
The Linguistic Features of Bribery in Some Selected Cases in Federal Courts of Ethiopia

Zinawork Assefa¹

Abstract

This study explores the linguistic characteristics found in cases involving bribery and corruption.² The phrase "language of a bribery case" highlights the use of language as both a tool for committing the crime and as a means of investigating it through linguistic analysis. In the Ethiopian legal system, there is limited familiarity with utilizing linguistic knowledge to aid in the delivery of justice. Therefore, this study aims to introduce and promote the use of forensic linguistics in bribery cases by enhancing knowledge and skills in this area. The study addresses two main questions: (1) What linguistic features are present in bribery cases? (2) How can linguistic tools and procedures be employed to identify language-related threats in bribery cases? To answer these questions effectively, the study collected oral and written Amharic expressions from Federal High Courtrooms using recording and observation techniques. The data was then qualitatively analyzed. Consequently, the study identified several linguistic indicators, including: avoidance of liability or lack of denial regarding allegations; contradictions within testimonies; verb tense usage; social introductions; pronoun usage; and seemingly insignificant information becoming significant.

Keywords: Bribery, No Denial of the Allegation, the Contradiction of the Testimony, Tense of the Verb, Social introduction, Pronouns

1. Introduction

In the Ethiopian Federal High Courtroom, the word bribe (*ጉጉ*) is less frequent; instead, the word *Corruption* (*ጭጥፍ*) is widely articulated, and it is used to refer to both meanings of bribery and corruption. However, these words have been used to denote different meanings. Bribery is both offering a bribe and demanding a bribe from another party. Corruption is the act of an official who unlawfully and wrongfully uses his position to procure some benefit for himself (Black 1996:345). As a result, corruption and bribery imply an impairment of public officials' duties. In Ethiopia, bribery or corruption is a

¹ PhD, Assistant Professor of Applied Linguistics, AAU, AELC, zinawork.assefa@aau.edu.et

² Corruption is not synonymous with bribery. In this study, the researcher uses these words interchangeably because bribery and corruption cases are heard by a similar bench of the Ethiopian High Federal Courts.

Selfishness is an instinct. Humans have the aspiration to get more to satisfy their desire, so they try to get bribes or ask for them (Burke, 2009). But the way to get income through unlawful profit has moral and legal consequences. In Ethiopia, moral restriction plays a great role in keeping people from getting inappropriate income, but still, society corrupts official duty. Legal researchers such as Zemelak (2017:2) found out that the types of corruption in Ethiopia are characterized as Petty corruption, such as giving presents or gifts in the form of cattle and agricultural products, gradually leading to grand corruption like embezzlement of public funds, abuse of power, etc. Petty cash corruption was common during the imperial and Derg eras. Since 1991, grand corruption has become common in the country. Due to the seriousness of the problem, the EPRDF government declared a proclamation cited as Anti-Corruption Proclamation No. 881/2015. It was declared to address corruption offenses in separate proclamations rather than make them part of the criminal code due to the fast-changing nature of the offense (2015:8154). In 2021, the federal government revised the Federal Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission Proclamation (1236/2021).

2. Conceptual and Theoretical Frameworks

Shuy (2013) discussed that bribery has different meanings in different contexts and has changed and extended its meaning throughout. The meaning of the English word bribery originally referred to an individual's piece of bread given to a beggar, and then it was generalized to alms and to the person who lives on alms. In the 16th century, the term bribe changed its reference to a person who demands money, not to the one who gives it. Today, it refers to both offering and giving a bribe as well as the extortion or demand of a bribe from another party (Shuy, 2013: 14). In bribery events, forensic linguists take several important issues into account and use linguistic tools and procedures in the context of bribery conversation. These tools are presented from the largest to the smallest units of language: sound, word, phrase, sentence, speech act, schema, and speech event. In bribery or other similar cases, using this procedure is important even if the data is very small or the recorded evidence is at a sentence or phrase level.

