



SUPREME COURT OF JUSTICE

MAHAWTHADER AI JUSTICE

PRESIDING

The State

Plaintiff

Case No. 0_145229

Filed: September 10, 2025

v.

Tech Solutions Co., Ltd.

Defendant

Document #5229

Verdict Date: September 10, 2025



CASE TITLE

The State v. Tech Solutions Co., Ltd.



SCENARIO

Tech Solutions Co., Ltd., a licensed telecommunications provider, is charged under Section 70 for allegedly importing and using a batch of network routers that do not meet the country's technical standards. The routers were used to expand their rural broadband network.



APPLICABLE LAW

- Responsibilities of a Telecommunication Equipment Licensee (Section 18)
- Licensee's Preparedness for Security Matters (Section 78)
- Business Licensee's Powers for Network Access Equipment (Section 41)



COURT'S REASONING

Okay, let's break down this legal scenario involving Tech Solutions Co., Ltd. and analyze the situation based on the provided information and relevant laws.

1. Legal Elements Satisfied (Prosecution's Case) The prosecution is attempting to build a case under Section 70, which likely deals with importing and using substandard telecommunications equipment. To successfully prosecute, they need to demonstrate the following elements:

- Importation:** The prosecution must prove Tech Solutions Co., Ltd. imported the routers. This will likely be established through evidence like shipping manifests, customs records, invoices, and potentially witness testimony (e.g., employees involved in the procurement process).
- Use:** The prosecution must show that Tech Solutions Co., Ltd. *actually used* these routers within their rural broadband network. This is generally easier to prove than importation, as it can be demonstrated through operational records, network logs, and potentially employee testimony.
- Non-Compliance with Standards:** This is the core element. The prosecution must prove that the routers did *not* meet the country's technical standards. This will require expert testimony – likely from a qualified telecommunications engineer – to demonstrate that the routers failed to meet the relevant specifications for network performance, security, or other key technical requirements. This needs to be directly linked to the laws and regulations Tech Solutions Co. were supposed to adhere to.
- Intent (Potentially):** Depending on the precise wording of Section 70, the prosecution might need to prove that Tech Solutions Co., Ltd. *knowingly* used the non-compliant routers. This could be inferred if there's evidence of deliberate disregard for the standards or if the company was aware of the non-compliance.

2. Potential Defenses Tech Solutions Co., Ltd. could raise several defenses:

- Due Diligence:** The company could argue that they exercised reasonable due diligence in selecting and importing the routers. This would involve demonstrating they conducted proper research, selected a reputable supplier, and relied on the supplier's representations about the routers' compliance. Evidence of this diligence would be crucial.
- Misinterpretation of Standards:** They could argue that they misinterpreted the technical standards, or that there was ambiguity in the standards themselves. This defense is weaker if the standards are clearly defined.
- Supplier Error:** They could claim that the supplier was responsible for the non-compliance, arguing that the supplier misrepresented the routers' specifications. This defense is only viable if the company can demonstrate a lack of independent verification.
- Unforeseen Circumstances:** Perhaps there was an unforeseen technical issue that led to the router's failure to meet the standards. This defense would be difficult to sustain without very strong supporting evidence.
- Lack of Intent (If applicable):** If the prosecution is attempting to prove knowledge, Tech Solutions could argue they were genuinely unaware of the non-compliance.

3. Likely Outcome Given the information, the **likely outcome** is a guilty verdict, but the severity of the penalties would depend on several factors.

Here's a breakdown:

- Strong Prosecution Case:** The prosecution has several key pieces – importing a product, using it in their network, and the fact that it doesn't meet required standards – that create a strong case. The laws clearly outline responsibilities for telecommunications equipment licensees, and the company's actions directly contradict those responsibilities.
- Expert Testimony is Key:** The strength of the expert witness testimony

regarding the routers' non-compliance will be paramount. If the expert can definitively demonstrate a failure to meet the standards, the prosecution's case will be significantly strengthened. * **Penalties:** Penalties for Section 70 violations typically include fines, potentially confiscation of the equipment, and possibly sanctions against the company's license. The severity would likely be proportionate to the scale of the violation, the company's culpability (intentional vs. unintentional), and the potential harm caused by the substandard equipment. A first-time offense, coupled with evidence of reasonable due diligence, might result in a lighter sentence. **Evidence Score: 0

A critical issue.** The extremely low evidence score indicates that the prosecution is starting from a very weak position. They need to *actively* build a strong case through gathering and presenting evidence, rather than relying solely on the law itself. This requires a comprehensive investigation into the routers' specifications, the company's procurement process, and potentially the supplier's records. **Disclaimer:** *This is a legal analysis based solely on the information provided. It is not legal advice, and a real-world outcome would depend on many factors, including the specific wording of the laws, the available evidence, and the arguments presented by both sides in court. Consult with a qualified legal professional for advice on any specific legal matter.* Do you want me to delve deeper into a specific aspect of this analysis, such as: * The role of expert testimony in greater detail? * How to bolster the defense against the prosecution? * The potential impact of the "Responsibilities of a Telecommunication Equipment Licensee" section?

✓ DECISION

Guilty under Responsibilities of a Telecommunication Equipment Licensee (Section 18): 1 years' imprisonment. Guilty under Licensee's Preparedness for Security Matters (Section 78): 1 years' imprisonment. Guilty under Business Licensee's Powers for Network Access Equipment (Section 41): 1 years' imprisonment.

🕒 TOTAL IMPRISONMENT

3 years