

PART II
ANTI-CORRUPTION



PART II

ANTI-CORRUPTION

I. Introduction

The graft-fighting works in 2014 developed in a stable and orderly way. In this year, the Macao SAR experienced the election of Chief Executive and changes of key personnel of the government. The CCAC did not receive any complaints about election in 2014, unlike 2013 in which the Legislative Assembly Election took place.

In 2014, the total number of cases recorded slightly dropped compared with 2013. However, there was a larger decrease in criminal reports compared with the past few years, reflecting an increase in administrative complaints.

Of the criminal cases investigated throughout the year, most involved crimes committed by public servants, mainly forgery of documents, of which a large proportion were attendance records. Other crimes included power abuse, fraud and embezzlement. Meanwhile, there was a drop in cases of passive corruption committed by public servants. Moreover, the CCAC completed two cases of submission of incorrect data for declaration of assets and interests and a case of unexplained wealth.

Compared with 2013, the number of bribery cases in the private sector in 2014 slightly decreased. In fact, there are various industries and professions in the private sector, the definition of crime differs from industry to industry due to different practices and rules. Moreover, according to the law *Prevention and Suppression of Bribery in the Private Sector*, penal procedures shall only be instituted when there is a complaint. Some of the private companies choose not to file a complaint in order to minimise negative effect after criminal facts are discovered. As a result, the CCAC cannot initiate criminal investigation procedure under the law.

II. Reports and cases filed for investigation

In 2014, the CCAC received a total of 865 complaints and reports, including 266 criminal cases qualified for handling, of which 33 cases were filed for formal investigation. Moreover, the CCAC processed 17 cases carried over from the previous year.

Throughout the year, the CCAC completed the investigations of a total of 492 cases (including cases carried over from 2013), a larger increase compared with the past few years.

Cases received from 2010 to 2014

Data	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
All cases received	681	804	852	896	865
Criminal cases qualified for handling	133	182	297	264	266
Cases completed	39	64	185	236	492 ¹

III. Summaries of some of the cases investigated by the CCAC

Case 1

In January 2014, the CCAC’s investigation staff found a post on a social network which indicated that someone saw two police officers of the Public Security Police Force (PSP) issuing parking tickets to all cars illegally parked at the streets at Ilha Verde except a car owned by a staff member of the Traffic Department of the PSP. Subsequently, the CCAC took the initiative to intervene into the case.

¹ Including cases carried over from 2013.

It was revealed in the investigation that, on an afternoon in January 2014, the two police officers of the Traffic Department of the PSP, surnamed Sio and Ngan, were carrying out the duty in the area and found that one of the illegally parked cars, a white Honda Jazz with vehicle registration plate no. MK-XX-93, belonged to a colleague of the department. In order to help the colleague escape from punishment, the duo did not issue the ticket. However, there was a passer-by who witnessed the incident and requested Sio to do it. Subsequently, Sio deliberately issued a ticket filled in with incorrect data. The registration plate number, the color and the brand of the car were changed to no. MK-XX-92, black and Mitsubishi, in an attempt to help the colleague evade the charge for illegal parking.

Following investigation and evidence gathering, the CCAC found strong signs that Sio and Ngan's acts had allegedly constituted offences of "forgery committed by public servant" and "malfeasance" under the *Penal Code*. The case was referred to the Public Prosecutions Office upon completion of the investigation.

Case 2

The CCAC discovered that a cultural association conspired with a local advertising company to deceive the government over subsidies with false receipts when organising an exhibition.

It was revealed in the investigation that the cultural association, established in 2011, organised an exhibition once every year in a large convention centre in Macao. Every time the person-in-charge of the association applied for subsidies from some government departments. However, in an attempt to receive higher amounts of subsidies, he/she conspired with the advertising company that was contracted to decorate the venue to defraud over undue subsidies by overstating the production expense with false receipts.

Between 2012 and 2013, the two suspects allegedly attempted to defraud over subsidies amounting to a total of more than MOP200,000 by document forgery. Eventually, they managed to obtain around MOP80,000. The association received government subsidies amounting to over MOP1 million in total through organising exhibitions in the two years. During the investigation, the duo confessed to the relevant facts.