Some theories are being used to study language crime domains. For example, the cooperative principle is often invoked in court or police investigations. It was fully developed and described by Grice in 1975. When a person speaks to another, he/she is trying to cooperate to construct meaningful conversations. This assumption is known as the Cooperative Principle. The speakers try to

contribute meaningful, productive utterances to further the conversation, and as listeners, they assume that the conversational partners are doing the same. Grice outlined a set of principles (Grice, 1975:47) and called them the Maxims of Conversation. They are: (1) Quantity (make your information informative); (2) Quality (do not say what you believe to be false); (3) Relations (be relevant); and (4) Manner (avoid obscurity and ambiguity and be brief and orderly).

Interlocutors in discourse must share some common principles. Such principles reveal not just how one generates utterances but also how one comprehends them. When interlocutors are engaged in conversation, they generally follow the maxims of conversation and cooperation principles. In courtroom discourse, participants also observe the cooperative principle. If the witnesses or the defendants give irrelevant responses to the lawyer's interrogation or questions, the lawyers are always quick to call them to order and order them to keep strictly to their line of argument. Shuy (2011: 25; 2013: 50) stated the importance of the maxims in examining language use by prosecutors and defendants. These principles are a touchstone, and suspects' or eyewitnesses' testimonies have been evaluated based on these maxims. Ogunsiji and Farinde (2012:117) stated that police officers and lawyers observe these maxims. If witnesses or suspects have given irrelevant responses to the lawyer's interrogation or questions, the lawyers call them to order and tell them to keep strictly to their line of argument, and police officers kick them when suspects give irrelevant responses to their questions. In this study, the cooperative principle has been employed to evaluate the questions (direct or cross-examination) asked by the prosecutor, defense counsel, and judges and the responses given by the suspect and witnesses. In courtrooms, the cooperative principle is strongly followed because the setting is highly constrained and formal. Therefore, the responses of suspects and witnesses during cross and direct interrogations should be relevant to the question asked by lawyers; the truth concerns the maxims of quality and quantity, and sometimes the speaker may be unable to confirm without violating one of these maxims (Coulthard and Johnson 2007:27). For example, the phrase "I cannot remember to be honest" originated from the maxim of quality, not to say what he/she believes is false but to violate quantity; likewise, the manner violates the relevance and the truth of the conversation.

3. Methodology

Forensic linguistics has been developed in recent years by prominent linguistics and law researchers (Roger Shuy 1993, Peter Meijes Tiersma, and Lawrence Solan 1999). These researchers have applied methodology from interdisciplinary fields including linguistics, law, and criminology, i.e., in the study of languages, describing linguistic elements is the work of objectively analyzing and describing how language is used. Law research is not a mere description of facts but a purposeful investigation to explain or interpret a legal phenomenon. Therefore, to properly investigate a crime and give appropriate justice, it is necessary to conduct a linguistic analysis to examine the statements of the accused and the witnesses.

3.1. Types of Data

The study has used both primary and secondary data: the testimony of suspects and witnesses, respectively; the secondary³ data are documents such as court records, corpus delicti, and police investigation reports. All the primary and secondary data are collected from the Lideta Federal High Courts.

3.2. Participants and Sample Size

Participants in this study are suspects and witnesses in bribery cases. The study employed the inclusion criteria of age and language. The ages of suspects above fifteen years because the Ethiopian civil and criminal laws do not directly exonerate infants under the age of fifteen (15). Article 53 states that children between the ages of 9 and 15 shall not be subject to ordinary penalties applicable to adults, nor shall they be kept in custody with adult criminals, and there is no maximum age limitation for witnesses. All suspects and witnesses are native Amharic speakers with no speech disorders. In this study, two cases were purposefully selected.

4. Bribery/Corruption Event in Courtroom Interrogation

In bribery cases, judges interrogate suspects and witnesses. The interrogation begins with a word of promise. Judges interrogation is the formal or systematic questioning of a person suspected of committing a crime by judges

³ In forensic linguistics, recordings of suspects' and witnesses' testimony are considered secondary data because, in the study of forensic linguistics, researchers/experts are not allowed to record statements of suspects and witnesses. The court or the office only allows the analysis of the recorded documents.

or prosecutors. The researcher observed that in Federal High Courtrooms, especially in criminal cases, suspects blame police interrogations and deny Miranda Rights⁴ has been violated before the trials. In a bribery case, very often the suspects have witnessed that they were tortured by the police, and most of such suspects do not conform to what they have admitted.

