

A Detailed Examination of the Supreme Court of Pakistan's Judgement given in the  
Criminal Appeal No.39-L of 2015  
(the case of Mst. Aasiya Noreen aka. Asia Bibi)

Date of hearing: 08.10.2018

Presiding Judges:

Mr. Justice Mian Saqib Nisar (Chief Justice)  
Mr. Justice Asif Saeed Khan Khosa  
Mr. Justice Mazhar Alam Khan Miankhel

**Introduction:**

It was the dream of the founding fathers of this nation to have a homeland for the Muslims that would be governed in accordance with the sanctified and equitable; legal, social and economic justice system which is unique to Islam. This justice system, for a fair and equal society for all, irrespective of their background is not a theoretical religion that is restricted to the Masjid or home but rather it is a practical one that has proven itself to be a source of justice and peace, technological, economic and scientific growth throughout the ages for Muslims and non-Muslims alike.

History bears testimony that whenever Islam has been implemented sincerely and completely, both on an individual level and state level, that it has been able to create a fair, free and peaceful society for all. This was initiated by the Mercy to the Worlds, The Bringer of Glad Tidings, The Holy Prophet Muhammad (*may peace & blessings of Allah be upon him*) and carried through by his Rightly Guided Deputies, the *Khulafa Rashidoon*.

It was on the above principles that on 27<sup>th</sup> Ramadhan 1366 AH/ 14<sup>th</sup> August 1947 that the Islamic Republic of Pakistan was founded.

**Islamic Republic of Pakistan's Legal System at a Glance:**

In any democratic country, the Rule of Law is to be administered and upheld by the formal bodies entrusted and instated to do so as custodians thereof. These include (but are not limited to) the Police, Judiciary and all its apparatus. It must also do so in a constitutional, unbiased manner and decide any cases brought before it upon evidential basis alone, without succumbing to any external or internal pressures to do so otherwise, whether they be political, financial or international. It is also paramount to ensure that the Judiciary functions as an independent body and not serve as mere extension to advance any political agenda of a government, be they domestic or foreign.

Under the Pakistan Penal Code, 295-C the law clearly states:

*“Use of derogatory remarks etc., in respect of the Holy Prophet (salallahu alayhi wassallam): whoever by words, either spoken or written, or by visible representation or by any imputation, innuendo, or insinuation, directly or indirectly, defiles the sacred name of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace & blessings of Allah be upon him) shall be punished with death, or imprisonment for life, and shall also be liable to fine.”*

The sentiments contained in this piece of constitutional legislation is something which is at the heart of the creed of almost 2 billion Muslims, belonging to almost every race, speaking every language, spread across the entire world. This makes up almost 25% of the global population.

The famous English philosopher and playwright, George Bernard Shaw [1856 - d.1950], when commenting on the Holy Prophet Muhammad (*may peace & blessings of Allah be upon him*) said:

*“he must be called the saviour of humanity...”* George Bernard Shaw insists that *“if a man like Muhammad were to assume dictatorship of the modern world, he would succeed in solving its problems that would bring it the much needed peace and happiness.”*[1] In support of this, a famous historian, Lamartine argues that *“as regards all standards by which human greatness may be measured, we may well ask, is there any man greater than he?”*[2] For he does lead the list of the world’s most influential persons.[3]

[1] George Bernard Shaw, The Genuine Islam. Singapore, Vol.1, No 8, 1936.

[2] Lamartine, Histoire de la Turquie, Paris, 1854, Vol. II, p.276-277.

[3] Michael H. Hart, The 100: A Ranking of the Most Influential Persons in History, New York: Hart publishing Company Inc, 1978, p.33

### **Background to Supreme Court’s latest Judgment:**

By the Grace of Allah and the sincere concern and prayers of my pious elders I have had the opportunity to thoroughly read and examine the recent Supreme Court of Pakistan’s hasty decision which though is a fifty-six-page (56) document in English, is essentially thirty-four (34) pages of Mian Saqib Nisar J’s Judgement, with the other twenty-two pages serving only as superfluous information and in most part, an identical repetition of the first thirty-four pages (but for a few words and sentences here and there.) of Mr. Asif Saeed Khan Khosa J.

