

Matondo Mukulu: Britain Can Do It, Why Can't We?

The Gleaner

The Caribbean Court of Justice (CCJ) and the European Union (EU), though performing different functions in different parts of the world, have both been on my mind for the past three weeks. I suspect that this has been on account of the fact that currently in the UK, the public is caught up with the question of whether, come June 23, the electorate will decide (in a referendum) on the question of whether it will stay in the European Union, which Britain joined formally in 1972.

The connection between the European and the Caribbean project is not direct, but it is important to note that both are institutions that can express the desires of their constituent nations.

The referendum on the UK's continued membership in the EU was called by the British PM, some say out of political necessity. Whatever the real reason, it is important to note that the vote has two sides. On one side are the Stayers (relatively monolithic group), who include the PM, and on the other side are the Leavers (not a very monolithic group).

LEFT OUT IN THE COLD

The argument advanced by the Stayers is essentially both economic and social. Thus, it is contended that Britain, being the fifth-largest economy in the world, must stay in the EU so that it can continue to enjoy access to the markets, without which it will be left out in the cold, in a world where most countries are members of one trading group that is more minded to strike deals with another group/trading bloc.

The economic argument is strengthened, they say, by the evidence that shows that by being in the EU, the UK will have access to a market that has 500 million buyers, which, in pure economic terms means a market that is valued at £16.6 trillion. The Confederation of British Industry (CBI) says, in its clear support of the 'stay in' campaign, that the EU (in 2011) accounted for 47 per cent of the UK's inward foreign direct investment. It is this economic argument that President Obama made during his joint press conference with PM Cameron last Friday on his official visit to Britain. The stayers add more weight to their argument by making the point that the free movement of persons across what is in essence a visa- and, some say, passport-free zone, has worked wonders in terms of cultural exchanges facilitated, but it is correct to say that what is truly driving the Stay campaign is the economic argument, with its supporters saying that EU membership has converted Britain from being the sick man of Europe into an economically competitive nation, with a marked improvement to its GDP.

RED TAPE

The Leavers, chief among them London Mayor Boris Johnson, apart from appealing to those nostalgic about the Old Empire, say that membership has brought more red tape from Brussels, which, in their view, cancels out any so-called economic benefits. The figures that are advanced by the No campaign have been tackled by the chancellor of the exchequer, George Osborne, and the appearance before a Commons Select Committee during this week of the chief executive of the Leave Campaign (Matthew Elliot) did little to add weight to the No campaign's argument - at least that's what is being said by those on the other side.

While I am following the arguments on both sides with a critical eye (of course, I will be voting to stay), I have been somewhat impressed by the fact that within the British Cabinet, there has been a freedom given to members to take a particular side in this referendum. In this regard, it is noted that Cabinet heavyweights such as the justice secretary, Michael Gove, and Chris Grayling (leader of the Commons), are opposed to the PM's position. What we see playing out daily in the media are exchanges between persons who sit together weekly to make decisions on government policy, while observing the constitutional convention known as collective responsibility.

FREE VOTE

This leads me to ask the question: Should we now expect the Jamaican Cabinet to put the question of whether Jamaica's final court of appeal should be the CCJ to a referendum? Would Cabinet members vote collectively, or could we expect, as is the case with the British Cabinet, that Prime Minister Holness would allow a free vote on such a question, at a time when he does have a very small parliamentary majority?

I ask this question because as someone who knows a thing or two about this debate correctly reminded me last week, the Jamaica Labour Party (JLP) does not have a monolithic view on this issue. At one point, the JLP wanted to stay with the current status quo of appealing to a foreign court, but there are those within the party who have taken the view that Jamaica should have its own final court of appeal, and, in effect, give the CCJ the proverbial middle finger.

While I think that the proposed Jamaican final court of appeal nightmare is jurisprudential and economic folly, I think that the current silence and unwillingness to allow a free vote is reflective of our political immaturity. The last time that a Jamaican PM allowed a free or conscience vote was when PM Patterson allowed PNP MPs to vote on the question of the abolition of the death penalty. I was a youngster then, but the records are there for all to read.