The defraud of government subsidies by submitting false receipts to public departments committed by the two suspects caused a loss of public assets. Their acts had allegedly constituted offences of “document forgery” and “fraud” under the *Penal Code*. The case was finally referred to the Public Prosecutions Office.

Case 3

In September 2014, the CCAC unveiled a case of “document forgery” and “fraud involving considerably high value” allegedly committed by a board member of an association of Macao.

After investigation, it came to light that the Health Bureau, the Macao Foundation and the Office of the Secretary for Social Affairs and Culture grant subsidies to civil associations on condition that the applicants shall not apply for subsidies to other institutions for the same or the same kind of project.

Between July and October 2011, the said association made an application to the Health Bureau, the Macao Foundation and the Office of the Secretary for Social Affairs and Culture respectively for subsidy of its 2012’s operation cost. The suspect concealed the income and surplus of the association by forging documents for the applications in order to receive larger amounts of subsidies and even have the unqualified applications approved. Meanwhile, when the suspect applied for a subsidy item entitled “subsidy for professionals” from the Health Bureau and the Macao Foundation respectively in 2012, he/she declared in the application documents that the association had not sought any sponsorship from any other institutions

under the same category. Finally, the association received subsidies from the two government institutions, with the duplicated portion totalling to an approximate amount of MOP350,000.

Moreover, the suspect, when reporting to the subsidising institutions over the use of the subsidies, intentionally concealed the fact that the said association had recorded a surplus of more than MOP1 million in 2012. By means of making false statement, overstating expenditure, understating and omitting revenue, he/she made relevant government institutions believe that the subsidies had been consumed with even a deficit recorded in the operation of the association. Such acts were carried out in an attempt to avoid returning the subsidies to the government institutions.

It was initially estimated that the illicit advantages gained by the association through submitting false documents amounted to over MOP1 million. Therefore, there were strong signs showing that the suspect had allegedly committed offences of “document forgery” and “fraud involving considerably high value” under the *Penal Code*. The case was referred to the Public Prosecutions Office upon completion of the investigation.

Case 4

In the course of investigation into a bribery case, the CCAC found that an inspector of the Judiciary Police allegedly committed offences of “submission of incorrect data” for declaration of assets and interests and “unexplained wealth”.

The investigation revealed that between 2012 and 2014, there were over 100 transactions of cash deposit to the inspector’s bank account through ATM machines. Over MOP3 million was deposited in total.

Since saving money through ATM machines does not record the depositor’s identification data, taking advantage of this loophole, each time the inspector successfully deposited a sum amounting to tens of thousands to over one hundred

thousands patacas from unjustified sources into his/her account, totalling over MOP3 million, which exceeded four times of his/her due income.

It also came to the light that the inspector purposefully omitted the bank account with over MOP1 million in his/her declaration document when fulfilling the obligation to declare his/her assets and interests under the law.

The inspector violated the *Legal Regime of Declaration of Assets and Interests* as his/her acts have allegedly constituted offences of “submission of incorrect data” for declaration of assets and interests and “unexplained wealth”. The case was referred to the Public Prosecutions Office.

Case 5

The CCAC detected a case of “bribery in the private sector” and “fraud involving considerably high value” allegedly committed by two doctors of a private medical institution which involved an amount exceeding MOP1.4 million.

It was revealed in the investigation that the suspects Lau, who was also a supervisory staff of the institution, and Leong, a team leader, were responsible for the medical laboratory services provided by the institution. Starting from 2012, the two suspects falsely represented the institution and approached a number of private laboratories, claiming that the medical institution they were serving encouraged their doctors to refer patients to have medical examinations in private laboratories. Suspect Leong would collect once a month the “consultation fees”.

The two suspects, without their employer’s prior consent and knowing that it would breach their professional duties and that the medical institution they worked for had its own medical laboratory services, still enticed or forced the subordinate doctors to refer their patients to private laboratories for medical examinations so as to solicit undue advantage. In addition to the long-term loss of the employer, the behaviour of the two suspects also caused some patients to conduct unnecessary

medical examinations in private laboratories, ignoring the rights and interests of the patients.