In the interest of being true to my findings on this judgment. I have avoided listening to media reports, whether they be in favour of, or against the judgement and have based my findings solely on the facts of the case, matters of law, incongruent arguments, inconsistencies in application of the law and procedural errors that are contained within this judgement.

One must bear in mind that though this case is primarily related to the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, yet the decision taken in hearing this appeal and the subsequent judgement given by the three judges of the Supreme Court has immense global reverberations and ramifications.

Due to the proliferation of social media and access to instant information, the world we now live in has become a global village. This can and often is used for good, but sadly it has all too often been used to ramp up the propaganda machine against Islam, Islamic symbols, Muslims, Muslim physical appearance, Muslim women's dress and attire, Muslim countries and in fact anything at all, that has a link or bears a recognizable link to Islam.

This has been evident from the sheer volume of new cases each year where some individual, determined to grossly offend as many Muslims as possible, takes to drawing a satirical image(s) or by making a film, wherein they vilify, denigrate and abuse the Holy Prophet Muhammad (*peace & blessings of Allah be upon him*), all in the name of "freedom of expression" or "free speech".

If this were limited to a handful of individuals, from a few countries then perhaps we could hope for a positive change by all countries implementing a zero-tolerance policy for those who incite religious hatred. As is indeed the case in Europe for anyone who criticizes Israel for their brutality of the Palestinian people and flagrant disregard of numerous international laws. Even if anyone makes an academic criticism of Judaism or questions some of the historical narratives surrounding World War II and what is known as the "Holocaust" in Europe, they are automatically sneered at and called "Anti-Semitic".

Here in England, a climate of fear has been created where not even a democratically elected party leader such as Jeremy Corbyn (of the Labour Party), can criticize Israel's foreign policy without accusations of being a racist and "anti-Semitic" and subsequent enquires and police investigations. Is this not an infringement and curtailing of "freedom of expression" and "free speech"?

What is even more troubling is that these very same countries not only allow people to make malicious and inflammatory remarks, derogatory comments, vitriolic diatribe and blasphemous images, against Islam and Muslims but that they actively and publicly support such hateful and dangerous actions and behavior.

We saw this in France with the Charlie Hebdo satirical cartoons as well as more recently when global corporate giant Facebook hosted and supported a "Draw Muhammad Day" (although this was later taken down). Where are the laws of anti-Islam or Islamophobia such as those enjoyed by the Jewish community?

It seems that a nefarious trend has taken hold whereby a quarter of the world's population (which is Muslim) is constantly being subjected to blasphemous speech and actions with little or no consequences.

However, the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and its people have a law to protect the sanctity and respect of Islam from such malicious and vitriolic behavior of individuals who seek to spread hate, instigate violence and create civil unrest, ultimately leading to anarchy and destabilization of the country, its people and its resources.

## Facts why this Judgment is flawed:

1. According to the Law, the appellant (Assiya Noreen)'s instant appeal was time barred by 11 days and therefore should have been immediately dismissed on this fact alone. In fact, Mia Saqib Nisar J notes this in his judgment paragraph [23]. He however presents the excuse that due to the appellant (Aasiya Noreen) having been sentenced to capital punishment (death),  
“...we deem it appropriate to **reappraise the evidence to ensure that the conviction and sentence recorded against her had been validly recorded. Besides, the matter of life and death of a lady is involved, therefore, the appeal should not be dismissed on mere technicalities....**” [emphasis added]

Yet on March 9<sup>th</sup>, 2018 only seven months ago, a three-judge bench (Supreme Court), headed by Asif Saeed Khan Khosa J, dismissed an appeal against the Peshawar High Court verdict in a murder case.

Muhammad Mujahid, an 18-year-old boy, was murdered by Imran and Aziz-ur-Rehman in Nowshera in 2011 following a minor dispute. The District and Sessions Court Nowshera awarded the death sentence to the accused.

