



Press Release

Taipei District Prosecutors Office

Release Date: Sep. 17 2025

Media Contact: Deputy Chief Prosecutor Kao, I-SHU

Contact number: (02) 23146881

Media reports citing remarks by a member of a certain political party have misrepresented the facts and misled the public. We hereby clarify as follows:

- I. The alleged “reply from the Ministry of Justice” was in fact a report submitted to this Office by the Northern Mobile Team of the Ministry of Justice Investigation Bureau after being assigned by our prosecutor to investigate suspected false reporting of political donations by Ko O-che. It was not a reply issued by the Ministry of Justice.
- II. Following investigation, the prosecutor determined that the surplus political donation funds were not directly used for personnel expenses of Taiwan O Party, but were paid to Mu Ke Co., Ltd. and the Zhongwang Foundation, which then used the funds to pay employee salaries. As these entities are unrelated to participation in public office elections, such use does not meet the statutory purpose of political donations. Moreover, after the January 2024 presidential election, no public elections were imminent, nor were the payments personnel expenses for prospective candidates. The case therefore involves the embezzlement of public funds, and prosecution has been initiated. As for the investigative opinion issued by the Northern Mobile Team of the Ministry of Justice Investigation Bureau, the prosecutor, based on the investigative results, determined that it was inconsistent with applicable law. In exercising prosecutorial authority to determine facts and apply the law, the prosecutor is not bound by such investigative opinions
- III. Regarding a Facebook post alleging that “state machinery blatantly infringes personal privacy,” the LINE messages between Ko O-che and Li O-zong constitute key evidence demonstrating Ko O-che’s financial control over the Taiwan O Party, the Zhongwang Foundation, Taiwan Origin Brain Trust, and Mu Ke Co., Ltd., and are legally admissible. The prosecutor’s use of these messages in questioning was necessary to substantiate the alleged offenses. Defense objections claiming political investigation were rejected by the presiding judge, who ruled the

questions relevant. The post therefore misrepresents the facts and warrants clarification.