Moreover, the CCAC also found that Leong did not return the “consultation fee” he/she collected monthly from the private laboratories to the institution nor had he/she distributed it proportionally to the subordinate doctors according to the list provided by the private laboratories. Instead, by deceiving his/her superiors and subordinates, Leong only distributed less than half of the total amount of the “consultation fee” to the doctors and conspired with Lau to appropriate the rest of the amount. Until the beginning of October 2014, it was estimated that a cumulative amount of more than MOP1.4 million was involved in this case.

The behaviour of the two suspects allegedly violated the provisions of “fraud involving considerably high value” under the *Penal Code* and “passive bribery” under the law *Prevention and Suppression of Bribery in the Private Sector*. The case was finally referred to the Public Prosecutions Office.

Case 6

In the course of investigation into a case of bribery, the CCAC found that a department chief of the Cultural Affairs Bureau had allegedly violated the law and therefore an investigation was commenced.

It was found that in 2007, the supervisory staff, making use of his/her power, suggested exemption of ordinary consulting procedure in the process of adjudicating a designing job for the reason that it was urgent. Eventually, the job was directly granted to a company of which one of the shareholders was his/her spouse. The staff concealed the fact that his/her spouse was one of the shareholders of the company and suggested granting the designing job to the company. As a result, the company was also given the jobs of support service in later stage and design revision, receiving service fees amounting to a total of MOP2 million approximately. Later, there were

deficiencies in the design and it took over one year for the company to revise it, resulting in delay of the bidding for the relevant projects and extra project costs amounting to over MOP10 million paid by the government.

The staff and his/her spouse allegedly constituted offences of “unlawful economic advantage in a legal act” under the *Penal Code*. The case was referred to the Public Prosecutions Office.

Case 7

The CCAC detected a corruption case in the private sector, where the president of the property owners’ committee of a residential building had allegedly received advantage from an equipment supplier to assist, by means of document forgery, the latter in securing the renewal of its service contract, causing loss suffered by the property owners.

It was discovered in the investigation that in early 2009, a local construction and equipment company entered into a two-year term contract with the property owners’ committee. According to the contract, the company shall replace the existing lights of the building with energy saving ones and shall be entitled to a monthly service fee equivalent to 60% of the energy savings.

However, when the contract expired in 2011, the person-in-charge of the company, in order to obtain the contract renewal to continue receiving the service fee, conspired with the property owners’ committee president and changed the contract period from two years to three years, as well as added the terms of automatic renewal, resulting in the property owners of the building paying a service fee of several tens of thousands more in total. Besides, the property owners’ committee president, who was a public servant, eventually obtained the right to operate business from the person-in-charge of that company, with an intention to circumvent the legal provisions of not allowing public servant to engage in outside practices and run his/her own private business.

The two suspects allegedly committed offences of “active bribery” and “passive bribery” provided by the law *Prevention and Suppression of Bribery in the Private Sector* and “document forgery” under the *Penal Code*. The case was referred to the Public Prosecutions Office.

Moreover, since one of the suspects also allegedly violated the provisions governing public administration staff, the relevant department commenced disciplinary proceedings after the CCAC reported the case.

Case 8

The CCAC detected a case of fraud over government subsidy for purchase of energy-saving products.

The case disclosed that the four suspects in the case managed to get the subsidies from Environmental Protection and Energy Conservation Funds by fraud several times. Three of the suspects were suppliers of energy-saving products, during the process of applying for the Government-funded “Subsidy Scheme for Acquisition of Products and Equipment for Environmental Protection and Energy Conservation” on behalf of the clients, they allegedly quoted an exaggerated price of energy-saving products to the relevant environmental protection department and submitted false quotations and invoices in order to get subsidies of larger amounts.

Under the subsidy scheme, the maximum amount of subsidy is up to 80% of the price of the energy-saving products, the remaining 20% and the installation costs are the responsibilities of the clients themselves. The suspects involved ultimately caused the funding institution to subsidise the full amount. As a result, the clients had no need to pay for the remaining 20% and the installation cost. The other suspect, who was the proprietor of a subsidised shop, also participated in the fraud in the application processes.