However, Peshawar High Court acquitted the accused due to supposed insufficient evidence. The appellant, Mujahid's father, appeared before the bench and informed them that he is a poor man and therefore instead of engaging a lawyer, he was appearing in person. Mujahid's father informed them that he had filed the appeal against the PHC in good time, but the Registrar Office returned it with the objection that some documents were missing.

The father of the murdered boy said that after attaching all the documents and re-submitting them, the Supreme Court office said that it was now time-barred.

The father once again pleaded that it was only four (4) days late and for the genuine reasons given and that his son had been murdered.

However Asif Saeed Khan Khosa J, remarked: "*Except a few all the people in the country are poor.*"

He further said, "*the law has prescribed a timeframe for filing an appeal*".

And that they **could not hear time-barred applications as they can't ignore the law**. The applicant prayed to have mercy on him, adding that his appeal is **only four days' time-barred**. To this Saeed Khan Khosa J replied, "*it is not a matter of mercy but of law. If they would hear time-barred appeals then it would become a precedent,*".

Khosa J also told the appellant **if he had engaged a lawyer the situation could be avoided**. [4]

The above judgement and reasoning given by Asif Saeed Khan Khosa J, who is also one of the three (3) judges presiding over this hearing, is completely at odds and

inconsistent with the judgement and reasoning of his colleague and fellow judge, Mian Saqib Nisar J for allowing an instant petition for Aasiya Noreen even though it was 11 days late and not a mere 4 days.

[4] Copyright Business Recorder, 2018

Asif Saeed Khan Khosa J said only seven months ago:

- The Supreme Court cannot hear time-barred applications as they (the Judges) cannot ignore the Law.
- It is not a matter of mercy but of Law.
- If the Supreme Court was to hear time-barred appeals, then this would become precedent.
- Had a lawyer been engaged the situation could have been avoided

Mian Saqib Nisar J said in Aasiya Noreen’s case:

- The appeal should not be dismissed on mere technicalities (implying that there is no merit to the law having a timeframe for filing an appeal & they are mere “*technicalities*”)
- We deem it appropriate to reappraise the evidence to ensure that the conviction and sentence recorded against her had been validly recorded
- Besides, the matter of life and death of a lady is involved, therefore, the appeal should not be dismissed.

If Mian Saqib Nisar J considers that a matter of life and death of a woman is more important, the question must be asked, is not the life and brutal murder of an innocent 18year old boy murdered in cold blood, whose poor father was seeking justice not important or is it less so?

Is not the *Namoos-e-Risaalat*, upholding the blasphemy law which is enshrined in the constitution of Islamic Republic of Pakistan and for which the Judges took an oath to uphold in their oath of office and for protecting the sanctity and honour of The Holy Prophet Muhammad (*peace & blessings of Allah be upon him*) important?

In paragraph [24] Mian Saqib Nisar J states that there was an “*inordinate delay of about 5 days in lodging the FIR which casts a serious doubt and shadow about the probity of the witnesses, and in fact, after the deliberations, a false story was concocted by the witnesses and reported to the police. Even otherwise, the complaint submitted to the police was drafted by an advocate (lawyer)*”

Two points are made in the above cited verbatim quote of the judge:

- (i) That due to a 5day delay in lodging/registering the FIR, this automatically means, that all the witnesses are lying.
- (ii) That even if the FIR was lodged/registered in time, it would not matter as an advocate/lawyer had drafted it.

This statement of Mian Saqib Nisar J is full of adverse inferences being drawn and that to, rather unjustly. We shall deal with both points in order and then note further incongruent reasoning of the judges in this matter. But firstly, lets note that numerous crimes not only in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan but all around the world are reported many days, weeks, months and even years after the incident. This can be for many reasons; the victims of the crime are too scared, too hurt or aggrieved physically or psychologically or simply because they would much rather avoid confrontation and try and move on with their lives quietly or indeed they themselves are trying to ensure they follow the right procedures.