I have no reason to believe that a free vote on the abolition of appeals to the Privy Council would not yield significant benefits in the sense of public education. Of course, my dreamy assumption is premised on the Jamaican media being very critical in its analysis in the run-up to any such referendum as being overly deferential to politicians will not help voters to make a decision.

The British Cabinet is giving us, practitioners of a Westminster style of government, a lesson in political maturity, and while there are serious tensions and even casualties (such as the resignation of the work and pensions secretary), it cannot be denied that there is an admirable state of political maturity on display, which we in the Caribbean must take a serious look at.

It is not an effective response to say that they've had a longer run at this democracy thing than we have had as in today's world, information is available, and it is for us to make effective use of this information so that we can practise a politics that is more beneficial to the idea of Jamaica.

I have shifted my position on the question of whether there should be a referendum as I am now firmly of the view that we should have one as this is an important generational question that must be decided by an informed electorate, with both campaigns (abolish or not to be abolish) making a concerted effort to focus on the issues at the core at this critical and defining decision.

If the British can do it, why can't Jamaica? As I focus on the June 23 UK referendum, I am eagerly awaiting a decision from the Jamaican PM as to when we will have our own referendum on the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

- Matondo K. Mukulu, former acting public defender, is a practising public-law barrister and attorney. Email feedback to columns@gleanerjm.com and matondo_mukulu@yahoo.co.uk.

Editorial: Curious Silence On CCJ

The Gleaner

Perhaps the most curious of the proposals on the Holness Government's legislative agenda for this parliamentary year is the plan to amend the Constitution to replace the Queen with a non-executive president as Jamaica's head of state. In other words, Prime Minister Andrew Holness intends to make Jamaica a republic, which this newspaper supports.

In a way, it was a declaration by Mr Holness of a repatriation of Jamaica's sovereignty, closing the circle on decolonisation. It is an idea that could have great symbolism and historic poignancy, given Mr Holness' position as the first of the post-Independence generation to lead Jamaica.

Our puzzlement, though, is the absence of accompanying constitutional measures, or even mention of any, in the governor general's Throne Speech of 10 days ago. There was, for instance, not a single sentence, or word, on the continued use of the United Kingdom Privy Council as its court of last resort. Nor was there mention of accession to the Caribbean Court of Jamaica (CCJ) - an issue that has animated this country for more than a decade and engulfed Mr Holness and members of his party in a constitutional quarrel that had to be resolved in the courts.

CONSENSUS ON A REPUBLIC

Unless positions have shifted, there is consensus on both sides of the political divide, Mr Holness' Jamaica Labour Party (JLP) and the Opposition People's National Party (PNP), on the idea of a republic. The question that will now arise is whether there is political alignment on its achievement.

It requires only a simple majority of all members of Parliament to amend Section 27 of the Constitution that establishes the office of governor general. That is the easy part. But Section 68, which vests "executive authority of Jamaica ... in Her Majesty" and allows the governor general to act on her behalf, can only be amended with a vote of at least two-thirds of the members of both Houses of Parliament, followed by support from the majority of the voters in a referendum.

Mr Holness' party and the Opposition are almost evenly split in the Lower House. The JLP would need at least a dozen PNP members voting with them for the bill to carry. The configuration of the Senate requires at least one opposition member voting with the Government to gain a two-thirds majority.

Ironically, exiting the Privy Council and embracing the regional court constitutionally requires only a two-thirds vote in both chambers of the legislature. In the last Parliament, the then government had the numbers on the Lower House, but it was blocked in the Senate by Mr Holness' party, then in Opposition.

According to Mr Holness' argument at the time - with which this newspaper disagrees - the decision on a final court should be the subject of a referendum. It is now unclear where the Government stands on the matter.

The administration's silence is not, we hope, a signal that the intention now is for Jamaica to stay with the Privy Council in perpetuity. Our suggestion is to reset the conversation of constitutional reform to get agreement on what is achievable.

