



Supreme Prosecutors Office

News Release

Release Date: February 16, 2012

Released by: Special Investigation Division

In the case of alleged money laundering by former Premier Frank Hsieh, the prosecutors have concluded their investigations and have found no substantive evidence of the alleged illegalities. The investigations were officially concluded on February 15, 2012, and the gist of the investigation report prepared by the responsible prosecutor is as follows:

1. The original letter of complaint had alleged: Su Tseng-chang of the DPP had claimed, “Frank, shifting the focus does not change the fact that you are involved in corruption!” Chen Shu-bian also criticized while testifying: “Why do you not prosecute Frank Hsieh for remitting \$1 billion overseas in the name of his brother-in-law...” These suspicions were also mentioned by guests on TVBS’ “Everybody Talk” program. However, Frank Hsieh boldly exclaimed in a public occasion that: “If I were corrupt, the Ma Government would have already indicted me!” Former Premier Hsieh was therefore suspected of having committed violations of the Anti-Corruption Act.
2. Results of the prosecutors’ investigations show:
 - (1) According to the corroborated testimonies of witnesses Chen Shui-bian and Yeh Sheng-mao, witness Chen Shui-bian had once received an intelligence report that “Frank Hsieh had remitted NT\$1 billion to Singapore in the name of his brother-in-law”. However, said report was merely information obtained by the intelligence service, and one can no longer verify the authenticity of the source of information, nor did the intelligence report provide any substantive evidence for investigation. Therefore, one cannot directly find the defendant Frank Hsieh to have violated the Anti-Corruption Act, merely on the basis of the witness Chen Shui-bian’s reference to the aforementioned intelligence report.
 - (2) The Taipei District Court had examined the case as Zi-Zhi No. 46 of 2009, and had sent a written inquiry to the Bureau of Investigation of the Ministry of Justice. The said Bureau had responded: To date there has been no investigation of the case of the private complainant (i.e. Frank Hsieh) making remittance to Singapore in the name of his family members, nor is there any factual intelligence in this regard, as evidenced by the contents of the criminal judgment in the aforementioned case attached to this file. The said response from the Ministry also corroborates the testimonies of the witness Yeh Sheng-mao, showing that the Bureau of Investigation had not received the aforementioned intelligence. Therefore, the aforementioned accusation by the witness

Chen Shui-bian cannot be accepted in making a finding against the defendant.

- (3) After checking the foreign exchange remittances by the defendant's spouse, You X-X and seven other relatives between Years 2004 to 2008, there is no finding of any remittances to Singapore or any large outward remittances by these eight people, as evidenced by the letter from the Foreign Exchange Bureau of the Central Bank dated August 5, 2011. Further, considering that You X-X and the Wang X-X couple are respectively the responsible person and financial manager of a company, as evidenced by the inquiry record from the Joint Credit Information Center, one cannot consider it to be abnormal even if there were remittances of a large sum. It is therefore evident that one cannot find there to be any illegalities.
- (4) The Bureau of Investigation has also been requested to investigate whether the defendant had made remittances overseas using the names of his relatives. Said Bureau had applied to the Foreign Exchange Bureau of the Central Bank for foreign exchange receipts and payments record from January 1, 2004 to March 31, 2008 in respect of relatives of the defendant within three degrees, and had also cross-checked such records against the large sum transaction records in respect of these persons, but there is no finding of large sum remittances overseas, as evidenced by the letter of the Bureau of Investigation dated October 18, 2011, the large sum transactions record, and foreign exchange receipts and payments record attached on file. There is lack of positive evidence showing that the defendant had ever made remittances to Singapore using the names of his relatives.
- (5) In light of the above, there is no positive evidence to substantiate the former President Chen Shui-bian's claim Frank Hsieh had made a remittance of more than NT\$1 billion to Singapore in the name of his relatives, supposedly reported by Yeh Sheng-mao, former head of the Bureau of Investigation. As no illegality has been found, investigations in the case have been concluded.