

Umrah package firm ordered to pay RM46,940

Published on: Friday, April 26, 2024
By: Lagatah Toyos

Text Size:



The decision was made after the claimant in this case, Rajis Yusof, 41, successfully submitted the previous instructions, Form 1, to the opposing party's legal advisor (Emraz Company).

TAWAU: An umrah package operator company based in Putrajaya was ordered to pay compensation of RM46,940 to six individuals after failing to “fly” them to perform umrah on the chosen date of March 20, 2023. Sabah Consumer Claims Tribunal (TTPM) President Larina Wong Shiao Yee ordered Emraz Travel & Tours Sdn Bhd to pay the compensation to the claimant within 14 days of receiving the order. The decision was made after the claimant in this case, Rajis Yusof, 41, successfully submitted the previous instructions, Form 1, to the opposing party's legal advisor (Emraz Company). During the hearing on Thursday without the presence of the company's representative, Larina gave the award of Reimbursement Order to the victim to order the company involved to pay compensation to the victims within 14 days. Earlier, Rajis filed his claim to TPPM on Jan 16, this year after the company failed to fly them on March 20, 2023 despite having made full payment for the umrah package through three transactions. The first transaction was paid on Nov 30, 2022 amounting to RM40,000 as deposit for six individuals, while the second transaction involved RM6,490 on Jan 30, 2023 and the remaining payment of RM450 was paid in the third transaction. For the record, claimants can file a complaint with the Ministry of Domestic Trade and Cost of Living (KPDN) enforcement if the 14-day order is not followed.

Meanwhile, two more cases involving one umrah package operator company and another were postponed to next May 16 this year because the representative of the opposing party (company) was not present at the hearing session. The case involved claims of RM49,712.03 (five victims) and RM22,080, respectively, against the same company based in Kelantan. Larina said the case was set for mention on the said date because her side received an e-mail from the director of the opposing company requesting a postponement of the case.