For our money, the CCJ, with its easier access to the third-tier of the courts, carries greater practical value to Jamaicans than renaming the governor general president, although we do not discount the symbolism or psychological value of the latter.

The Maintenance Act explained

[ALL WOMAN](#) Monday, April 25, 2016 , [Margarette MACAULAY](#)

Dear Mrs Macaulay,

When the Maintenance Act was amended in 2005, it made provision for each spouse to be obligated to maintain the other. Men can now apply for maintenance from their wives, and a woman is no longer entitled to be maintained by her husband whether she is capable of maintaining herself or not. Is this indeed now a part of the Maintenance Act in Jamaica?

Your first sentence is in simple terms correct, but there is more to the actual provision and other sections of the Act which must be considered by a judge in considering the issue of maintenance of a spouse. There is also the fact that the Maintenance Act provides for maintenance applications within the jurisdiction of Resident Magistrate's Courts and Family Courts.

It also effected amendments to the Matrimonial Causes Act for maintenance applications filed in the Supreme Court, or as part of divorce proceedings in this court. One of these amendments was that which deleted the word 'wife' and substituted the word 'spouse' therefor. However, in the

body of the section, it provides that one spouse would be referred to as the ‘contributing spouse’ and the other the ‘dependent spouse’. You can deduce which spouse would provide maintenance for the other. It is also interesting to note that the change from ‘wife’ to ‘spouse’ does not go further to say that the definition of ‘spouse’ in the Maintenance Act applies to the Matrimonial Causes Act.

Anyway, your question related specifically to the Maintenance Act and provision for spouses, so having made clear that this Act also effected amendments to the maintenance provisions in the Matrimonial Causes Act, I shall restrict myself. The provisions in the other Act need to be dealt with separately in order for them to be made clear.

Section 2 of the Act, which is the definition section and which defines ‘cohabit’, ‘single woman’, ‘single man’ and ‘spouse’, makes it clear that the Act also relates to legally married persons and persons in common-law unions.

Section 3 makes clear that the Resident Magistrate’s and Family Courts are the relevant courts to which a party may apply for maintenance orders under the Act. It also enables these courts, when dealing with an application under the Property (Rights of Spouses) Act, to make an order for maintenance in accordance with the provisions of the Maintenance Act.

Then the main provision, “Obligation of spouses during marriage or cohabitation”, is dealt with in section 4 of the Act. This section provides that each spouse has an obligation, as far as he or she is capable, to maintain the other spouse when such maintenance is necessary to meet the reasonable needs of the other spouse when this spouse cannot in practical terms or in reality provide for him/herself wholly or in part.

It also provides that the judge, in considering the evidence on the issue, must take into account the entire circumstances of the spouses; the assets and means which they have and are likely to have in the future, including pensions and the size(s) of the amount; the capacity of the spouse in need to contribute to their own support; the capacity of the other spouse to provide support; the mental and physical health of each to obtain appropriate gainful employment; and if any means

are available for the dependant spouse to become able to provide for their own support, what this is, how long it would take, and the costs. It also takes into account the need for the best interests of the dependant or respondent to stay at home to care for a child or children; the contribution made by the dependant to the realisation of the respondent's career potential; the quality of the relationship between them; and any fact or circumstance which in the opinion of the judge would be just to take into account in deciding the application.

There are several other matters and circumstances which a judge, in considering whether to order maintenance of a spouse and the period and amount of such support, must consider pursuant to the Act. I do not wish to bore the readers by listing any more. The thing to remember is that the Act seeks to have the courts act fairly between the parties, and yet not leave the needful and other party in want and destitute. In fact, there should be a full and detailed examination of both parties' financial and other relevant circumstances. The standard of living the parties had is also a relevant matter for consideration.

The Act enables the courts to make interim and final orders — orders for a certain time or for the rest of the natural life of the dependant spouse. Orders for periodic payments or for payment of a lump sum or for it to be paid and held in trust can also be made. Orders of attachment may also be made by the courts when the respondent has failed to abide by the maintenance orders and he or she has a pension or other income which can be attached, so that the monies are made payable directly from the payer of the pension or income to the dependant spouse.

