

Hearsay won't do, rakyat want cold, hard proof on RM2.6b

MalaysiaKini.com

Apr 18th, 2016

Yoursay

YOURSAY | 'Even the man on the street knows it can't be as simple as that. The AG should instead question the Saudi foreign minister...'

No need for further probe on RM2.6b donation, says AG

Meh: We are not interested in knowing whether the money in prime minister Najib Razak's account is a donation or not. That is politics, and we are not interested in politics or a so-called conspiracy to topple the government.

What we want is the truth, cold hard truth. Was the money in Najib's account 1MDB's money? No amount of political statements will resolve this. The only way this can be done is through a thorough and complete investigation, and that includes examining the whole flow of funds and all the offshore accounts.

Only this will uncover the truth. If the prime minister has done nothing wrong, he must allow this process to take place. If he is telling the truth, the results of the investigations will absolve him.

Kawak: In forensic financial crime investigation, a mere written or oral statement from the supposed donor is not conclusive unless supported by evidence of the money trail from the original source of the funds. If this is compromised, the investigation is considered not complete.

Kingfisher: The attestation to a donation by the Saudi foreign minister Adel Al-Jubeir does give credence to the AG's exoneration of the PM. But were all the past many months in establishing the truth necessary as the scandal was unfolding with so much notoriety for the PM and the nation?

And why was it necessary to classify certain evidence and findings/ reports as official secrets. Here we had the premier of a nation being probed for alleged financial improprieties and much in the manner of investigation and reporting, was viewed by the discerning public as suspect.

There were other allegations of extravagant and indulgent use of funds for personal and political purposes. As it involved the dignity of the PM and the nation, the declaration of innocence should have been promptly verified and made with utmost transparency so as to render the decision utterly convincing to the public.

Anonymous 1281621434255574: Next time, if A kills B but if C says A was with me all the time and he didn't kill B, can the AG say the case is closed, as C has already confirmed A

didn't do it? What has happened to the Malaysia legal system?

WDA: Imagine that MACC officers find huge sums of money in an office boy's home. The office boy gets a written statement from a businessman saying that the money was given by the latter.

For attorney-general (AG) Mohamad Apandi Ali, it seems that would be good enough to close the case and move on. It is appalling to hear a person of law such as our AG say "...because there is already a statement from the donor, so what is there left to be investigated?"

Even the man on the street knows it can't be as simple as that. The AG should instead question the Saudi foreign minister Adel Al-Jubeir who two months earlier, said that the money came from a private Saudi citizen, and its purpose was for investment.

Also, why is Apandi "relieved" with this news? If you're impartial, emotion should not come into the picture. You only feel relief if the news is beneficial to the side you are leaning towards. With every piece of new information, there should be a relentless desire to seek out the truth instead of an overzealous desire to close the case.

1Citizen: Isn't this statement by a foreigner hearsay? I will not believe it until it is said in a court of law under oath or vide a SD. It would be helpful if bank statements can be produced.

That's not a problem is it? Only then can all these yes-men go to town and crow as loudly as they want. Better still Najib should proceed without any hesitation to sue all these negative foreign reporters. I will not vote for him otherwise.

Spinning: Al-Jubeir's statement cannot be accepted as it was not made under "oath" in a court of law.

Alamak: Strangely though, Al-Jubeir didn't mention anything about the return of the unused portion of the donation. Malaysians would like to know if it was returned to sender or to another proxy account and to whom.

Ram14: Who is the donor? Is it the Saudi government or a private individual? That has not been mentioned by the Saudi minister.

Wong Fei Hoong: The Saudi foreign minister did not say that the Saudi government donated the money. He merely said he was aware of the donation. Nothing more, nothing less. The show must go on. It's not for you to say that the case is closed.

AJ: What an unintelligent AG. Doesn't he know it was I who gave the money to Najib? I just had some spare cash laying around. I can even sign a SD attesting to this.

The Prince from Arabia is bluffing. Oil price is down so Najib took some of my money to compensate the drop in oil price and accept the blame. AG, now take this information to clear Najib.

Swipenter: Apandi can now tell his fellow peers from Switzerland, Singapore, Luxembourg, Washington DC and elsewhere he has nothing that can assist them in their investigations into the 1MDB scandal since Al Jubeir has now stated (but without giving any proof) that the RM2.6b came from Saudi Arabia.

We just have to rely on foreign investigations to dig out the truth of the matter. In this time and age, the money trail cannot be hidden and erased from the international financial system.

Meh: But Mr AG, the flow of funds into Najib's account showed the money came from countries other than Saudi Arabia. The funds flowed from 1MDB to many other countries and Singapore and finally to Najib. So many writers have clearly demonstrated this.

Police reports have also been lodged on this. Surely, you are duty bound to investigate whether the money came from 1MDB. How do you know the Saudi minister was not made to make a diplomatic statement to help Najib? In the meantime, who suffers? 1MDB and Malaysia. Please investigate all the overseas accounts. Your duty demands it.

Anonymous #40538199: A man of law is supposed to look for solid evidence instead of mere words of a foreigner. Worse still, it was not even an official statement.

Anak JB: Since when can a mere statement absolve people of crime? Where was the source of funds? Did it come from an entity or entities and given to the donor to be donated through some illegal means?

Leongan: Whether it was for donation or otherwise, just show us the banking evidence, it is that simple.

Anonymous_1371458513: Does Al-Jubeir have sufficient evidence to prove the donation is RM2.6 billion and RM2.03 billion was returned, if it is a donation, what happened to the balance, why it was not in BN's or Umno's bank account instead of Najib's?

Daniel: So the next time the bank or other authorities question anyone about large amounts of monies deposited into their accounts, they will only need to have some random foreigner, preferably an Arab, make a statement that it is a donation from someone he knows - living or dead.

Note that the money does not need to be from the person making the statement and you do not even have to have it attested by a commissioner of oaths, have it taken at a police station or show relevant documents. Just this alone will make the incoming funds kosher, tax free and it is definitely not illegal. No further investigation needed, and case closed.

Anonymous 772841445313682: Apandi is making an extremely dangerous act as AG here. So a mere statement can clear someone of wrongdoing even though there is a lot of evidence pointing the opposite way?

Boeyks: Actually there is no difference whether they are investigating or not. Nothing will come out from their so-called investigation.

Copyright © 1999-2012 Mkini Dotcom Sdn. Bhd
Source: <https://www.malysiakini.com/news/338214>