

# **Monitoring the Trial Concerning The Murder of Munir**

**Trial VI  
The Central Jakarta District Court  
Jakarta, 13 September 2005**

**Material: Examining Witness Ramelgia Anwar  
Time: 10.25 –12. 25 West Indonesia Time  
Place: Central Jakarta District Court, 3rd Floor,  
Room 1**

## Situation of the Courtroom

### 1. Before the Trial

At 9.30 am, around 80 people consisting of KontraS activists, families of May victims, families of Semanggi victims, victims of Tanjung Priok and victims of 65 demonstrated in front of Central Jakarta district court building. They displayed a banner that said *“Reveal the Mastermind Behind Munir’s Assassination”*, a poster of Munir, a poster that said *“Why Was He Silenced”*, and a billboard containing Munir’s picture. Around 15 electronic media and print media were present to cover the event. Pollycarpus’ wife, Herawati, was also present accompanied by two young men bearing the facial characteristics of people from eastern Indonesia.

At 10.15 am, Pollycarpus arrived in a green Kijang prison car. One green minibus escorted the prison car. Around 15 police officers from the Regional Police and 3 people from the Attorney office escorted Pollycarpus as he entered the courtroom. Pollycarpus was wearing brown long-sleeved shirt and grey trousers.

## II. During the trial

The judge started the trial at 10.25 am. According to court agenda, today the court would examine the following witnesses:

1. Ramelgia Anwar (former Vice President Corporate Security)
2. Rohainil Aini (Garuda scheduling staff and secretary to Chief Pilot Karmal Sembiring)
3. Karmal Sembiring (Chief Pilot)

Before the hearing started, the Public prosecutor said that one witness was unable to come and that the particular witness has sent a letter to the judge and the public prosecutor (without mentioning the name of the witness). The judge then ordered witness Ramelgia Anwar to be brought before the court.

Before the witness was sworn in, the chief judge, Cicut Setiarso, asked if the witness know the accused Pollycarpus. **Witness Ramelgia Anwar claimed to know Pollycarpus, the accused.**

### 3. The Testimony of Ramelgia Anwar (former Vice President Corporate Security Garuda)

#### Witness Identity

Full Name : Muhammad Ramelgia Anwar  
Place/Date of Birth : Bukit Tinggi, 9 May 1951  
Religion : Islam  
Occupation : Garuda Employee, Airlines Security Expert (former Vice President Corporate Security)  
Office Address : Jl. Merdeka Selatan No. 13 Central Jakarta  
Home Address : Jl Parkit I no.28 Griya, Rt 02 Rw.10, Kel. Limo, Depok

The witness was then sworn in Islamic procedure, and was enlightened by the chief judge about giving truthful information and punishment for false testimony.

Ramelgia Anwar claimed that he had known Pollycarpus since early 2004. At that time, Pollycarpus, who was a pilot, came to the headquarters to accompany his nephew who was going to apply to become a pilot. Ramelgia Anwar was acting as the Vice President (VP) Corporate Security.

Ramelgia Anwar said that he understood why he was brought up as a witness in this trial. Ramelgia knew about Munir’s death from electronic and print media. Ramelgia told the judge that he had given his testimony during investigation and he would stay with the content of his previous testimony. Afterwards, the chief judge permitted the public Prosecutor (JPU) to question witness Ramelgia.

#### 3.a Questions by the public Prosecutor (JPU)

Before starting the questions, public prosecutor asked to confirm the judge’s promise to bring witness Indra Setiawan during Ramelgia Anwar’s testimony, as agreed at the previous trial (6/09). Upon this request, the chief judge ordered Indra Setiawan to enter the courtroom and sit at the front row of the spectators’ bench.

*Domu P Sihite asked the following questions:*

- Witness’ knowledge of Munir’s death and his whereabouts at the time of death, **Ramelgia Anwar answered** that he found out about Munir’s death from mass media on 8 September. Ramelgia claimed to have been on duty

in Balikpapan on 2-4 September, on duty in Ujung Pandang on 4-7 September and on duty in Denpasar on 8-11 September.