The trial gives the suspect a chance to hear defense witnesses. In the Ethiopian procedural criminal code, article 143/3, it is stated that where the accused wishes to make a statement, he shall speak first. The accused may not be cross-examined on his/her statement, but the court puts questions to him to clarify any part of it. The setting makes suspects feel free to defend charges. At this time, the defendant's commitment becomes very high to convince the court. In general, the study uses the testimony of defendants against themselves, the Attorney's witnesses, and the Prosecutor's witnesses' testimonies. In line with this analysis, the data is presented as follows⁵:

Case 1

Addis Ababa University, College of Health Science purchasers, *Ato*⁶ Yilma and *W/ro*⁷ Aregash, have been accused by The Federal High Court Prosecutor, and they are charged with 50,000 birr in corruption. The Prosecutor General read the charge for the trial:

In June 2008, the Black Lion College of Health Sciences of Addis Ababa University announced an invitation to bid for dry food. W/ro Bizunesh registered and submitted a sealed bid before the deadline. Then, the Black Lion Health Science College Purchasing Director sent the letter of award to W/ro Bizunesh via the office of W/ro Aregash. In this instant, the suspects claimed a bribe because they had helped her win 1.5 million birr through the bidding process. Finally, they were arrested by the police officers when they received 50,000 birr from the accuser at the Ras Hotel..

⁴The right to remain silent, the right to show legal counsel, and the right to be told that anything he/she says can be used in court against him/her (source).

⁵ In this research all the names of suspects and witness are hypothetical names.

⁶ "Ato" is a title for an Ethiopian adult equivalent with the English "Mr."

⁷ "W/ro" is a title for Ethiopian married women equivalent with the English "Mrs."

Case 2

Ato Tesema was accused by the Federal High Court Prosecutor of over one million birr, and the charge reads as follows:

Ato Tesema was accused of over one million birr by the Federal Public Prosecutor. According to the charge, Ato Tesema was assigned by the Ethiopian Road Authority Agency in the Afar Regional State, Abala Woreda, to estimate farmland for compensation, but he submitted a wrong report of farmland estimation, and the government paid one million extra birr because of the false estimation.

In both cases, the suspects, *Ato Yilma*, *W/ro Aregash*, and *Ato Tesema*, did not plead guilty to the charge. In the first case, suspects were denied Miranda rights, and they told the courtroom that they had been tortured by the police officers. Then, during their testimony, they reported that the accusers did this deliberately to harm them.

In the first case, when the judge asked *Ato Yilma* and *W/ro Aregash* to clarify the statement, both of them responded that this was done deliberately, and they said that the accuser had a hidden mission to harm them. Then the suspects asked the court to defend the charge made against *W/ro Bizunesh*. On November 22, 2009 E.C., the attorney ordered the defense witnesses to appear before the court. Before the defense witnesses' testimonies, *Ato Yilma* and *W/ro Aregash* had made statements about the charge (the testimony of *Ato Yilma* and *W/ro Aregash* is available in Annex 1 Case 1).

In the second case, *Ato Tesema* stated to the court that his initial estimation of 5.3 hectares of farmland was correct, but the auditing committee wrongly reduced it to 3.3 hectares of farmland to deliberately hurt me. Then, *Ato Tesema* gave a testimony in his defense (the testimony is available in Annex 1, Case 2).

