

The Republic

versus

Tarea Kareitaua.

SENTENCE:

The accused is a person of previous good character and has pleaded guilty. I accept the proposition that she had made a frank confession at the earliest stage of the process and if the matter had been dealt with expeditiously and properly she might have been agreeable to dispose of the matter more promptly. I therefore give her credit for having shown remorse by her admissions and her plea. I also accept the view that her guilty arose from inexperience and ignorance and she probably did not think she was committing a Criminal Offence.

She is a married woman with children and her husband is currently overseas. With her educational background and experience she should have never been given the responsibility of handling so much cash.

However the public officers cannot be run without honest officers and I cannot ignore that these offences of this nature can prevent Every case is dealt with on its own merit and I find there is strong mitigation in this case and I pass the most lenient sentence which in cases of this nature can be passed namely that:-

1. 9 months imprisonment suspended for 2 years on condition that she does not commit an offence of which dishonesty is an element.
2. \$100 fine or 3 months imprisonment in default pay in fine on or before 15th January 1990.
3. Make restitution to Maiana Island Council on or before 31st January 1990 in the sum of \$354.97.

F. Muhammad
JUDGE