- Regarding the procedures that Garuda employed in assigning duties to the witness. **Ramelgia said** that official duty would always be supported by an official letter. He already received his assignment letter for 2-11 September before he had left for the trip and such was regulated by the company (Garuda). Ramelgia said that his assignment came from INAKA (Indonesia’s international flight; *it was not clear what INAKA stood for*), where he served as the head of saving and security commission. The assignment letter came from the Director of Strategic and General. Upon his return, he made a written report to INAKA, and **Acc** to his superior, but after the report was submitted there were no more instructions from his superior.

*(The judge reminded public prosecutor, Domu P. Sihite, to focus his questions on the witness and that he was allowed to ask in-depth questions but they did not have to be the same as in the investigation )*

- Regarding the work relationship between the witness and Pollycarpus. **Ramelgia said** that there was no direct organizational link between him and Pollycarpus. Pollycarpus was directly responsible to his superior, Captain Ronggo and Captain Karmal. Captain Karmal was the General Manager and Captain Ronggo was the Vice President. Ramelgia said that he could not give a direct order to the accused Pollycarpus and that Pollycarpus could only be given direct orders from Captain Ronggo and Captain Karmal.
- Regarding Pollycarpus’ activities on 6–7 September based on the report given by Karmal and Ronggo to witness Ramelgia. **Ramelgia said** that he had not received any reports of any activities that Pollycarpus did. On 15 September, he called Captain Karmal to explain about the follow up to the letter from the President Director because he had not had a chance to coordinate with Captain Karmal before he left for his assigned duty. During the telephone conversation with Captain Karmal, Ramelgia explained about an assignment letter to Pollycarpus from the President Director and plans for the explanation that had been given to Pollycarpus. Karmal’s response sounded slightly angry because he then asked “Did you (Ramelgia) assign Polly?”, Ramelgia answered no and regarding the explanation related to the assignment letter from the President Director about the assistance, Ramelgia said that it was true that had known about it before he left for his assigned

duty but the assignment had not been given. Ramelgia also denied knowing about the trip to Singapore. At this point Karmal said, “Yes, but he had already left to Singapore and I do not want to cover the expenses”.

- Regarding Pollycarpus’ assignment. **Ramelgia said** that it was based on a letter to Pollycarpus, carbon copied to him and all directors, Captain Ronggo, Captain Karmal and HRD, dated 11 August 2004, No. Garuda/DZ-2270/04 which said that Pollycarpus was assigned as assistance staff at corporate security.
- Regarding assignment procedure at Garuda. According to Ramelgia, every assignment had to be given with the superior’s permission and the instructions must be clear. An assignment for Pollycarpus must be given through a letter from Karmal and Ronggo. However, scheduling did not have to be in the form of an assignment letter; it could be given in the form of a note but it still had to have Karmal’s permission.
- Regarding scheduling arrangement. **Ramelgia said** that scheduling was Rohainil’s responsibility. Rohainil did not have any authority without an approval from Karmal and Ronggo. If such happened, then the person would be responsible.
- Regarding the report made by Pollycarpus dated 8 September and a letter from Ramelgia dated 4 September, whether Ramelgia thought it was according to procedures or not.

The Defense Counsels objected to the questions and the chief judge, Cicut Setiarso, took over by asking where the letter came from. According to Ramelgia, the letter was supposed to refer to whoever gave the assignment; however, Pollycarpus referred to the President Director so that the report was also made in accordance with what the President Director wanted and this was out of the ordinary.

- Regarding the mechanism of the letter that was supposed to be based on Captain’s order before being reported to Ramelgia. **Ramelgia said** that the report of the letter referred to the President Director.
- Regarding the party who assigned Pollycarpus to Singapore. **Ramelgia answered** that he did not assign Pollycarpus to Singapore and neither did

Captain Karmal and Captain Ronggo, and Polly should have had an assignment order to Singapore.