**(i)No limitation for lodging F.I.R.**

It is not given a limitation to register an F.I.R. under Cr.P.C. Hence, the **Superior Courts of Pakistan had held decision** on this issue as follows: - *“Section 154 Delay in lodging of F.I.R. was not material... No limitation has been provided in criminal law for lodging F.I.R.”* [3]

**(ii)Evidentiary value of F.I.R.**

An FIR is not of evidentiary value and **the Supreme Court of Pakistan** had held decision as follows: -*“It is for this reasons that in its wisdom, repeatedly this Court had held that F.I.R. is not substantive piece of evidence, but simply an information about occurrence laid down before the law enforcing agency to set the law into motion for the purpose of investigation. Therefore, narration of facts in the F.I.R. cannot be made basis for getting contradictions in the prosecution case or discarding ocular testimony on that premise. At best F.I.R. can be considered as a piece of document to which the complainant, when he appears in the witness box, can be confronted with its contents.”* [4]

Considering the laws, it is extremely disingenuous of the judges to try undermining the character of the PWs (prosecution witnesses) and thereby try and cast doubt on the entire prosecution case against Aasiya Noreen (Asia Bibi), on the basis that the FIR was registered 5 days after the incident.

This case was and is of blasphemy, a capital offence, thus punishable by death and one that is recognized as rightfully being extremely sensitive to every Muslim in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Therefore, far from being called liars the judges should be commending Mr. Qari Salaam for taking the appropriate amount of time to

determine whether there was any truth and merit to the accusations against Aasiya Noreen.

Qari Salaam, being a respected and responsible Imam and community leader in the village felt, that due to this being a matter the honour and sanctity of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (*peace & blessings of Allah be upon him*) having been potentially violated as well as a woman's life and death, that he should exercise precaution and not be hasty in lodging/registering the FIR with the police.

Only when Qari Salaam set about to determine the facts of the matter and held a village counsel and Aasiya Noreen (aka. Asia Bibi) herself willingly confessed to the vitriolic abuse of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (*peace & blessings of Allah be upon him*) did Qari Salaam report it to the Police and lodge/register the FIR.

If Qari Salaam and the villagers were not law abiding, honest citizens of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan then they could easily have set upon Aasiya and killed her immediately after her confession. But instead of taking the law into their own hands they fulfilled their civic duty and exercised patience and demonstrated immense restraint after Aasaiya confessed to abusing the Holy Prophet Muhammad (*peace & blessings of Allah be upon him*). Something no Muslim can possibly tolerate.

(ii) Dealing now with the second incongruent reasoning provided by the judges. How can the fact that an advocate/lawyer drafted the FIR be a reason used by the judges for casting doubt on the truthfulness of the incident as reported by the prosecution witnesses?

What is astonishing is that once again both Mia Saqib Nisar J and Saeed Khan Khosa J are inconsistent in their reasoning and application of the law. I shall explain hereunder.

On page four (4) of this report I have cited the appeal to the Supreme Court by the poor father of a murdered 18 years old boy, whose appeal was rejected due to being time-barred by 4 days. The three (3) judges on that bench were headed by Asif Saeed Khan Khosa J and his final advice to the grieving and pleading father seeking justice was, that had the father **engaged a lawyer the situation could be avoided.**

I ask the question of both Mian Saqib Nisar J and Asif Saeed Khan Khosa J, tell me which one of you is correct in applying the law? It stands to reason that both cannot be correct!

2. In paragraph [28] Mian Saqib Nisar J, sates that the FIR states that there were 25-30 ladies present at the place where the blasphemy offence is said to have taken place but that except for 2 ladies, namely Mafia Bibi [PW2] and Asma Bibi [PW3] (sisters), no one else came forward. From this the judge goes onto drawing an unjust and adverse inference.

The answer to this is very simple and glaring. Firstly, the Law does NOT require every possible witness to give evidence. The prosecution has produced more than enough witnesses who have nothing to gain by putting themselves through the ordeal of Court and cross-examination. These are simple village people with little or no education in the secular sense. It is remarkable in fact that PW2 and PW3 were able to find the courage to even come to court and give evidence. Given their socio-economic and religiosity (as these ladies observe the *purda* from non-family men).

