IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF VANUATU

<u>Criminal</u>

Case No. 25/363 SC/CRML

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

BETWEEN: Public Prosecutor

AND: Tambe Molitavity

Defendant

Date of Plea:2nd April 2025Date of Sentence:4th April 2025Before:Hon. Justice Oliver A. SaksakCounsel:Ms Josephine Tete for Public I

Ms Josephine Tete for Public Prosecutor Mr Lent Tevi for the Defendant

SENTENCE

- 1. Tambe Molitavity pleaded guilty to one count of cultivation of cannabis contrary to section 4 of the Dangerous Drugs Act [Cap.12]. He is for sentence today.
- 2. On 7th November 2024 at Alowaru Village, Malo Island the defendant planted 50 stems of cannabis which were uprooted and weighed measuring 6.905kg. These were removed by the Police from the defendant's garden after a complaint was lodged by Sarahlyn Tabi. The plants were tested positive as cannabis. The defendant made admissions to the Police and pleaded guilty in this Court on the facts.
- 3. Cultivation of cannabis carries the maximum penalty of up to VT 100 million in fines or 20 years imprisonment or both.
- 4. There are no mitigating circumstances given for the offending.



1



- 5. But there are aggravating such as the intentional and deliberate planting of the cannabis, the high quantity of 50 plants weighing 6.905kgs. He had been planting cannabis since 2022. He explained that they were for his personal use only but that is highly unlikely to be the truth.
- 6. In any event, he is convicted and sentenced on his own guilty plea.
- The Prosecution's referred to <u>Wetul v PP</u> [2013] VUCA 26, <u>Naia v PP</u> [2020] VUCA 1, <u>Tukuro v</u> <u>PP</u> [1999] VUCA 9, <u>PP v Jimmy</u> [2020] VUSC 252 and <u>PP v lata</u> [2021] VUSC 138. The Court is guided by these cases in assessing the defendant's appropriate sentence.
- 8. Mr Tevi agreed this is a very serious offending with no mitigating circumstances. He agreed the offence falls within category 2 of the <u>Wetul</u> case. He agreed with the cases referred to by the Prosecutions. He agreed that the quantity was relatively small and that a start sentence of 16 months should be the appropriate starting point and deducted appropriate by a further 3-4 months. He agreed the sentence should be suspended with 60 hours of community work.
- Taking all the factors into account, it is my view this case falls into category 2 of the <u>Wetul</u> Case. The quantity is more than the quantity in <u>Jimmy's</u> case but very much less then the quantity in <u>lata's</u> cases.
- 10. I therefore adopt the start sentence of 28 months imprisonment.
- 11. In mitigation I reduce the sentence by 4 months for his guilty plea. For all his personal factors in his Same Day Report I deduct the sentence by a further 5 months, leaving his end sentence at 19 months imprisonment.
- 12. I Order that this sentence be suspended for a period of 2 years on good behaviour under section
 57 of the Penal Code Act. If he reoffends within this period and is charged and convicted, he will go to prison for 19 months.
- 13. In addition, I sentence the defendant to community work for 60 hours to be performed within 12 months from the date of this sentence.



2

. .

14. I condemn the plants in the custody of the Police to destruction forthwith.

15. The defendant has a right of appeal against the sentence within 14 days, if he so chooses.

DATED at Luganville this 4th day of April 2025 şС BY THE COURT ET : F Hon. Oliver A Saksak Judge