- Regarding Pollycarpus’ report to Ramelgia upon his return from Singapore. **Ramelgia answered** that he received a report (letter) dated 8 September 2004 from the accused after he finished his activities in Singapore on 16 September. Polly said that “*Report in Singapore is in Point 5*”. Ramelgia admitted that he understood what Pollycarpus meant with the report that Pollycarpus brought on 16 September because on 15 September he called Captain Karmal, who told him that Pollycarpus had left for Singapore.
- Regarding the coordination in the making of Pollycarpus’ report (letter) to witness Ramelgia Anwar. **According to Ramelgia**, first, when Pollycarpus came on the 16 September, Pollycarpus said that Karmal asked for the letter dated on 15 September to be checked for correction. **Ramelgia admitted** that on 17 September he had corrected the letter (the letter was dated 15 September and then backdated into 4 September 2004) in order to find a way to cover the expenses because on 15 September, Captain Karmal said that he did not want to cover Pollycarpus’ expenses so that the expenses were then covered by Ramelgia’s unit.
- Regarding the content of the letter that had been corrected (backdated) from 15 September into 4 September. **According to Ramelgia**, the letter was an interoffice letter from Ramelgia to Chief Pilot Captain Karmal, based on the communication that he had on 15 September. The purpose of the letter was to allocate the expenses which would probably be covered by Ramelgia’s unit in the end.
- Regarding the reason for the change, where 15 September was backdated into 4 September. **Ramelgia said** that first it was written on 15 September dated on 15 September based on the communication with Captain Karmal via telephone. Second, it was made on 17 September because there had been a request to correct the date from Captain Karmal through the accused; this time the date was changed from 15 September to 4 September 2004. Third, on 20 September 2004 for filing because there was no copy of the letter that was dated 4 September 2004.
- Regarding the contribution and approval from witness Ramelgia to the changes in the letter into 4 September 2004. **Ramelgia said** that the letter came from the request for expense allocation.

*(judge Cicut Setiarso said that the answer to this question was to be used as assessment only. The prosecutor showed the letter dated 4 September 2004 signed by the witness, Ramelgia Anwar).*

- Regarding the report about the accused’s activities on 8 September given to witness Ramelgia and the President Director. **Ramelgia said** that he received the activity report from the accused and he did not deliver the report to the President Director.
- Regarding the consequence arising from the signature that witness Ramelgia put on the letter dated 4 September 2004 (interoffice letter to Captain Karmal). **Ramelgia said** that he understood the consequence arising from that letter upon him.
- Regarding Ramelgia’s responsibility for the changes made in the letter from 15 September into 4 September 2004.

*(The defense counsels objected to this question)*

***Prosecutor F Eyert L asked the following questions:***

- Regarding the difference in the signature on the letter dated 15 September and the one on the letter dated 4 September 2004. **Ramelgia said** that the difference was between the signatures on the letter dated 4 September made on 17 September and the same one made on 20 September. Ramelgia said that the difference was that on 20 September 2004 he signed the letter while standing up.

*(The spectators booed this answer and the Judge reconfirmed whether Ramelgia was certain that both signatures were the same. Ramelgia looked confused and finally said that the difference was that the one on 17 September was made while sitting down and the one on 20 September was made while standing up. The Judge said, “what witness Ramelgia said should be used as assessment only”)*

- Regarding the procedures of delivering the letter to the accused Pollycarpus for his activities in Singapore. **According to Ramelgia**, the letter that Pollycarpus had (the letter from the President Director) was not an assignment letter. Ramelgia said that he was not aware whether Pollycarpus went to Singapore with an assignment letter or not.

*(Related to this answer, the Chief Judge asked witness Ramelgia whether he had ever been questioned as a suspect; Ramelgia said “Yes”, The Chief Judge reminded him that honesty could lead him to answer questions easily. The judge also reminded him of the punishments for giving false testimony).*

- Regarding the reference in the making of the letter dated 15 September and 4 September by the witness and the base of the letter that Pollycarpus used as a reference to go to Singapore. **Ramelgia said** that the letter referred to the letter from the President Director. He also said that the letters dated 4 September and 15 September were **letters of request to the Chief Pilot and that they were not assignment letters.**
- Regarding the person who assigned Pollycarpus to Singapore. **Ramelgia answered** that he did not know.
- Regarding the need for human resources at Corporate Security unit. **Ramelgia said** that the work at the Corporate Security unit did not have to be performed by Pollycarpus, others could do it as well.
- Regarding the mechanism of scheduling arrangement for Pollycarpus as assistance staff at Corporate Security and as a pilot. **Ramelgia said** that there were no regulations about this because a case of assignments from two units at the same time was still new.
- Regarding the witness’s knowledge on Pollycarpus’ departure and the purpose to Singapore. **Ramelgia said** that he found out about Pollycarpus’ trip to Singapore from Captain Karmal on 15 September 2004, and on 16 September 2004, Pollycarpus came with a report about dumping fuel. Ramelgia said that he did not know the purpose of Pollycarpus’ trip to Singapore.
- Regarding Pollycarpus’ assignment to Singapore to handle dumping fuel and Pollycarpus’ experience in the issue of dumping fuel. **Ramelgia said** he did not know and that this was Pollycarpus’ first assignment to check dumping fuel.
- Referring to the dossier dated 2 February point 16:” Pollycarpus went to Singapore to handle dumping fuel and political asylum. **Ramelgia said** that Pollycarpus had not reported about the political asylum.