Secondly it is evident and easy to discern from normal social behavior of people in general that many crimes are committed where there are numerous by-standers and members of the public but hardly anyone reports the crime except for either the victim or one or two brave individuals. This is sad but true. People are scared to get involved in anything that they are not directly involved in. Even if 30 people witness a mobile phone being snatched, none but for the victim of the crime, report the incident and lodge an FIR.

Again, it must be noted that all the other potential witnesses are female as well and are simple village women with little or no education, who are shy and avoid getting embroiled in anything that they can possibly make them a subject of gossip by others. This is also often owing to their vulnerable disposition or natural shyness.

Mian Saqib Nisar J, in paragraph [44] states, *“In this case the appellant was brought to a gathering of potentially hundreds of people, she was alone at the time, tensions were running high, and it was an intimidating environment, the appellant may well have felt threatened and vulnerable....”*

Nisar J is almost testifying himself as to the feelings of Aasiya Noreen. He is going to great lengths to paint the image of an extremely “vulnerable” and “intimidated” (scared) woman in an “intimidating” environment. Yet NOWHERE in any of Aasiya Noreen’s statements does she mention being “intimidated” or feeling “threatened”. So why is Mian Saqib Nisar J speaking on behalf of Aasiya Noreen and her feeling when she herself has not expressed anything of the sort?

Finally, regarding this adverse inference the judge has drawn against the two witnesses who did come forward it should be noted that, these two women were the ones in closest proximity to Aasiya Noreen (Asia Bibi) and thus their testimony carries the most weight. The Trial Court as well as the High Court certainly thought so and that is why the Trial Court passed the appropriate sentence and that upon appeal from the appellant (Aasiya Noreen) upheld the conviction and as well as the sentence.

3. Let us now analyze the statement of the appellant (Aasiya Noreen). Aasiya makes the following claims:
  - (i) She claims that Qari Salaam was approached by the two female witnesses through his wife as they were “teaching the both ladies” (incorrect English quoted from original judgment)). But the court understood this to mean that due to this



connection of the two witnesses to the wife of Qari Salaam and in this way to Qari Salaam himself, that they conspired and fabricated a “false” and “fictitious” case against her.

However, the reality is that Qari Salaam’s wife is the teacher of several women in the village and not just these two female witnesses, as she is the Imam (Qari Salaam’s) wife. This means that the womenfolk of the village study under her. This proves that there is no special connection or relationship between Qari Salaam or his wife with the two witnesses (PWs), which the accused, Aasiya Noreen is trying very hard to create.

- (ii) Aasiya then goes on to allege that the police were also lying and conspired with the other witnesses to “fabricate” the case against her.

Are we to believe Aasiya that the Police also have a special connection with the complainant, Qari Salaam and the two female prosecution witnesses, (PWs)?

I am surprised that Aasiya is not accusing the lower Court and the High Court where she was tried and found guilty on the weight of the evidence and where her appeal was dismissed respectively, of conspiring against her also.

- (iii) *“I am also about 40 years old and since the occurrence, no complaint of such nature has ever accrued.”*

Why does Aasiya Noreen not know her age? Why does she say, “about 40 years old”? If she cannot be relied upon to remember her own age, then how can we be asked to believe any of what she claims?

- (iv) *“...and since the alleged occurrence, no complaint of such nature has ever accrued.”*

This part of her statement makes no sense whatsoever. It is extremely poor English. But neither Aasiya nor the witnesses, as far as we can tell, speak English in which case the fault lies with the translator. And if we are to blame the translator then we will have to do the same for the two female witnesses, who, as has already been stated, also do not speak English and are from the same village.