Orders of maintenance can also be later varied on applications made to the courts if and when circumstances have changed for either of the parties. Any party who is dissatisfied with a maintenance order or order of attachment or collection orders as made can appeal to the Court of Appeal pursuant to its rules.

Spouses and those contemplating marriage can enter into maintenance agreements which must meet the requirements specified in the Act. Any term or act taken by either party to defeat the other's right to be maintained will make the agreement void and the court can, if appropriate, set aside such arrangements.

I hope that this has not been too technical, but the provisions relating to maintenance are quite extensive and not as simple as you, the writer, stated them.

Margarette May Macaulay is an attorney-at-law, Supreme Court mediator, notary public and women's and children's rights advocate. Send questions via e-mail to allwoman@jamaicaobserver.com; or write to All Woman, 40-42 1/2 Beechwood Avenue, Kingston 5. All responses are published. Mrs Macaulay cannot provide personal responses.

DISCLAIMER:

The contents of this article are for informational purposes only and must not be relied upon as an alternative to legal advice from your own attorney.

Former J'can beauty queen pleads not guilty to cocaine charge

The Observer



LOS ANGELES, United States (AP) — A JetBlue flight attendant accused of trying to sneak a suitcase full of cocaine through Los Angeles International Airport has pleaded not guilty to a federal charge.

City News Service says Marsha Gay Reynolds entered the plea Friday to possessing cocaine with intent to distribute.

Authorities say during a random security screening at LAX in March, the former Jamaican beauty queen left her carry-on luggage, kicked off her Gucci high-heels and bolted down an upward-moving escalator.

Authorities said they found about 70 pounds of cocaine in her luggage.

Reynolds, who lives in Queens, later surrendered in New York. If convicted, she faces 10 years in prison.

Reynolds is a graduate of New York University and is studying to be a nurse at Mercy College while working for JetBlue, the New York

Daily News reported. She has been suspended from her job. At her bail hearing last month, former New York City Councilman Allan Jennings described her as “a very good young woman”.

“She’s done all the right things in life except for this one situation,” he said. “She may not have been fully aware of what was in the bags.”

Tension rising in St Elizabeth sugar belt

BY KIMONE FRANCIS Observer staff reporter francisk@jamaicaobserver.com



Sugar cane in St Elizabeth. Farmers say they stand to lose over \$300 million because of non-production. Photos: Kimone Francis
THERE is growing tension among sugar workers in St Elizabeth following a decision by the Court of Appeal to uphold an

injunction obtained by Algix Jamaica Limited against J Wray & Nephew, which has resulted in a suspension of operations at Appleton Estate in the parish.

Algix in January filed an appeal for Appleton to cease production of sugar, which has resulted in the cancellation of the 2016 sugar cane harvest. The sugar harvest normally runs from January through June. Algix, in filing the injunction, claimed that Appleton was discharging effluent from the sugar factory that was killing its fish, an allegation that J Wray & Nephew has denied. The fish company has since filed a US\$49-million claim.

Appleton, which employs over 600 people, also caters to more than 800 third-party cane farmers who stand to lose upwards of \$300 million because of non-production.

“It’s very dangerous; it’s a chain... because it affects every single solitary life in the community. We have children not going to school since January because their father only cuts cane and their mother probably work on the estate so they can’t find food and they can’t find money to send the children to school. The whole neighbourhood is suffering,” vice-president of the All Island Cane Farmers Association Garfield Salmon told the Jamaica Observer when the newspaper visited the parish recently.

Salmon owns approximately 50 acres of sugar cane and employs more than 100 people during harvesting.

“It goes far. Fertiliser businesses are losing; three trailer load, of fertiliser would be coming to St Elizabeth per day. That is about 1,500 bags of fertiliser and that is now cut off. Talk about the chemical companies, that cut off, and talk about whom they employ, that cut off. So a lot of companies may soon have to start cutting off people too. It’s a multiplier effect anyway you take it. It’s a very dangerous thing happening. I can’t even count my loss right now,” he lamented.