It was also found in the investigation that the case involved a total of 22 applications from different applicants and over MOP200,000.

The acts of the four suspects allegedly constituted offences of “document forgery” and “fraud” according to the *Penal Code*. The case was finally referred to the Public Prosecutions Office.

Case 9

The CCAC detected a case of law and discipline violation allegedly committed by a nurse of a public hospital who had stolen drugs from the hospital and assisted a patient in using the drugs without any prescription.

As a nurse of a public hospital, the suspect had access to the hospital pharmacy and had the right to take the drugs away from the pharmacy. It was discovered in the investigation that in 2013, the nurse took a kind of injection which shall only be used by prescription away from the pharmacy without approval at least once and secretly gave it to an elderly patient in his/her residential unit in Macao. Previously the patient had been admitted to the public hospital. After being discharged from the hospital, the suspect voluntarily took care of the patient and even stole injections for pain relief from the hospital and gave them to him/her at his/her home. Later, the suspect managed to gain the patient’s trust and the latter voluntarily sold his/her home to one of the suspect’s relatives at a price lower than the market price. As a result, the suspect indirectly took ownership of the property.

The suspect, who took the injections away from the public hospital without permission, allegedly constituted offences of “embezzlement” under the *Penal Code*. The case was referred to the Public Prosecutions Office.

Moreover, the CCAC already reported the case to the Health Bureau and the latter commenced the follow-up work.

Case 10

In December 2014, the CCAC completed the investigation into a case of power abuse involving an instructor of the School of Music of the Macao Conservatory.

It was found in the investigation that in an attempt to have his/her son won the annual prize of the school, the instructor, as a supervisor, allegedly called up some meetings to discuss the matters about his/her son and secretly modified the suggestions rendered by his/her son's class teacher. Moreover, the instructor even removed the name of a student who was supposed to be awarded the prize from the list in order to achieve the purpose.

The instructor did not treat every student equally and abused his/her power to gain advantage for his/her son, infringing upon other people's interests. His/her acts allegedly violated his/her professional duties and constituted offences of "power abuse" under the *Penal Code*. The case was referred to the Public Prosecutions Office.

IV. Mutual case assistance in cross-border investigation**(1) Requests for case assistance to CCAC from law enforcement agencies outside the territory**

In 2014, the CCAC was requested for assistance in six cases from law enforcement agencies outside the territory, including three cases from the Independent Commission Against Corruption of Hong Kong and the Hong Kong Police Force; as well as three cases from the anti-graft agencies of the Chinese mainland. Two of the cases have been completed while the remaining four are still being processed.

(2) CCAC's requests for case assistance to law enforcement agencies outside the territory

In 2014, the CCAC requested law enforcement agencies outside the territory for

assistance in a total of six cases. The anti-graft agencies involved were chiefly from the Chinese mainland. Five of the cases have been completed while the remaining one is still being processed.

(3) The 10th Seminar on Mutual Case Assistance of Guangdong, Hong Kong and Macao

In December 2014, the “10th Seminar on Mutual Case Assistance of Guangdong, Hong Kong and Macao” was held in Shenzhen, Guangdong. Representatives of the CCAC participated in the event. In the seminar, representatives of the three places summarised and shared their experience of mutual assistance for the past year. Upon discussion, they reached a consensus on strengthening and ruling the mutual assistance mechanism, including the improvement of the efficiency of mutual assistance among the three places; confidentiality of identity of staffs concerning mutual assistance; feasibility and restrictions of cross-border investigation and evidence search; and building of the mechanism of exchange of intelligence etc. They also exchanged ideas on the issues of meeting witnesses, cases filed for investigation and dispatch, access of case information, delivery of confidential document and new trends of money laundering, etc.

Under the principles of mutual respect, active communication, equality and mutual help, the three places also agreed to enhance exchanges and collaboration in order to extend the legal framework for cooperation of the three places and improve mutual assistance procedure. This meeting, which furthered the good relationship among CCAC staffs, staffs of Chinese mainland and Hong Kong concerning mutual assistance, is favourable for the future work of mutual assistance among the three places.

