



**Supreme Prosecutors Office News Release**  
**Released on: December 23, 2013**  
**Released by: Special Investigation Division**

---

In connection with the alleged corruption trial of Judge Hu Jing-bin and others before the Taichung Branch Court of the Taiwan High Court (“Taichung High Court”), the Special Investigation Division (“SID”) of this Office has, jointly with the Taiwan Taichung District Prosecutors’ Office, led the investigation by the Central Region’s Mobile Squad of the Investigation Bureau under the Ministry of Justice (“MJIB”). The investigation was concluded on December 23, resulting in public indictment of the defendants. The grounds for the indictment are as summarized below:

**I. Defendants Hu Jing-bin, Huang O-chan, and Lin O-hu have accepted bribes in violation of their statutory duties; defendant Huang O-chan was involved in money laundering; defendants Qiu O-zhu and Huang O-ling have colluded in bribery; and defendant Huang O-ling has committed fraud:**

On July 19, 2010 the SID received a complaint that Judge Hu Jing-bin of the Taiwan Taichung District Court had solicited bribes from a party in a civil trial in May 2010. Prosecutor-General Huang immediately instructed the SID to investigate the complaint. Following extensive surveillance and evidence collection by members of the SID, and proactive viewing of the relevant facts and evidence from the civil trial files, it was found that defendant Hu Jing-bin had communicated closely with Qiu O-zhu, chairwoman of the Harbor Hotel in Taichung, ever since he began presiding over the trial regarding the return of shares of the Harbor Hotel in October 2012. Hu and Qiu had communicated

about and discussed the trial, as well as negotiated the terms for payment and acceptance of bribes, through Qiu's sister-in-law Huang O-ling (the "white glove" in this case) and Hu's cohabiting girlfriend Huang O-chan. As Hu Jing-bin had already communicated and agreed with Qiu O-zhu – through Huang O-ling and Huang O-chan – regarding the bribes before and during the trial, Hu Jing-bin then deliberately favored the defendant Qiu O-zhu in the trial, continuously oppressed the counterparty (the complainant), and repeatedly requested that the complainant settle with the defendant, all of which were contrary to the principle of fair exercise of his duties as a judge presiding over a case. During the period of his presiding over the trial, he had on several occasions met with Huang O-ling at his cohabitation residence with Huang O-chan on Huafu Road in Taichung City, to give guidance to Huang O-ling regarding litigation strategies, and to instruct that the defendant retain a certain attorney-at-law Lin O-hu as her legal counsel, who would then cooperate with Hu Jing-bin's instructions. Huang O-ling would then convey Hu's instructions to Qiu O-zhu. Lin O-hu and Hu Jing-bin had been close friends ever since both worked as judges of the court, and after Lin O-hu retired from public service and took up private practice as a lawyer, he maintained close contact with Hu Jing-bin. With the indirect intention of assisting the defendant Hu Jing-bin to receive bribes, Lin O-hu accepted Qiu O-zhu's instructions to act as her legal counsel, and continued to implement the litigation strategy planned out by Hu Jing-bin for Qiu's benefit. In this manner, Lin assisted Hu Jing-bin to receive, and received a high remuneration from Qiu O-zhu as a service fee. Qiu O-zhu, as a reward to Hu Jing-bin for his partiality in the trial, first purchased on May 17, 2013 a glass art work piece titled 'Upstream' to the value of NT\$ 44,800, which

was given to Hu Jing-bin as a bribe through Huang O-ling. Subsequently, the litigation parties reached a settlement on August 9, 2013 that enabled Qiu to retain management rights over the hotel. Huang O-ling knew that Hu Jing-bin demanded a bribe of NT\$3 million to be paid through Huang, O-chan, but with the criminal intent of deriving an illegal benefit, she deceitfully misinformed Qiu O- Zhu that the amount of the bribe demanded by Hu Jing-bin was NT\$5 million. Qiu O- Zhu, in her mistaken belief, therefore withdrew NT\$ 5 million in cash for Huang O-chan to deliver to Hu Jing-bin. Once Huang O-ling received the cash bribe, she first pocketed the NT\$2 million in cash, using it to pay off a personal loan and a credit loan, before delivering the remaining NT\$3 million to Hu Jing-bin and Huang O-chan on August 26, 2013. Hu's cohabitant Huang, O-chan, in order to avoid criminal investigation, to change the appearance of the unlawfully obtained goods, and to conceal the bribe by laundering the cash, therefore removed all of the plastic wrapping and the bank's paper wraps from the bribe money, and tied the bills together with rubber bands. The next day (that is the 27<sup>th</sup>) Huang, O-chan hid NT\$2.3 million out of the NT\$3 million in a safety deposit box rented under someone else's name.

