

# SUPREME COURT OF JUSTICE

### MAHAWTHADER AI JUSTICE

# **PRESIDING**

Unknown Case No. e1b5b141

Plaintiff Filed: September 08, 2025

٧.

Unknown Document #b141

Defendant Verdict Date: September 08, 2025



# **CASE TITLE**

The Moneylender's Reminder



# **SCENARIO**

Ko Ba Than, a small grocery store owner, borrowed 2,000,000 MMK from a local moneylender, Min Lwin. After falling behind on the exorbitant weekly interest payments, Ko Ba Than was visited at his shop by Min Lwin and an associate. An argument ensued over the debt. The prosecution alleges that Min Lwin's associate held Ko Ba Than down while Min Lwin deliberately struck Ko Ba Than's forearm with a metal pipe, causing a severe fracture. As he was leaving, Min Lwin allegedly told the victim, "Consider this a reminder. You have one week to pay me everything you owe, or your legs are next." The defense claims it was a mutual fight that got out of hand, not a calculated act of extortion.



#### **APPLICABLE LAW**

None



### **COURT'S REASONING**

Given the following scenario: Ko Ba Than, a small grocery store owner, borrowed 2,000,000 MMK from a local moneylender, Min Lwin. After falling behind on the exorbitant weekly interest payments, Ko Ba Than was visited at his shop by Min Lwin and an associate. An argument ensued over the debt. The prosecution alleges that Min Lwin's associate held Ko Ba Than down while Min Lwin deliberately struck Ko Ba Than's forearm with a metal pipe, causing a severe fracture. As he was leaving, Min Lwin allegedly told the victim, "Consider this a reminder. You have one week to pay me everything you owe, or your legs are next." The defense claims it was a mutual fight that got out of hand, not a calculated act of extortion. And the following relevant laws: No applicable laws found. Provide a structured legal analysis discussing:

Which legal elements are satisfied

Which defenses may apply

The likely outcome



### **DECISION**

Defendant acquitted.