“In a neighbourhood like this, this is what we know; this is what we’re used to. We don’t know anything else, so we put our lives in the sugar industry,” Salmon added.

“I am being affected every angle of my life. I can’t even look inna mi wife face again; I can’t even hug her up, I can’t kiss. Dem days deh done. And it’s the same way it becomes hate on the street. I don’t eat fresh water fish anymore and I won’t buy it. This is how serious it is, I tell you. This is not a joke situation, it is a very serious situation. If you take the food outta the dogs’

mouth they're going to bite and the biting don't start yet. Listening to people, it's just going to be a revolution some day, some way," he said.

Lincoln Thompson, a small sugar cane farmer from Siloah in the parish, told the Observer that the suspension of operations has impacted his life in a negative way.

"It a affect mi bad, very bad. Mi use sugar cane send mi three youth a school and one a graduate May and mi did a depend pon the little cane crop here now fi pay fi graduation," a despondent Thompson said. "Mi nuh know wah fi do. Him owe all student loan and mi nuh know how it ah pay. A di little cane wi a depend pon, this a affect wi bad, bad. Mi used to making \$200,000 a year and mi not even a go mek a penny now. Only mi wife have one little stall a di roadside and some time she nuh make \$20. Cane affect the area bad, bad ennuh because a it everybody depend pon."

His colleague, Carol Smith, who lives in the same community, is calling on the Government to intervene.

"Mi a plant cane fi more than 30 years now and mi nuh do nothing else. Mi work hard ennuh, and when mi look and see the crop lock dung mi nuh waah fi go rob nobody, so mi would want fi see di Government come help. A nuh mi one a suffer. If yuh walk and look at the shop the people dem buy dem something and it naah sell. Right yah now mi borrow money and cyah pay it back. "Mi nuh waah go rob so mi just a watch and see. Di government affi help because Appleton is di centre of the community and di source of income. Mi owe Courts and cyah pay right now, so Government affi go do something," he urged.

Another farmer, from the Thornton community in the parish who declined to give his name, said he has reached his limit.

"Anyhow mi did believe inna suicide you wouldn't see me now. Believe mi, mi a tell you mi a suffer. Mi borrow di people dem money and cyah pay it back cause crop naah start. A mi family

affi help me. From mi a go a school and mi a old man now a it help mi. If mi know who a mek mi a suffer suh mi reach a prison,” he warned.

Despite the suspension of production at Appleton, the company is still assisting its workers by making wage payments.

In the meantime, aquaculturist and managing director of Algix Jamaica Maurice Reynolds, in defending his company’s position to file the injunction, said it was not his intention to cause any suffering.

“It was never our intention for any of this to happen. What we want is for both Algix and Appleton to be able to operate without causing any infringement on each other,” Reynolds told the Observer.

The Observer attempted to make contact with Minister without Portfolio in the Ministry of Industry, Commerce and Agriculture J C Hutchinson but repeated calls and text messages to his phone went unanswered.

Accused, complainant trade cellphone robbery charges

Covering the courts
with Tanesha Mundle
The Observer

A brief look at Jamaica's political history provides an interesting background to the concept and creation of the 1962 Constitution and the format of the Senate.

A Kingston vendor was taken before the court for reportedly robbing a man of his cellphone in downtown Kingston.

But the accused, Simone Cunningham, denied the allegation and claimed that it was the complainant who had robbed her of her phone.

The court heard that on April 6, the complainant was walking on Orange Street when he was approached by Cunningham, who demanded his phone and accused him of stealing her phone. The complainant reportedly told her that he was seeing her for the first time and did not rob her of a phone. Shortly after, a gang of men took away his phone and gave it to Cunningham.

The complainant left and reported the matter to the police. He then took them back to the location where he was robbed and pointed out Cunningham, who was reportedly held with the phone.