## **II. Joint fraud by defendants Hu Jing-bin and Liao O-li**

Hu Jing-bin and Liao O-li, his friend who operates a real estate business, often colluded with one another, looking for targets to wantonly defraud based on the financial strengths of parties in trials, and the amounts and types of litigation matters. SID investigations discovered that a certain Wang O-li, one of Liao O-li's friends, was involved in a lawsuit. Although Liao O-li and Hu Jing-bin were aware that they had no means of manipulating or lobbying the judge

presiding over that lawsuit, they nonetheless communicated with the criminal intent to commit a fraud. In December 2011, Liao O-li deceitfully misinformed the party in the trial that he had requested Hu Jing-bin to lobby the judge presiding over the trial, and he would find ways to manipulate the trial, but such manipulations would require an intervention fee. So deceived, Wang O- Li not only paid for Hu Jing-bin and Liao O-li to attend 'Forever Crazy,' a topless show with French girls (entry being NT\$ 4,200 per person), he also paid NT\$ 200,000 in cash to Liao O-li. Liao O-li splitted the defrauded amount with Hu Jing-bin and and spent it. The total sum of fraud consisted of the illegal benefits from the show tickets valued at NT\$ 8,400 paid for by Liao O-li and NT\$ 200,000 cash.

### **III. The unclear sources of defendant Hu Jing-bin's assets**

On August 28, 2012 the SID conducted a raid on the safety deposit boxes of Huang O-chan – rented in the names of others – at Jian-Xing Branch and Taichung Chung Branch of the Bank of Taiwan, as well as the Zhong-gang Branch of Citibank. The SID seized more than NT\$ 23,960,000 in cash. Moreover, more than NT\$ 2,220,000 in cash of unknown origin as well as 52 bank passbooks of savings accounts opened in other people's names were found in Hu Jing-bin and Huang O-Chan's residence on Huafu Road. Subsequent investigation of the financial assets of defendant Hu Jing-bin, his first wife Wang O-duan, his second wife Zhong O-qing, his third wife Huang O-chan, and Hu Jing-bin's children, as well as accounts held by these individuals in the names of other people, showed that they owned assets in excess of NT\$300 million. Hu Jing-bin's assets of unclear origin and obtained through corruption from May 2010 until present are calculated to total more than NT\$ 46,470,000.

A study of Hu Jing-bin's assets over the period from Year 2010 until August 2013 shows gaps of NT\$504,000, NT\$7,223,040, NT\$1,719,808 and NT\$4,741,448 respectively each year (gaps being the amounts by which his expenses exceeded his income each year). When asked to account for the sources of his suspected assets, the defendant Hu Jing-bin had no proper explanations, gave false accounts or did not explain at all.

**IV.** Based on the above, the acts of corruption by Judge Hu Jing-bin of the Taichung District Court have dishonored the civil service and the judicial culture. His ill-gotten assets of unclear origin are the highest ever to be found from a single civil servant in the judiciary, but he has shown no remorse and even sought to justify his ill deeds after being discovered. Given the extremely serious nature of the case, this Office requests the Court to adjudicate sternly and to punish severely, and to mete out a heavy fine and revoke his civil rights. The prosecution also applies to confiscate NT\$ 3 million of ill-gotten assets from the defendants Hu Jing-bin and Huang O-chan, pursuant to Paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 10 of the Anti-Corruption Act, in effective sanction, deterrence and correction of the defendants' acts.