- Referring to the dossier: since Pollycarpus received the assignment from President Director, his schedule had been arranged in accordance with his flight schedule. **Ramelgia said** that he did not want to assign the accused, Pollycarpus because he had not decided yet. Therefore, the schedule was determined together with the flight schedule while he monitored any information that could be given to him.
- Regarding Pollycarpus’ flight schedule on 5 and 8 September to Peking. **Ramelgia said** that he did not keep up with Pollycarpus’ flight schedule.
- Regarding Pollycarpus’ qualifications to be assigned at Aviation Security. **Ramelgia said** that it was difficult for him to answer this question because he received a direct letter from the President Director and he did not know whether Pollycarpus was qualified or not.
- Referring to the dossier: “Pollycarpus was not qualified to be assigned for aviation security duty”. **The witness answered** that Pollycarpus’ duty was not a specific duty. It was simply to monitor, not to act as a security officer but only to assist corporate security. Aviation Security duty was to monitor whether the flight was in accordance with international standard, dumping fuel was not an aviation security duty.
- Regarding the content of the letter dated 15 and 4 September and the agenda between the two letters. **The witness said** that the contents of both letters were the same, the one in the agenda was dated 15 September and the one made on 20 September was for filing.
- Regarding the standard of report making and the witness’ response on Pollycarpus’ activity report, which did not meet the requirements. **Ramelgia said** that he gave examples and explanation to Pollycarpus. The standard for writing a letter was available, Pollycarpus’ report did not meet the requirements.
- Regarding Pollycarpus’ ID Card at Corporate Security. **Ramelgia said** that Pollycarpus had an ID Card but he did not remember the valid date because ID Cards were made by Human Resources Department (HRD).
- Regarding Pollycarpus’ notification to the witness about his departure to Singapore. **Ramelgia said** that Pollycarpus did not request for his

permission to leave for Singapore. Ramelgia also said that he did not make a call to Rohainil about Pollycarpus’ departure to Singapore.

- Regarding the witness’ knowledge about Pollycarpus’ flight schedule and the scheduling mechanism in Garuda. **Ramelgia said** that he did not know Pollycarpus’ schedule. All flight schedules must be signed by Chief Pilot.
- Regarding the position, duty and authority of Rohainil Aini. **Ramelgia said** that Rohainil was responsible for scheduling as well as acting as secretary to Chief Pilot Karmal. (*After quite a long silence*) Ramelgia said that **Rohainil had no authority to change flight schedule.**

*Prosecutor Domu P Sihite asked the following questions:*

- Regarding the obligation to have a boarding pass for crew or extra crew in Garuda. Ramelgia said yes, it was an obligation.

*Prosecutor Muhammad Rum asked the following questions:*

- Regarding the President Director's summoning witness Ramelgia about Pollycarpus’ assignment. **Ramelgia said** that he had never been summoned by the President Director regarding Pollycarpus’ assignment, he was only called by the President Director's secretary.
- Regarding the person responsible for Pollycarpus’ work at Corporate Security. **Ramelgia said** that there were no regulations yet.
- Regarding witness’ report to the President Director about the internal security unit’s lack of performance and lack of personnel, and whether Corporate Security unit work evaluation was considered lacking by the President Director either orally or in writing. **Ramelgia answered** that it never happened because at that time he was serving as the Chairman of Asia Pacific flight at INAKA commission.
- Regarding the assignment that Pollycarpus carried out in Singapore on 6 September and the report that claimed of aviation security duty. Ramelgia answered that on 6 September Pollycarpus was not assigned to assist at Corporate Security.