This is an important point to note. That the all three presiding judges have exerted themselves in trying to cast doubt on the credibility of the witnesses. For example, regarding the number of people that the prosecution witnesses say were present. Some apparently said 250 another 1000 etc. But how do we know that this is not the mistake of the translators? Secondly, the fact that a “panchayat” i.e. Counsel was convened in the village is not denied by the defence at all. This leads to the only logical conclusion that the incorrect quotes and recollection of the two sisters who are the prosecutions witnesses (Mafia Bibi [PW2] & Asma Bibi [PW3]). Why have the judges chosen to ignore that the wrong estimation of a mathematical figure as to the number of people present in the panchayat does not prove that it did not take place. In fact it simply means that the two (2) ladies, Mafia and Asma must have felt scared and

intimidated by the process of cross-examination and being simple village ladies they are not good at estimating figures and amounts.

I have detailed on page 8 of this report, how Mian Saqib Nisar J goes out of his way to almost testify for Aasiya Noreen that must have felt “intimidated”, “threatened” etc. Yet he is not willing to extend the same to the two ladies who are the prosecution witnesses and are from the exact same village, socio-economic background as the appellant (Aasiya Noreen aka Asia Bibi).

We must question why?

In (iv) Aasiya uses the word “*since*” this would indicate that she is referring to after the incident, but surely this is no credit to Aasiya as she was already in custody. The word “*accrued*” has also been used. However, this word means to amass, or gain, or build up at the end of a specific length of time. Here again we can say without any fear of contradiction that the word intended was “*occurred*”, meaning taken place.

All these errors for those who do not speak English is very worrying as it casts doubt on the entire statements on all parties concerned.

- (v) “...how can I use such clumsy and derogatory remarks against the beloved Prophet (PBUH) of Allah and the Divine book viz. Holy Qur’an.”

Bearing in mind that this statement was submitted without any pressure or fear of harm, why would a Christian woman refer to the Holy Prophet Muhammad (*peace & blessings be upon him*) as “*beloved*” or the Qur’an for that matter as “*Divine book*”? Surely if Aasiya Noreen believes that the Holy Qur’an is the Divine book (revealed by God Almighty from heavens above) and takes the Holy Prophet Muhammad (*peace & blessings of Allah be upon him*) as “*beloved*” then why is she referring to herself as Christian in her statement? No Christian in the world believes that the Holy Qur’an is divine, otherwise they cease to be a Christian.

- (vi) Referring to the two sisters, Maafia and Asma Bibi i.e. the prosecution witnesses, Aasiya states in her own statement, “... they both felt disgrace and dishonor on the basis of the altercation and hard words extended to them.”

Here we have an admission, albeit unwittingly, from Aasiya stating clearly that she “*extended hard words to them*” which caused them “*disgrace and dishonor*”. But Aasiya suppresses a key piece of evidence, that being what those “*hard words*” she has admitted here she “*extended*” to the two witnesses were.

Based on the facts and evidence including a full confession previously given by Aasiya Noreen, which was judged as good evidence by the Trial Court and then subsequently by the High Court along with the corroborating evidence of the Police, and the two female witnesses as well as Qari Salaam, it is inconceivable and illogical to assume that so many independent individuals/witnesses with good moral and social standing, who share no connection to one another which can be deemed as to have a close or strong relationship, or that they would conspire to accuse an innocent woman. There is no land or money or romantic gain or loss

whereby the witnesses could be accused of being greedy or that they were aggrieved and somehow wanted revenge.

- (vii) In paragraph [44] Mian Saqib Nisar J states that, “... *when a specific question was put to Mafia Bibi (PW2), in her reply she stated that “it is incorrect to suggest that I recorded statement against the accused Asia Bibi due to the quarrel which took place between me and Asia Bibi during the plucking of Falsa on the same day”*”

The judge (Mian Saqib Nisar J) has tried to conclude that the above statement of Mafia Bibi, (one of the two prosecution witnesses), somehow rebuts the blasphemy “*allegation*” yet no mention of what this “... *specific question*” was.

A statement of facts can only be construed as an answer if the specific question is known. Astonishingly however the judge is trying to once again draw an adverse inference that somehow this statement rebuts the blasphemy and by doing so he is clearly overreaching.

