

Loan shark claims trial for harassing borrower; another man gets jail, fine over debt dispute

SIBU: A loan shark pleaded not guilty in the Magistrate's Court here yesterday to a charge of harassment and causing distress to a borrower on May 24.

Ma Hock King, 42, claimed trial before Magistrate Oon Kork Chern, who granted him bail of RM4,000 with one surety. The court fixed this July 16 for case management.

According to the charge, Ma, together with another individual still at large, was allegedly acting on behalf of a moneylender when he harassed a borrower at the latter's home at Jalan Teku Barat at 12.35pm on May 24 this year.

The charge was framed under Section 29B(2) of the Moneylenders Act 1951, which provides for a fine of not less than RM10,000 and not more than RM50,000, or imprisonment for up to two years, or both, upon

conviction.

In a separate case, a 57-year-old man was sentenced to one month in jail and fined RM2,000, in default another month's imprisonment, after he pleaded guilty to a charge of causing hurt to another person.

Tang Tung Chai was accused of intentionally causing injury to a 31-year-old man at a house along Jalan Selangan on May 26 this year, at around 1.45pm.

He was charged under Section 323 of the Penal Code, read together with Section 34 of the same Code.

According to the facts of the case, three unidentified men had gone to the complainant's house on the day of the incident, accusing him of owing a Chinese national woman RM5,000.

They then assaulted him by punching him in the face and

the back of the head, resulting in injuries.

The complainant denied owing anyone money.

Following a police report, the accused was arrested at the Sibu Court Complex on May 27, 2025, at around 9.30am to assist with investigations.

Investigations revealed that the incident stemmed from a debt the complainant allegedly owed to the accused's girlfriend, which he failed to repay.

The accused also claimed the complainant had previously slapped his girlfriend, although no police report had been lodged regarding the matter.

When the accused confronted the complainant about the debt, the latter claimed not to know him, prompting the accused to resort to physical violence out of frustration.