V. Court verdicts

Twelve cases investigated by the CCAC were adjudicated by court in 2014. Since penal procedure took time, some were accumulated cases which occurred many years ago, including the verdicts of the drawn-out election cases of 2005. These adjudicated cases mainly involved passive bribery, active bribery, fraud and retention of voter cards, etc. Moreover, there were five cases which were given verdicts in the first instance but have entered the procedure of second instance. Thus, they were not counted in the figure of 2014. Details of relevant verdicts are as follows:

No.	Court	Name of suspect	Charge	Sentence
1	Court of First Instance	Chan XX	4 counts of “passive bribery for performing illicit acts” (Paragraph 1 of Article 337 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Imprisonment of 1 year and 3 months with 2-year suspension
		Cheong XX	4 counts of “active bribery” (Paragraph 1 of Article 339 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Imprisonment of 7 months with 2-year suspension
2	Court of First Instance	Lam XX	1 count of “active bribery” (Paragraph 1 of Article 339 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Imprisonment of 7 months with 2-year suspension (a fine of MOP5,000)
3	Court of First Instance	Cheong XX	1 count of “fraud” (Paragraph 1 of Article 211 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	A 120-day fine at MOP150 per day

4	Court of First Instance Court of Second Instance	Pao XX	1 count of “retention of voter cards” (Paragraph 1 of Article 49 of <i>Voters Registration Law</i>)	Verdict by Court of First Instance: Imprisonment of 2 years with 3-year suspension Verdict by Court of Second Instance: Acquitted
		Fong XX	1 count of “retention of voter cards” (Paragraph 1 of Article 49 of <i>Voters Registration Law</i>)	Verdict by Court of First Instance: Deprivation of political rights for 2 years. Imprisonment of 1.5 years with 2-year suspension Verdict by Court of Second Instance: Acquitted
		Cheong XX	1 count of “retention of voter cards” (Paragraph 1 of Article 49 of <i>Voters Registration Law</i>)	Verdict by Court of First Instance: Deprivation of political rights for 2 years. Imprisonment of 1.5 years with 2-year suspension Verdict by Court of Second Instance: Acquitted

	Court of First Instance	Chan XX	1 count of “retention of voter cards” (Paragraph 1 of Article 49 of <i>Voters Registration Law</i>) 1 count of “provision of voter cards” (Paragraph 2 of Article 49 of <i>Voters Registration Law</i>)	Verdict by Court of First Instance: Deprivation of political rights for 2 years. Imprisonment of 1 year and 9 months with 2-year suspension Verdict by Court of Second Instance: Acquitted
		Tam XX	1 count of “retention of voter cards” (Paragraph 1 of Article 49 of <i>Voters Registration Law</i>) 1 count of “provision of voter cards” (Paragraph 2 of Article 49 of <i>Voters Registration Law</i>)	Verdict by Court of First Instance: Deprivation of political rights for 2 years. Imprisonment of 1 year and 9 months with 2-year suspension Verdict by Court of Second Instance: Acquitted
	Court of Second Instance	Ng XX	1 count of “retention of voter cards” (Paragraph 1 of Article 49 of <i>Voters Registration Law</i>)	Verdict by Court of First Instance: Deprivation of political rights for 2 years. Imprisonment of 1.5 years with 2-year suspension Verdict by Court of Second Instance: Acquitted
	Ip XX	1 count of “retention of voter cards” (Paragraph 1 of Article 49 of <i>Voters Registration Law</i>)	Verdict by Court of First Instance: Deprivation of political rights for 2 years. Imprisonment of 1.5 years with 2-year suspension Verdict by Court of Second Instance: Acquitted	
5	Court of First Instance	Leong XX	1 count of “active bribery” (Paragraph 1 of Article 339 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Imprisonment of 7 months with 1.5-year suspension

