

**A STUDY OF DOUBLE JEOPARDY: A COMPARISON BETWEEN  
ARTICLE 7(2) OF FEDERAL CONSTITUTION AND THE  
POSITION IN ENGLAND**

By:

Aimi Nadiah Bt Abd Rahman (2006200762)

Saira Nur Farrin Bt Baharin (2006200746)

Nur Farzana Bt Mohd Puat (2006200892)

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Bachelor in Legal Studies (Hons)



**Universiti Teknologi MARA**  
**Faculty of Law**

October 2008

The students/authors confirm that the work submitted is their own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

## **Abstract**

This research was conducted to critically analyse the comparison between Article 7(2) of Federal Constitution of Malaysia and the position in England on double jeopardy. We chose this topic because we want to know the ways in which the courts in Malaysia or England interpret double jeopardy whether it is wider or narrower. Moreover, recently there have been so many cases where the accused had been acquitted because of the lack of evidence to convict them. This is because there is a lacuna in our law to recharge them if there is new evidence found. This led to the feeling of dissatisfaction on the part of the victim because they cannot get justice on their part. This research can open up our minds to the subject and also we can draw our own conclusion and recommendations for this research. Therefore, this issue needs more discussion and explanation for future benefits.

## **Acknowledgement**

First of all, we wish to thank Allah the Almighty, because of His blessings, we are granted with good health, and are able to finish this challenging assignment smoothly on time. We would also like to express our highest gratitude to Encik Ismail Bin Badiuzzaman, who is our supervisor of this research. He has helped us so much throughout the making of this project paper. We are really thankful to him because of his encouragement, guidance and patience.

Secondly, special and warm “thanks” to our parents who have made us what we are today. They have been our biggest supporters and our pillar of strength. Thank you for their continued support and faith in us.

Especially to Tuan Shahrul Rizal Bin Majid who is the Principal Assistant Director of the Judicial and Legal Training Institute (ILKAP), Tuan Che Wan Zaidi Bin Che Wan Ibrahim who is the Deputy Registrar of the High Court in Shah Alam and Puan Amirah Mohamed Yusoff who is the Deputy Public Prosecutor/ Federal Counsel of the Royal Malaysian Customs; all of them had spent their valuable time to share their knowledge and opinions, hence, we would like to express our deepest gratitude for their willingness and contributions for our research.

All of our friends also deserve a special dedication because they have helped us a lot in finding the sources and as a result have made this assignment a great one.

Next, we also like to thanks the librarian in PTAR2 for their assistance and willingness to help us in finding all the books and other sources which are related to our research.

Lastly, we would like to thank anyone who had assisted us in doing our project paper one way or another, we really appreciate it. They had given their commitment, patience

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgment	ii
Abstract	iii
Contents	iv
List of Cases	viii
List of Statutes	ix

### CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Problem Statement	3
1.3	Objective of Study	3
1.4	Methodology	4
1.5	Limitation	4
1.6	Significance of Studies	5
1.7	Provisional Plan of Research	6

### CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW:

2.1	Background	7
	2.1.1 Malaysia	7
	2.1.2 England	8
2.2	Definition of Double Jeopardy	10
	2.2.1 Malaysia	10
	2.2.2 England	11
2.3	Scope of Double Jeopardy	12
	2.3.1 Malaysia	12
	2.3.2 England	13
2.4	Rules against Double Jeopardy in Malaysia	15
	2.4.1 Conviction or Acquittal	16
	2.4.2 Meaning of the 'same offence'	17
	2.4.3 Preventive Detention	17
2.5	Rules of Double Jeopardy in England	18
	2.5.1 The Present Law of Double Jeopardy	19
	2.5.1.1 The <i>autrefois</i> rule	19
	2.5.1.2 The <i>Connolly</i> principle	20
2.6	New Evidence	21
2.7	DNA Evidence	23

### **CHAPTER THREE: DISCUSSION OF RELEVANT CASES RELATING TO DOUBLE JEOPARDY**

3.1	Cases relating to Double Jeopardy in Malaysia	25
3.1.1	Conviction	25
3.1.1.1	Fan Yew Teng v Public Prosecutor	25
3.1.2	Acquittal	26
3.1.2.1	Sau Soo Kim v Public Prosecutor	26
3.1.3	Meaning of “same offence”.	27
3.1.3.1	Jamali Bin Adnan v Public Prosecutor	27
3.1.4	Preventive Detention	29
3.1.4.1	Yeap Hock Seng @ Ah Seng v Minister for Home Affairs, Malaysia & Ors	29
3.1.4.2	Saravanan a/l Ks Somu v Timbalan Menteri dalam Negeri Malaysia & Ors	30
3.1.5	Disciplinary Proceeding	31
3.1.5.1	Zakaria Bin Abdul Rahman v Ketua Polis Negara Malaysia & Anor	31
3.2	Cases relating to double jeopardy in England	33
3.2.1	Connelly v Director of Public Prosecutions	33
3.2.2	Deputy Public Prosecutor v Humphrys	35
3.2.3	R v Dunlop	36
3.2.4	Williams v Director of Public Prosecutions	37
3.2.5	R (on the application of Redgrave) v Metropolitan Police Commissioner	38
3.3	Conclusion	39

### **CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS BASED ON INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED**

4.1	Identification of the Main Issue Relating to the Rule against Double Jeopardy	41
4.2	Awareness of the Differences between the Rule against Double Jeopardy in Malaysia and England	42
4.3	The Strengths and Weaknesses of the Rule against Double Jeopardy	43
4.4	The Needs for Improvement	47
4.5	Conclusion	48