

**A STUDY ON THE DEOXYRIBONUCLEIC ACID (DNA)
IDENTIFICATION ACT 2009**

By

Che Mohd Firdaus bin Che Soh (2007144041)
Eliza Safreen binti Mohd Sidek (2007143825)
Fairuz Azhan bin Amiruddin (2005682289)
Mohd Aiman Syafiq bin Mohd Nasir (2007136999)
Mohd Aizat bin Azmi (2007144117)
Mohd Azzamuddin Shah bin Yaakap (2007136993)

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

**Universiti Teknologi MARA
Faculty of Law**

April 2010

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.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, we would like to express our utmost gratitude to Professor Dr Lim Heng Gee, for his guidance in assisting and supervising us at every stage in undertaking and completing the research. We are also thankful to Associate Professor Norha Abu Hanafiah and Madam Norazlina Abdul Aziz for their guidance and assistance in preparing the research proposal. Last but not least, special thanks to everybody who has been involved directly or indirectly in the completion of this research project. For their moral support, words are insufficient to express our appreciation.

ABSTRACT

The research conducted is on the DNA Identification Act 2009. It looks into the various issues surrounding the DNA Identification Act 2009 that may have implications on the general Malaysian public. The aim of the research is to identify the problems and defects of the DNA Identification Act 2009 and to propose necessary amendments and recommendations to overcome these problems and defects.

Throughout the research, we discovered that there are several issues arising out of the said DNA Identification Act 2009. First, the police are given absolute power in storing and collecting DNA samples with no separation of powers or independent body to monitor them. Also under the Act, the Head of the DNA Databank has power to rectify the information stored in the database without being subject to allegations of tampering and this may lead to abuse. The third issue is that chemists have been given the privilege of being immune from any default or omission done by them, thus not making them liable for any negligent act during the processing of DNA samples. Also, the definition of chemist under the act is too wide and general. Finally, the Act allows for retrospective DNA sample to be taken from people who are currently serving their sentence, as it has retrospective effect.

From the research, it is concluded that there are many improvements that can be made to the DNA Identification Act 2009. Thus, recommendations and amendments are suggested for the aforementioned issues to be resolved.

Acknowledgement	ii
Abstract	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Cases	vii
List of Statutes	viii

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.0 Title	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Background Study	1
1.3 DNA Statutes in Selected Countries	6
1.3.1 The United States of America	7
1.3.2 Australia	11
1.3.3 New Zealand	13
1.3.4 Republic of China	14
1.4 Problem Statement	16
1.5 Objectives of study	17
1.6 Methodology	17
1.7 Limitations	18
1.8 Literature Review	19
1.9 Significance of Study	21

CHAPTER TWO: ANALYSIS OF THE DNA IDENTIFICATION ACT 2009

2.1 Introduction	23
2.2 History and Background of the DNA Identification Act 2009	23
2.3 Arrangement of the DNA Identification Act 2009	24
2.4 Structure of the DNA Identification Act 2009	24
2.4.1 Preliminary Matters	24
2.4.2 The Forensic DNA Databank and the Various Indices	25
2.4.3 Taking of Intimates and Non-Intimates Sample and Related Matters	29
2.4.4 Immunity from Legal Proceeding and External Cooperation	31
2.5 Deoxyribonucleic Acid (DNA) Identification Bills 2008	32
2.6 Analysis of DNA Identification Bills 2008 and DNA Identification Act 2009	33
2.7 Defects of DNA Identification Act 2009	34

CHAPTER THREE: COMPARISON BETWEEN THE MALAYSIAN DNA IDENTIFICATION ACT 2009 AND SIMILAR STATUTES IN OTHER COUNTRIES

3.1 Introduction	37
3.2 Types of DNA Databank	37
3.2.1 Malaysia	37
3.2.2 Canada	38

3.2.3	Mauritius	38
3.2.4	Republic of Trinidad and Tobago	39
3.2.5	Singapore	40
3.2.6	United Kingdom	40
3.3	Functions and Objectives of the DNA Database	40
3.3.1	Malaysia	41
3.3.2	Canada	41
3.3.3	Mauritius	42
3.3.4	Republic of Trinidad and Tobago	42
3.3.5	Singapore	43
3.3.6	United Kingdom	43
3.4	Power to Request DNA Samples	44
3.4.1	Malaysia	44
3.4.2	Canada	44
3.4.3	Mauritius	45
3.4.4	Republic of Trinidad and Tobago	45
3.4.5	Singapore	46
3.4.6	United Kingdom	46
3.5	Offences and Sentences provided under the Act	48
3.5.1	Malaysia	48
3.5.2	Canada	49
3.5.3	Mauritius	50
3.5.4	Republic of Trinidad and Tobago	51
3.5.5	Singapore	51
3.5.6	United Kingdom	52
3.6	Protection of Human Rights and Civil Liberties	52
3.6.1	Malaysia	52
3.6.2	Canada	53
3.6.3	Mauritius	54
3.6.4	Republic of Trinidad and Tobago	55
3.6.5	Singapore	55
3.6.6	United Kingdom	56

CHAPTER FOUR: PUBLIC PERCEPTION ON DEOXYRIBONUCLEIC ACID (DNA) IDENTIFICATION ACT 2009

4.1	Introduction	58
4.2	Analysis of Respondent	58
4.2.1	Respondents Gender	58
4.2.2	Respondents Level of Education	59
4.2.3	Respondents Occupation	60
4.3	Analysis of response towards the DNA Identification Act 2009	61
4.3.1	Analysis on question “Are you aware of the existence of the DNA Identification Act?”	62
4.3.2	Analysis on question “Do you agree with the need for the DNA Identification Act?”	63
4.3.3	Analysis on question “Do you think Malaysia is ready	