



**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE  
20 OCTOBER 2020**

## **LETTER OF DEMAND SENT TO MR RAVI S/O MADASAMY**

The Attorney-General's Chambers ("AGC") issued a media release on 19 October 2020 pertaining to an interview given by Mr Ravi s/o Madasamy ("**Mr Ravi**"), counsel for Mr Gobi a/l Avedian ("**the Applicant**"), that has been uploaded on The Online Citizen Asia's Facebook page in relation to the decision of the Court of Appeal delivered on 19 October 2020 (*Gobi a/l Avedian v PP* [2020] SGCA 102) ("**the Judgment**").

2. Following from the media release, the AGC has, earlier today, sent Mr Ravi a letter demanding that he apologise and unconditionally retract the following allegations made during the interview, namely that:

- a. the Public Prosecutor has been "overzealous" in the prosecution of the Applicant, and "that has led to the death sentence for [the Applicant]";
- b. "it was troubling" that the Public Prosecutor had run a different case before the High Court and the Court of Appeal;
- c. the Public Prosecutor, among others, should apologise to the Applicant for the suffering the Applicant went through; and
- d. the "fairness of the Prosecution is called into question" by the Court of Appeal.

3. These are serious allegations that the Public Prosecutor has acted in bad faith or maliciously in the prosecution of the Applicant. They are false and highly inflammatory. It is highly improper and entirely contrary to Mr Ravi's obligations as an officer of the court for him to make these unfounded, baseless and misleading allegations.

4. The Court of Appeal made no adverse findings against the Public Prosecutor or the prosecution of the Applicant. In fact, the Court of Appeal pointed out in the Judgment that the initial decision to convict the Applicant was "correct

at the time [it was] made”<sup>1</sup> and that none of the arguments considered in the Judgment “could have been made in view of the legal position as it was understood then”<sup>2</sup>.

5. Further, the Court of Appeal explicitly highlighted at Paragraph 110 of the Judgment that “[i]n fairness to the parties, we reiterate our earlier observation that at the time of the trial, they did not have the benefit of the guidance subsequently set out in” *Adili Chibuike Ejike v PP* [2019] 2 SLR 254. The Court of Appeal further highlighted that “the different case that the Prosecution ran on appeal, namely, that the Applicant had actual knowledge of the nature of the Drugs, [was] a difference that was not pointed out by the Defence in the course of the appeal and that was likely not thought to be material by either the Prosecution or the Defence at that time, given the prevailing legal position then”<sup>3</sup>.

6. The AGC has given Mr Ravi until noon on 22 October 2020 to respond.

\* \* \*

ATTORNEY-GENERAL’S CHAMBERS  
MEDIA AND COMMUNICATIONS UNIT

For queries, please contact:

Ms Dawn Ang  
Senior Assistant Director  
Tel: 6908 9448  
Email: [dawn\\_ang@agc.gov.sg](mailto:dawn_ang@agc.gov.sg)

Ms Lai Xue Ying  
Manager  
Tel: 6908 3067  
Email: [lai\\_xue\\_ying@agc.gov.sg](mailto:lai_xue_ying@agc.gov.sg)

---

<sup>1</sup> Found at Paragraph 126 of the Judgment: <https://www.supremecourt.gov.sg/docs/default-source/module-document/judgement/-2020-sgca-102-pdf.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> Found at Paragraph 49 of the Judgment: <https://www.supremecourt.gov.sg/docs/default-source/module-document/judgement/-2020-sgca-102-pdf.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Found at Paragraph 125(b) of the Judgment: <https://www.supremecourt.gov.sg/docs/default-source/module-document/judgement/-2020-sgca-102-pdf.pdf>