*Prosecutor Jefri asked the following questions:*

- Regarding the coordination between witness Ramelgia and the President Director about Pollycarpus’ assignment. Ramelgia said that the President Director never made any coordination on this issue.
- Regarding the nature (permanent or temporary) of Pollycarpus’ assistance at corporate security and **Ramelgia said** that it was not clear whether Pollycarpus was a temporary or permanent assigned staff because an assignment letter was supposed to contain dates that express the validity of the assignment, the duty and budgeting, whereas the assignment letter from the President Director contained no such items.
- Regarding the work relationship between witness Ramelgia and the accused Pollycarpus. **Ramelgia said** that based on the organizational links, Pollycarpus was not part of his unit.
- Regarding the ID Card used by the accused. **Ramelgia said** that administratively, Pollycarpus’ ID Card was not listed at corporate security unit. However, functionally, Pollycarpus could have a Corporate Security ID Card. Ramelgia admitted to not knowing whether a person who used internal security ID card was under his responsibility because, according to Ramelgia, there were no regulations for such case.
- The prosecutor showed the judge and witness Ramelgia an ID Card that Pollycarpus used as Aviation and internal security staff. The valid date was 6 June 2004 whereas the assignment from the President Director was 11 August 2004. **Ramelgia said** that he learned about the ID Card during investigation. The mistake was that when the ID Card was made the valid date was not changed. According to the information given by the Vice President (VP) of HRD, the mistake was the responsibility of the person who made the ID Card because he used an old file without changing the time according to the photo that was printed. Furthermore, Pollycarpus was not supposed to use the ID Card before an assignment letter was available.
- Regarding special regulations to become a pilot in Garuda. **Ramelgia said** that there was a work agreement (PKB) with employee called PKB Pilot. In article 27, pilots who are assigned to be assistance staff should have regulated references or rules. Ramelgia said that he had never seen such rules.

- Regarding the person that Pollycarpus met in Singapore. **Ramelgia answered** that Pollycarpus did not mention the person he met in Singapore his report. After the investigation, Pollycarpus then mentioned of a meeting with a person whose name Ramelgia said he did not remember.
- Regarding the news of dumping fuel in Singapore that the witness heard. Ramelgia said that he learned about the existence of dumping fuel from Garuda on 29 August, **Ramelgia said** that dumping fuel was not one of his duties so that he did not coordinate with Garuda Singapore; dumping fuel was out of the Internal Security’s scope of work.
- Regarding Pollycarpus’ report of his activities in Singapore to check Dumping Fuel. **Ramelgia said** that Pollycarpus’ report on dumping fuel was not part of his authority.
- Regarding the intention of “General Declaration”. Ramelgia said that general declaration had to be filled in by flight crew and was made by ground officers.
- Regarding the making of general declaration for flight Jakarta-Amsterdam (made per-segment or per-transit) **Ramelgia said** that it was made per-segment every time the plane landed. Ramelgia said that he did not know whether continued flight could have general declaration or not.

*Prosecutor F Eyert L asked the following questions:*

- Regarding whether the content of the letter dated 4 September, which is about covering expenses, was carried out or not. Ramelgia said that it had not been realized until now.

### **3.b Confrontation between Indra Setiawan and Ramelgia Anwar**

The chief judge, Cicut Setiarso, called Indra Setiawan to have his testimony confronted with Ramelgia’s. This was related to contradictory testimonies from the two witnesses regarding “a meeting between the two of them to talk about complaints on lack of performance at Corporate Security and requests for assistance from corporate security unit made by Ramelgia to Indra Setiawan as the President Director”. According to Ramelgia, there was no such meeting or discussion about such issue.

When confronted, the two witnesses said the following:

**Ramelgia** : never talked about any complaints of lack of performance at corporate security, never met Indra to discuss and never asked for assistance

**Indra Setiawan:** according to the dossier, Ramelgia met me and talked about complaints at corporate security.

*Both witnesses stick to each of their testimony. The chief judge decided to use their own assessment based on the testimony.*

### **3.c. Questions from the Defense Counsels**

*Defense counsel, Suhardi Sumomuljono, asked the following questions:*

- Regarding the determination of flight sector for Pollycarpus in the letter dated 15 September 2004. **Ramelgia said** that it was in accordance with the briefing on 13 August regarding airbus route.
- Regarding flight schedule arrangement. **Ramelgia said** that the schedule was arranged by Captain Karmal.
- Regarding the follow up to the accused’s activity report in Singapore. **Ramelgia said** that he did not know.