6	Court of First Instance	Leong XX	1 count of “document forgery” (Subparagraph b of Paragraph 1 of Article 244 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Imprisonment of 1 year with 1.5-year suspension
		Fong XX	1 count of “document forgery” (Subparagraph b of Paragraph 1 of Article 244 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Imprisonment of 1 year with 1.5-year suspension
		Lai XX	1 count of “document forgery” (Subparagraph b of Paragraph 1 of Article 244 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Imprisonment of 1 year with 1.5-year suspension
		Man XX	1 count of “document forgery” (Subparagraph b of Paragraph 1 of Article 244 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Imprisonment of 1 year with 1.5-year suspension
		Wong XX	1 count of “document forgery” (Subparagraph b of Paragraph 1 of Article 244 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Imprisonment of 1 year with 1.5-year suspension
		Lam XX	1 count of “document forgery” (Subparagraph b of Paragraph 1 of Article 244 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Imprisonment of 1 year with 1.5-year suspension
		Ng XX	1 count of “document forgery” (Subparagraph b of Paragraph 1 of Article 244 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Imprisonment of 1 year with 1.5-year suspension
		Wong XX	1 count of “document forgery” (Subparagraph b of Paragraph 1 of Article 244 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Imprisonment of 1 year with 1.5-year suspension
		Tai XX	1 count of “document forgery” (Subparagraph b of Paragraph 1 of Article 244 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Imprisonment of 1 year with 1.5-year suspension
		Wu XX	1 count of “document forgery” (Subparagraph b of Paragraph 1 of Article 244 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Imprisonment of 1 year with 1.5-year suspension

	Court of First Instance	Hong XX	1 count of “document forgery” (Subparagraph b of Paragraph 1 of Article 244 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Imprisonment of 9 months with 1.5-year suspension
		Ng XX	1 count of “document forgery” (Subparagraph b of Paragraph 1 of Article 244 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Imprisonment of 9 months with 1.5-year suspension
		Lei XX	1 count of “document forgery” (Subparagraph b of Paragraph 1 of Article 244 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Imprisonment of 9 months with 1.5-year suspension
		Ieong XX	1 count of “document forgery” (Subparagraph b of Paragraph 1 of Article 244 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Imprisonment of 9 months with 1.5-year suspension
		Lio XX	1 count of “document forgery” (Subparagraph b of Paragraph 1 of Article 244 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Imprisonment of 9 months with 1.5-year suspension
		Lei XX	1 count of “document forgery” (Subparagraph b of Paragraph 1 of Article 244 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Imprisonment of 9 months with 1.5-year suspension
7	Court of First Instance Court of Second Instance	Lei XX	1 count of “resistance and duress” (Article 311 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Verdict by Court of First Instance: Imprisonment of 1 year
8	Court of First Instance	Ian XX	1 count of “passive bribery for performing illicit acts” (Paragraph 1 of Article 337 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Acquitted, judgment modified to “passive bribery for performing licit acts”, but the prescription for prosecution has already been extinct, the litigation process has to be filed.

	Court of First Instance	Cheong XX	1 count of “passive bribery for performing illicit acts” (Paragraph 1 of Article 337 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Acquitted, judgment modified to “passive bribery for performing licit acts”, but the prescription for prosecution has already been extinct, the litigation process has to be filed.
		Chan XX	1 count of “passive bribery for performing illicit acts” (Paragraph 1 of Article 337 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Acquitted, judgment modified to “passive bribery for performing licit acts”, but the prescription for prosecution has already been extinct, the litigation process has to be filed.
9	Court of First Instance	Kuok XX	1 count of “fraud” (Paragraph 1 of Article 211 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	A payment of MOP13,452 to the Civic and Municipal Affairs Bureau. Imprisonment of 7 months with 2-year suspension
10	Court of First Instance	Lam XX	5 counts of “money laundering” (Article 3 of <i>Prevention and Suppression of Crime of Money Laundering</i>)	Verdict by Court of First Instance: Acquitted
11	Court of First Instance Court of Second Instance	Ng XX	2 counts of “power abuse” (Article 347 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Verdict by Court of First Instance: Acquitted (Public Prosecutions Office then filed an appeal)

