* (WSJ) has clearly stated upon receipt of PM Najib Razak's letter that they are not going to waive any line of defence that would be available to them.

Any sane person would certainly have interpreted that as a 'yes' to the question posed. So where do we go from here?

Isn't it the logical option that the PM should file his case in the US courts to take the Speech (Securing the Protection of our Enduring and Established Constitutional Heritage) Act out of the equation.

Thereafter, once the case has been filed, he may consider invoking the American equivalent (if any) of an application for summary judgment and see whether the US judicial system grants him the order without the need for him to take the stand and be subject to cross-examination by the counsel for WSJ.

After all, there is an attempt to bend the fundamental rules in Malaysia with such applications as is now happening in the case of the PM **against Taiping MP Nga Kor Ming**.

Therefore, there is no further harm to test it out on the global stage as our dignity and pride has already been heavily battered and bruised.

Anonymous_1371457014: If WSJ fails to produce its 'proof', then its continued follow-up articles that repeat its baseless claims are just perpetuating lies, which means WSJ was never interested in the truth right from the start.

With all the evidence against WSJ so far, why do people still believe this flawed publication?

Anonymous #40353350: Everyone expects the media to get the facts right, and many feel the international media would go the extra mile to doubly ensure the accuracy of their reports.

But WSJ has proven itself to be a bit lacking in fact-checking many a time and has had to retract stories in recent years.

Anonymous_1371978116: People who think WSJ is a flawed publication with no proof are also the same people who have been 'roboticised' by BN.

If anyone actually has the ability to read and process information, it is 1MDB and the BN government which are not answering questions. Who is the flawed one now?

Bluemountains: Why all the ding-dong between the two parties? Najib should not waste time but sue WSJ in any court, even if it is in the US if he is so sure that he has been unfairly defamed.

If his case is very strong, he can still win even if the case is not heard in Malaysia. There is no need to insist on suing WSJ in Malaysia.

Bamboo: WSJ has already replied that they stood by their report. Was that not clear enough?

Want to sue, sue please. There is no need turning in circle. All these show that what was reported in WSJ was true.

Kbe: The point of suing WSJ is to clear his name, more so in the present political climate where the PM claims the 1MDB issue is deliberately twisted to defame him.

Whether the judgment can be enforced in the US if he wins should be secondary.

Najib: 1MDB doesn't owe IPIC US\$481mil

Justice Pao: Najib, why then the 2015 financial report of International Petroleum Investment Co (IPIC) shows this on page 109: "In 2014, the Group entered into an agreement relating to the Options Agreements where the Group assigned all of its rights under the Options Agreement to 1MDB and its subsidiaries for a fixed price. As of Dec 31, 2014, an amount of US\$481,326,000 was outstanding (note 23)"?

Will this US\$481,326,000 outstanding to IPIC be hidden in somebody's personal account again as 'donations'?

Is IPIC, which is a public-listed company in London, showing 'phantom debts' in its account just like your 'phantom donation'?

Since my 'account' is showing that I do not have any loan with the banks even though the banks are showing I owe them over half-a-million ringgit, can I use the same logic to say I do not owe the banks any money?

Anonymous 2305141436452229: That's the reason why no one trusts him as the finance minister.

Even in a hypothetical world where he is not a fraud, his actions as finance minister just go to show his ineptitude and mismanagement of key government assets and the lack of transparency.

A more competent financial manager would reconcile the two accounts promptly and be transparent to its shareholders (the public).

Furthermore, the government owes IPIC undisclosed assets (again, most likely public assets which ultimately translate into value/cash) for a recent debt takeover scheme.

And it is public information announced by IPIC, which is listed in London.

Democrat: What is going on? A case of now you don't, now you see? Was the officer who prepared the parliamentary written answer aware that he is going to make Najib and 1MDB look stupid?

Copyright © 1999-2012 Mkini Dotcom Sdn. Bhd
Source: <http://www.malysiakini.com/news/317596>