*The defense counsel then asked:*

- Regarding the accused’s knowledge of Munir. **Ramelgia said** that Pollycarpus never mentioned Munir’s name.
- Regarding the content of the letter dated 15 and 4 September. **Ramelgia said** that the letter contained a request to Chief Pilot for permission for Pollycarpus.
- Regarding the documents containing 3 versions of the letter (whether they were destroyed or not). **Ramelgia said** that the letter dated 15 September was filed, the one dated 4 September was not filed, which was why another one was made on 20 September because the one dated 4

September had no file. This was because Pollycarpus had the original after the original was mistakenly handed to him.

- Regarding the notification of the format of report at Corporate Security. **Ramelgia said** that he had not told Pollycarpus about the format of report at corporate security.
- Regarding boarding pass that has to be obtained by extra crew. **Ramelgia said** that extra crew must possess boarding pass but it was not the same as the one for a passenger, there are special codes in it.
- Regarding the ownership of more than one ID Cards in Garuda and Pollycarpus’ ID Card valid date. **Ramelgia said** that in Garuda, more than one ID Cards was possible. At Corporate Security in central, there was 30 staff, 10 to help with daily activities, all of which had ID cards.
- Regarding Rohainil’s duties and authority. **Ramelgia said** that based on the position, Rohainil did not have the authority to change flight schedule unless there was an order. Ramelgia said that he did not know who changed Pollycarpus’ flight schedule.
- Regarding the briefing for Pollycarpus from Ramelgia. **Ramelgia said**, that on 12 August he received the letter; on 13 August he gave briefing to Pollycarpus. On 13 August, Pollycarpus’ letter of assignment was given to him, witnessed by Vice President (VP) of HRD Dahlan Ahmad, but because Dahlan was going to a meeting, he was only alone with Pollycarpus.
- The defense counsel referred to the dossier: “Pollycarpus went to Singapore based on my order given orally on 13 August during briefing”. **Ramelgia said** that it was not an order to go to Singapore. It was only a briefing regarding 6 cities (one of which was Singapore) and there was also a talk about entrusted goods.
- Regarding Ramelgia’s opinion that said that Pollycarpus’ assignment based on 11 August was odd. **Ramelgia said** that the assignment letter was supposed to refer to his superior (direct).

- Regarding the initiative to cover expenses so that 15 September was changed into 4 September. **Ramelgia said** that it was based on the initiative of Karmal’s request and he agreed.
- Regarding the loss incurred due to Pollycarpus’ trip. **Ramelgia said** that there was no expenses loss due to Pollycarpus’ trip.

*The next defense counsel asked:*

- Regarding the Aviation Security information from Pollycarpus. **Ramelgia said** that Pollycarpus once gave a report on aviation security after he returned from Singapore.
- Regarding ID Card regulations for Garuda employee. **Ramelgia said** that red ID card is for air crew and the blue one is for ground officer.
- Regarding Aviation Security education for Pilot. **Ramelgia said** that all pilots received Avsec (Aviation Security) education.
- Regarding Indra Setiawan’ reason to assign Pollycarpus to become assistance staff at Ramelgia’s unit. **Ramelgia said** that he did not know.

### **3.d Additional Material in Prosecutors’ Questions**

The judge previously requested that the number of spoke persons from the defense counsels and prosecutors was limited. If possible, there should be just one representative from each in order to minimize the time since there were still other witnesses to examine.

*Prosecutor F Eyert L asked the following questions:*

- Regarding the application of flight sectors division based on the letter dated 15 September 2004. **Ramelgia said** that it had not been applied yet.
- Regarding the change of boarding pass or seat in Garuda from Economy class to business class (upgrade). Ramelgia said that upgrade was possible and that there were two mechanisms: first, if the plane was still on ground and a passenger wanted to move to business class and there was a seat available in business class, then the passenger could move after paying an additional price. If the passenger was already in the cabin/flight then it

was the Captain Pilot’s authority to give permission and this was usually carried out through session manager because the captain pilot would be busy, but it would still be carried out with the captain pilot’s permission.