She was subsequently arrested and charged with robbery with aggravation. However, on Thursday when the matter was mentioned Cunningham told the court that she had taken the phone but later denied that it was ever in her possession.

“Yes, I did rob him, but I was not with nobody,” she said. “He rob me when I was selling and him pass mi and I saw him in the morning and I go up to him and ask him bout my phone and he start fight mi and mi tek the phone out of his hand.”

Senior Parish Judge Judith Pusey then asked her why she did not report the matter to the police and let them deal with the case.

“Mi tell the police and dem seh ‘Nobody cyaa rob yuh, yuh come from Chancery Lane’,” Cunningham answered.

The magistrate then asked her about the complainant’s phone and she said that the police did not take any phone from her.

The judge turned to her lawyer, Hopeton Marsh, and said: “Talk to your client, this is an interesting case.” She, however, told the accused that she should not have taken the matter into her own hands.

“That’s the problem, you have taken it upon yourself to do your own investigation and arrest and you have found yourself behind bars,” Judge Pusey said. Cunningham’s bail was then extended for her to return to court on May 2.

Judge refuses vendor’s request to throw out case

Covering the courts
with Tanesha Mundle
The Observer

A vendor who said she was chopped on her neck by another higgler during a fight in downtown Kingston, last December told the St Andrew Parish Court last Thursday that she did not wish to continue with the matter, as she was related to the accused.

She also complained about the number of times that she has had to attend the court. However, Senior Parish Judge Judith Pusey told her that she could not throw out the matter and extended the bail granted to Jermaine Wynter, as she scheduled the case for mention in May due to an outstanding medical report.

The court had heard that on December 30, 2015 the 26-year-old complainant was inside a wholesale store on Princess Street purchasing goods when she heard an uproar outside and went to check.

The complainant said she saw the mother of Wynter’s children, whom she knew, and two girls

embroiled in a fight. When the fight subsided, Wynter's babymother reportedly told the complainant that one of the girls was having an affair with the accused.

The complainant and Wynter's babymother were talking when the woman with whom Wynter was allegedly having an affair approached the complainant and pointed her finger in her face, saying "A come yu come fi buy out di argument."

The complaint said she replied: "Likkle girl, mi nuh fight ova man, plus, mi have too much man fi go fight ova man."

The complainant said she then redirected her attention to Wynter's babymother who was explaining how the fight started. The complainant said she asked the babymother: "So why yuh stand up and mek dem beat yuh off?"

The woman with whom the complainant had the exchange of words reportedly approached her again and grabbed onto the rollers in her hair, triggering a fight between them.

The complainant said that during the fight Wynter used a stone to hit her in her back, resulting in her engaging him in a fight, during which she kicked him and ran.

He chased her, but the dispute was reportedly quelled by a cop who was passing by. But the complainant alleged that shortly after, when she returned to the store and was making a purchase, Wynter came up behind her and said: "Hey gal, bet yuh nuh mek it into 2016 wid me," before using a machete to chop her on the neck.

According to the complainant, blood flowed from the wound like [water from a] pipe. She was rushed to Kingston Public Hospital where she was admitted. Wynter was subsequently arrested and charged with attempted murder.

Man tells court he broke into house because he wanted to sleep

Covering the courts
with Tanesha Mundle
The Observer



There was laughter in the St Andrew Parish Court last Tuesday when a St Mary man who was caught trying to break into a man's home in Kingston, said he was doing so in order to sleep.

Alexander Blake was caught by security guards attempting to break into the complainant's home on April 9.

The court heard that when the security guards arrived at the home, Blake reportedly had half of his body inside the garage.

The complainant, who was present, told Judge Ellis that the incident marked the second time that Blake had broken into his home.

"On the first occasion he attempted to break inside and damaged several items," the complainant said.

When asked why he had not reported the first incident, the complainant said he had called the police but when they came they did not take any statement from him.

The judge then asked Blake where he was from and learnt that he was from St Mary.

"What you doing in Kingston and St Andrew if you live in St Mary?" she asked.

