

Analysis of the judgment.

In light of the arguments made by the four justices pursuant to complaints filed by Jumhooree Party (JP) with reference to the computer forensics analyst report compiled by the police, and the dissenting judgments of two justices under the Supreme Court judgment number 42/SC-C/2013 regarding the election on 7 September 2013, it is apparent that the judgment contains factual discrepancies and does not indicate a basis which would change the outcome of the election results.

		With reference to Police Computer Forensics Analyst Report	
#	Arguments made by JP	Judgment given by 4 justices (Justice Abdullah Saeed, Justice Ali Hameed, Justice Adam Mohamed, Justice Dr. Ahmed Abdullah Didi)	Dissenting judgment of 2 justices (Chief Justice Ahmed Faiz Hussain, Justice Abdullah Areef) <u>Judgment of Justice Ahmed Muthassim Adnan:</u> The timescales by which an election should be held is stipulated in the Constitution therefore since the Supreme Court does not have the power to issue a ruling that violates the aforementioned, the Supreme Court is not required to issue a ruling on JP's case.
1	41 persons under the age of 18 were included on the electoral registry	<u>7 persons</u> under the age of 18 voted	32 persons in the electoral registry had not turned 18 by 7 September 2013, 9 persons information was not ascertained and of the 32, <u>12 persons</u> voted.
2	669 deceased persons were included on the electoral registry	<u>18 persons</u> indicated as deceased on the DNR registry <u>voted</u> .	Out of the 669 persons, information was obtained regarding 637 persons. Out of that 637, <u>14 persons voted</u> , and out of that 14, 2 persons voted using an Identity Card that was not issued to them. (Note: This indicates that 14 persons were not deceased, and that 2 persons fraudulently voted)
3	204 persons with their names repeated on the electoral registry	225 persons who have been indicated as repeated names on the DNR database who are not be issued Identity Cards cast	174 persons names matched those that were on the list of eligible voters, out of which 22 persons are indicated as repeated names on the DNR database, <u>however none of these persons were seen to</u>

		their votes.	<u>have voted twice in the voters list</u>
4	1818 persons included in the electoral registry who are not in the DNR database	7 persons who are not in the DNR database voted	In the list submitted by JP, 1637 persons who were not issued ID cards were identified, and out of those 207 persons voted. (Out of that 207, 96 persons voted using an ID card number that was different to the ID card number in the gazetted list)
5	1187 persons in the electoral registry whose listed address was registered without the knowledge of the property owner.		<u>Of the list of 1187 persons submitted by JP, 1115 voted. However none voted at any ballot box other than that which they were assigned.</u>
6		Despite ID card number discrepancies, 773 persons were allowed to vote. <u>(Note: However there is no evidence to suggest that any of these person had voted twice)</u>	
7		7 persons who were not on the list were added to the list with a pen and allowed to vote. <u>(Note: However there is no evidence to suggest that due to this any of these persons had voted twice)</u>	7 persons who were not on the list were added to the list with a pen and allowed to vote, <u>however there is no evidence to suggest that any of these person had voted twice</u>
8			Since the information on the electoral registry contradicted with the DNR database, it was revised according to the DNR database with a pen and the chance to vote was given. <u>However there is no evidence to suggest that due to this any of those persons voted twice.</u>
9		2830 persons who had discrepancies with their permanent address were allowed to	

		vote. (Note: <u>However there is no evidence to suggest that due to this any of these persons had voted twice</u>)	
10		952 persons voted despite discrepancies with their listed name. (Note: <u>However there is no evidence to suggest that due to this any of these persons had voted twice</u>)	
11		Due to negligence by Elections officials, there were discrepancies between what was noted by the officials and the printed ID card numbers of 819 persons. (Note: <u>However there is no evidence to suggest that due to this any of these persons had voted twice</u>)	
12		3 persons voted repeatedly	
	Number of fraudulent votes	<u>242 votes</u>	<u>473 votes</u>

11 October 2013

- DNR: Department of National Registration.