### **3.e. The accused’s Response**

1. Regarding the qualifications, Pollycarpus claimed to have been a pilot for 18 years, and that he possessed Avsec (aviation Security) qualifications because he took Avsec exam every year and he was certified.
2. The follow up to the result of his activities in Singapore was through the operational manager who would give briefing to employees during training.
3. The permission for a work order could be given in writing, orally and via telephone or pager.
4. During the briefing, the format or report was informed but it was too small and difficult to be filled in with the result of the report.
5. His departure to Singapore was through a given permission, and he was promised by the President Director that if he succeeded in becoming assistance staff at Corporate Security, he would be sent to Singapore to study.

### **3.d Ramelgia’s Response to Pollycarpus Statements**

- Pollycarpus indeed had Avsec qualifications but it was Avsec for pilot; whereas Pollycarpus had not met the qualifications for Avsec expert.

**Pollycarpus denied** Ramelgia’s response. He said that those who taught Avsec at Duri Kosambi were more Stewards and friends of ours (pilots). **Ramelgia said** that even so, I my self (Ramelgia himself) acted as Avsec instructor.

At 14.25 the court ended. Witness Rohainil Aini was brought up into the courtroom but after the judges, the prosecutors and the defense counsels coordinated, they all agreed that the examination on witness Rohainil be carried out at the next trial on 20 September 2004 saying that they could not examine the witness in a rush.

### **3.f Important Pointers in Testimony**

- Ramelgia as Vice President Corporate Security never met and or talked to Indra Setiawan about any complaints of lack of work performance at Corporate Security and about the needs for assistance at Corporate Security (*this testimony has been confronted with Indra, who said that Ramelgia once met him and discussed the issue. After being confronted, both of them stick to their own testimony*)
- Ramelgia Anwar as Vice President Corporate Security never gave an order to Pollycarpus to conduct any activities in Singapore to check dumping fuel.
- Ramelgia cannot give order to Pollycarpus because Pollycarpus’ superior were Captain Ronggo (Vice President Chief Pilot) and Captain Karmal (Chief Pilot).
- Karmal, as the Chief Pilot, was slightly angry when he learned about Pollycarpus’ trip to Singapore because he was not aware of the trip and his unit refused to cover the expenses for the trip.
- Rohainil has no authority to change the schedule without an approval from Captain Karmal and Vice President Pilot Ronggo.
- Pollycarpus’ letter of assignment from the President Director was odd because according to the procedures the letter was supposed to refer to an order from a direct superior.
- **Interoffice Letters containing Pollycarpus’ assignment signed by Ramelgia Anwar was made in three versions:**
  1. the one dated 15 September
  2. 17 September, backdated into 4 September on the grounds of finding a strategy to cover the expenses incurred by Pollycarpus’ trip.
  3. 20 September 2004, 4 September was written as the date, by reason for filing since there was no copy because Pollycarpus had the original.
- According to Ramelgia, the difference between his signatures on the letter dated 4 September that was made on 15 September and the one made on 20 September was because he signed the one made on 20 September 2004 while standing up.

- The assignment letter from the President Director dated 8 September 2004 (assistance staff at Corporate Security) and a letter dated 4 September (interoffice letter; request for permission to Chief Pilot) were not assignment letters to Singapore.
- At the Corporate Security unit led by Ramelgia there have never been any needs for additional human resources, and even if there were, it does not have to be Pollycarpus.
- Referring to the dossier dated 2 February point 16: “Pollycarpus went to Singapore to handle dumping fuel and political asylum. **Ramelgia said** that Pollycarpus had not reported the political asylum.
- Pollycarpus’ qualifications to be assigned to assist Aviation Security. Ramelgia admitted that it was difficult to tell and that he did not know because Pollycarpus was directly assigned by the President Director.
- Pollycarpus’ activity report did not meet the standard requirements of reporting at Corporate Security.
- Crew or extra crew in Garuda must possess boarding pass. (*this is contradictory to Pollycarpus’ response to Suciwati’s testimony, where he said that extra crew did not have boarding pass.*)
- Pollycarpus’ ID card was valid dated on 6 June 2004, prior to his assignment letter on 11 August 2004.
- Dumping fuel was not a duty of internal security led by Ramelgia Anwar (*whereas Pollycarpus made the trip on the grounds of Corporate Security work*)
- Pollycarpus’ trip to Singapore did not incur any expenses