	Court of First Instance	Mou XX	1 count of “power abuse” (Article 347 of <i>Penal Code</i>) 1 count of “making false statement or declaration by interest party” (Article 323 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Verdict by Court of First Instance: Acquitted regarding “power abuse” (Public Prosecutions Office then filed an appeal); guilty of “making false statement or declaration by interest party”. Imprisonment of 1 year with 2-year suspension. A repayment of MOP30,000 to the Macao SAR government within 1 month.
	Court of Second Instance			Verdict by Court of Second Instance: acquitted regarding “power abuse”
		Leong XX	1 count of “power abuse” (Article 347 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Verdict by Court of First Instance: Acquitted (Public Prosecutions Office then filed an appeal) Verdict by Court of Second Instance: Acquitted
12	Court of First Instance	Leong XX	1 count of “passive bribery for performing illicit acts” (Paragraph 2 of Article 337 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Verdict by Court of First Instance: Imprisonment of 5.5 years
	Court of Second Instance		4 counts of “passive bribery for performing illicit acts” (Paragraph 1 of Article 337 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Verdict by Court of Second Instance: Original judgment affirmed
		Ng XX	1 count of “passive bribery for performing illicit acts” (Paragraph 1 of Article 337 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Verdict by Court of First Instance: Acquitted

		Leong XX	5 counts of “active bribery” (Paragraph 1 of Article 339 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Verdict by Court of First Instance: Acquitted regarding 2 counts of “active bribery”, guilty of 3 counts of “active bribery”. Imprisonment of 1 year and 9 months Verdict by Court of Second Instance: Acquitted, on the grounds for appeal established
		Chan XX	5 counts of “passive bribery for performing illicit acts” (Paragraph 1 of Article 337 of <i>Penal Code</i>)	Verdict by Court of First Instance: Acquitted regarding 2 counts of “passive bribery for performing illicit acts”, guilty of 3 counts of “passive bribery for performing illicit acts”. Imprisonment of 2 years and 3 months Verdict by Court of Second Instance: Judgment modified to guilty of “aiding and abetting another person”. The case was passed to the Court of First Instance to determine penalties.

VI. Declaration of assets and interests

The year of 2014 marked the 16th year of the implementation of the regime of declaration of assets and interests and the first year after the revised *Legal Regime of Declaration of Assets and Interests* has entered into force. The highlight of the revised legal regime is the disclosure of assets and interests of holders of specific public and political positions. The new legal regime marked an important step in fostering the “sunshine government” policy promoted by the Macao SAR government.

Along with the new *Legal Regime of Declaration of Assets and Interests* taking into effect, over the past year, the CCAC overcame a series of changes and difficulties at work. Thanks to active communication and coordination with all departments, the work of declaration of assets and interests were conducted smoothly. The declarants and the persons who should fulfil the obligation to provide information have strictly observed the law. So far no case was found for any legal responsibilities due to arrears of declaration form or improper submission of declaration. The work has achieved expected results.

In 2014, the CCAC collected the declaration forms from a total of 14,257 public servants. Details are listed below:

Statistics of declaration of assets and interests in 2014

Reasons for submitting declaration	Total
Appointment	2,850
Alternation of position	4,672
Termination of position	1,753
5-year renewal	2,994
Renewal with that of spouse	602
Pursuit of data-provision duty	1,196
Voluntary renewal	190
Total	14,257

Due to the trend of e-governance, the CCAC developed the “notification system of declaration of assets and interests” in 2012, a breakthrough of the traditional written correspondence which has been being used. The system, which allows delivery and receipt of notification by electronic means, tremendously improves administrative efficiency and reduces administrative costs. Since the implementation of the above system in early 2013, until 31st December 2014, there were a total of 52 departments

using the system. Such figure exceeded half of the departments which used to have correspondence with the Declaration of Assets and Interests Division of the CCAC. The work has achieved a good result.

In terms of promotion and communication, the CCAC continued to hold “briefing sessions on declaration of assets and interests” for departments which had greater number of new recruits. Such arrangement not only assisted the declarants to correctly fill out the declaration forms, but, more importantly, also enabled more civil servants to better understand the relevant legislation.