



Press Release

Taipei District Prosecutors Office

Release Date: Mar. 12th 2018

Media Contact: Deputy Chief Prosecutor Chou

Contact Number: (02) 2314 6881

Regarding the China Times report dated March 9th 2018 that “The attorney retained by LEE Sush-Der casted doubt on the prosecution’s concealing related facts of the Big Dome Case,” the misleading statement made by LEE’s defense attorney was obviously inconsistent with the fact. The Taipei District Prosecutors Office hereby clarifies as follows:

1. After more than two years investigation, the prosecutors of our Office have found solid evidence, and therefore indicted defendant LEE, Sush-Der on Oct. 30th 2017, for his improper enrichment to Taipei Cultural and Sports Park contractors (the “Big Dome Case”), which constitutes a violation of Anti-Corruption Act. For the time being, the Big Dome Case is presently pending in the Taipei District Court. Our Office has conducted thorough investigations regarding the relevant contract negotiations and conclusions of the case, all of which are stated in the pertinent fact section of the indictments in detail. Along with the indictment made by the prosecution, all the relevant evidence as well as the case files acquired during our investigation phase have been submitted to the Taipei District Court. Therefore, the defense attorney’s accusation that “Some facts were concealed and hidden by the prosecutors” is not only groundless but also contradictive to the facts and the evidence shown in the Big Dome Case.
2. As to the press report regarding “The defense attorney raised their doubt on the Agency Against Corruption’s official letter to the Taipei District Prosecutors Office two years ago, in which the AAC officers pointed out that LEE et al. did not violate the Anti-Corruption Act,” our Office finds the statement has been intentionally made to misguide the public opinions. As a matter of fact, our Office has been conducting investigations through various channels and acquiring a great amount of evidence to support our findings of the Big Dome Case. Specifically,

there are dozens of evidence listed in our indictment. Unfortunately, the defense attorney purposely ignores and disregards the solid evidence in this case, and their wrongful statements mentioned above are thus not sustainable.

In conclusion, statements made by defendant LEE's attorney are contradictory to the fact and evidence shown in the Big Dome Case. The Taipei District Prosecutors Office shall therefore clarify the misleading information as above.