“I got discharged from a health centre,” Blake replied.

When quizzed further by the judge, Blake said that he was released from the health centre in Kingston and that he had planned to visit his mother who lives in the same parish.

She then asked: “ So why you wanted to go inside the man’s home?”

“Sleep, mi did waa sleep,” he said, eliciting laughter from the court.

“Really,” Judge Ellis said. “Why you never call and ask?”

“From mi a age 15 nobody nuh live there,” Blake replied.

“You should have gone to your parent’s house,” Ellis told Blake.

“Why you didn’t go into your mother’s house to sleep? Why you gone to stranger’s house?” she asked Blake, who did not answer.

Blake was subsequently remanded for psychiatric evaluation and is to return to court on May 19.

Woman charged with breaches of the Spirit Act

The Observer

KINGSTON, Jamaica – The police are reporting that as a part of ongoing efforts to address public order and human trafficking issues, an operation was conducted in the Grove Road area of Kencot, in Kingston on Friday.

Nine women were taken into custody, one of whom was charged with breaches of the Spirit Licence Act.

She is 36-year-old Akealia Gordon of Independence City, St Catherine.

Information gathered by the communications arm of the Jamaica Constabulary Force is that about 7:30 am a special operation was carried out at a facility operating as a bar and a massage

parlour. Eight females from different parishes across the island, and as far as Westmoreland were picked up. The operator of the bar was subsequently charged for operating without a licence. The other women were processed and released.

“The police will be unrelenting in addressing matters treating on public order and other related issues within the division,” said SSP Millicent Sproul Thomas, Commander for the St Andrew Central Division and leader of the operation.

UPDATE: St Vincent pastor, family members in court for wounding

The Observer



Cuthbert Victory shows his back after being doused with hot water (Photo:CMC)

KINGSTOWN, St Vincent (CMC) – A pastor and two other members of his family, including his wife, were released on EC\$5,000 (One Ec dollar =US\$0.37 cents) bail each after they appeared in court here

Friday on a charge of unlawfully and maliciously inflicting grievous bodily harm on a man.

Read: [St Vincent police questioning pastor after mason doused with hot water](#)

Pastor Nigel Morgan, his wife Althea, an office clerk, and their daughter, Crystal, pleaded not guilty to throwing a hot liquid on Cuthbert Victory, who suffered burns to his back, shoulder, face and chest, earlier this month.

Doctors said that he was doused with hot water mixed with oil during the April 9 incident.

The trio, appeared before Chief Magistrate, Rechanne Browne-Matthias at the Serious Offence Court in Kingstown, and will re-appear in the Mesopotamia Magistrate’s Court in Marriaqua, the interior community where they incident took place, on April 29.

“I hope you all make enough money — you hear?” said Morgan, as photographers too the picture of the family as they left the court building.

“I hope you all give an offering to all the churches,” he added.

Attorney Kay Bacchus-Browne told CMC on Friday that her clients have a good defense.

“It is not like what you see going around on social media where it is being said that the three of them joined together. It is not like that at all,” Bacchus-Browne said.

Morgan had earlier told CMC that the incident was ‘a spiritual warfare.

“This is a spiritual warfare. It is in the hands of God and he will fight and he will deliver,” he had said then.

Victory, a mason, and a father of two, said that he wants to be compensated for the burns he suffered as well as the loss of income.

Jamaican charged for cocaine in Bermuda



The Star Online

A Jamaican national accused of importing a quantity of cocaine into Bermuda was charged in the country this morning.

Charged with importing cocaine is 30-year-old Tyrone Brown, who was not required to enter a plea to because it must be heard by the Supreme Court before.

THE STAR understands that Brown attempted to enter the island with roughly 900g of cocaine to the which has a street value of between BMD\$95,700 (approximately J\$11.7 million and BMD\$209,625 (approximately J\$25.6 million) if sold on the streets of the island.

The presiding magistrate ordered Brown further remanded into custody until May 2, at which point he is expected to be scheduled to appear before the Supreme Court for arraignment.

The End