If anything, this statement of facts from Mafia Bibi (PW2) only further establishes the credibility of the witness and thus the case for the prosecution. It is evident that Mafia Bibi (PW2) is simply stating that she has no ulterior motive to record her statement other than to speak the truth and state the facts in relation to the incident and what she witnessed.

- (viii) The judge then states again in the very next sentence of paragraph [47] that, “*The allegation of blasphemy was also rebutted by the defence which is evident from the answer given by her (PW2) namely, “its is incorrect to suggest that I have deposed falsely today...”*”

This attempt by Mian Saqib Nisar J is extremely concerning as he is continuing to misinterpret the statement of prosecution witness 2 (PW2), which simply and clearly state that there is no ulterior motive to deposing Aasiya Noreen (Asia Bibi/appellant) and completely misinterpret her words to suit the conclusion he eventually and rather shockingly determines.

If this is the rebuttal for the most important question of all viz. Did the Aasiya Noreen blaspheme against the Holy Prophet (peace & blessings of Allah be upon him) then nothing could be a more preposterous judgment. This clearly illustrates and highlights the nefarious intention with which these judges have approached the entire case.

- (ix) It must be noted that NOWHERE, NOT EVEN ONCE does Aasiya Noreen (Asia Bibi) deny the chain of events as reported by the prosecution witnesses. She does not deny that she “*extended hard words*” to the two ladies. She does not deny that the incident was reported the local Imam, Qari Salaam. She does not deny that a village Counsel was held (panchayat).
- (x) NOT EVEN ONCE does Aasiya Bibi state ANYWHERE in HER STATEMENT that she felt “*intimidated*”, “*scared*” or that any threat of violence was made against her by anyone.

## **Global Facts:**

It is extremely odd that even though the Pope (Francis) who is the Head of the Catholic Church, recently visited Ireland and who is on record as saying, *“react with strong and clear words, he does not tolerate this, because those scribes, perhaps without realizing it, are falling into the gravest sin: negating and blaspheming the Love of God which is present and working in Jesus.”*

*“And blasphemy, the sin against the Holy Spirit, is the only unpardonable sin - so Jesus says - because it starts from a closure of the heart to the mercy of God acting in Jesus,” the pope said June 10 in St. Peter’s Square.*

And yet only 6 days ago (2th October) in Ireland, the country went to the ballot boxes in a referendum to vote on whether to keep the blasphemy Law or not and the result is, removing the term from the state’s official statement of values, marks the latest sign of Ireland’s decades-long social liberalisation from a deeply-Catholic and conservative society to an increasingly secular one.

The referendum was held on the same day as Ireland’s presidential election on Friday.

The result, which was announced late on Saturday night, hours after Michael D Higgins was formally re-elected president, saw almost 65% of the electorate back change.

A total of 951,650 (64.85%) people voted for the change, with 515,808 (35.15%) opposing the move.

At the same time in The Islamic Republic of Pakistan we find that the time-barred appeal of a tried, convicted and self-confessing blasphemer (Aasiya Noreen aka Asia Bibi) is being decided to be heard by the Supreme Court in such haste that a judgement completely disregarding the strength of the evidence and on the basis of weak analysis, overreaching adverse inferences as well as total misinterpretation of the facts and smearing of independent witnesses by the judges from the outset is given.

Is this mere coincidence or a well-planned international effort from foreign powers to try and coordinate international efforts and time this in such a manner to make it seem like the choice of the people?

It is the finding of this report, after careful consideration of all the facts and evidence, contained in the official judgement as contained in the 56 page document released for public records, that the bench, comprising Mian Saqib Nisar J, Asif Saeed Khan Khosa J and Mazhar Alam Khan Miankhel J has given a judgement which goes against not only the findings of the Police, the Trial Court and the High Court but also against both the letter of the Law and the Spirit of the Law.

I hope this hasty and unjust decision will be thoroughly reviewed by legal experts and reconsidered otherwise it has the dangerous potential of becoming one of the biggest travesties of modern legal history.

I pray that the truth comes out and justice is served.

An *Ummati* of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (*salallahu alayhi wasssllam*)

Birmingham,  
England,  
United Kingdom