4.1. Speech Event

Gumperz (1982), as cited in Shuy (2015), recognizes interviews, committee negotiations, courtroom interrogations and formal hearings, public debates, and discussions as examples of speech events. The term speech event was introduced by Hymes (1972). It is a type of communicative event in which speech is the main component. It includes meetings, conferences, weddings, courtroom testimony, funerals, etc. Shuy (2013:5) stated that bribery takes

place in speech events and has its requirements and participants. The participants have a shared schema and agenda and appear on the surface as the cause, proposed negotiation, offers, and completions. The details are presented as follows:

Bribery Case 1

Phase 1: Cause

W/ro Bizunesh said that on January 20, 2008, E.C., I got a telephone call from Addis Ababa University, Black Lion Hospital College of Health Science, and they informed me to take the letter of award. On the same day, I went to the College and took the letter. After that, *W/ro* Aregash told me she did some favors to win the bid, and she asked me for my cell phone number.

Phase2: Proposed Negotiation

Three days later, on January 23, *W/ro* Aregash and *W/ro* Bizunesh met at Kaldis Coffee Shop, around Mexico, Addis Ababa. Again, two days later, *W/ro* Aregash appointed *W/ro* Bizunesh around Beharawi, Addis Ababa, and when *W/ro* Bizunesh arrived at the café (the name of the café is not mentioned by the accuser), *W/ro* Aregash was sitting with *Ato* Yilma, and she introduced him to *W/ro* Bizunesh as her boss. Later on, he said, We had helped you win 1.5 million in the bidding process, and as a reward, you should pay 130,000 birr to us. *W/ro* Bizunesh replied to them that she had no such amount of money and asked them for more time to think and discuss it with friends. Then, they made the next appointment for January 30, 2008, and left the café.

Phase 3: Report to the Police or Legal Body

Before the date of appointment, *W/ro* Bizunesh reported to the K'irkos Sub-city (Kiflā kətəma) Woreda (Wərəda) 5 justice office and raised the issue with *W/ro* Alemi, the head of the office. On January 30, 2008, *W/ro* Bizunesh prepared Forty-Seven thousand Birr (47,000) in check and Three thousand Birr (3000) in cash and went to *W/ro* Alemi's office. Afterward, *W/ro* Bizunesh and *W/ro* Alemi went to the K'era Police Office and reported the case to the officer. The officer copied the check and some Hundred Birr notes of cash. Finally, *W/ro*

Bizunesh and *W/ro* Alemi went to the Ras Hotel with the two police officers in a police vehicle.

Phase 4: Offers

W/ro Bizunesh met *Ato* Yilma and *W/ro* Aregash at *Ras* Hotel and had a cup of macchiato, and *W/ro* Bizunesh gave the envelope with the check and three thousand birr in cash to *Ato* Yilma and *W/ro* Aregash. After that, *W/ro* Bizunesh left the table.

Phase 5: Completion

The police officers caught *Ato* Yilma and *W/ro* Aregash, and they took them to the Kera (K'era) Police Office.

First, from the phases of the speech event, we recognized that the bribery case started with a normal business process but suddenly changed into bribery. As can be seen in Phase 2, Negotiation, there is a phrase that refers to the agreement between the two parties: "We had helped you win 1.5 million through the bidding process, so as a reward you should pay 130,000 birr to us". It was an oral agreement made between the suspects and the accusers; it was not a written agreement because it would be a crime to do that, and both parties were trying to get benefits illegally. Such a negotiation is known as the language crime scene phase.

Second, *W/ro* Bizunesh accepted the negotiation, but she asked for a while to think about it. She said, "I asked them for time to think and discuss with friends". From this statement, the study infers that *W/ro* Bizunesh felt that she had lost the bid, so she accepted the negotiation. During intervals, she communicated the issue to police officers.

Corruption Case 2

Phase 1: Cause

In January 2007 E.C., *Ato* Tesema was assigned by the Ethiopian Road Authority to come up with a feasible estimate of the compensation for estimated farmland.

Phase 2: Negotiation

Not known

Phase 3: Offers

Some money was paid to committee members who were estimating the farmland on behalf of *Ato* Tesema.

Phase 4: Completion

Ato Tesema reported that 5.6 hectares of land should be paid as compensation. The Federal Prosecutor charged him with more than one million birr for raising the estimate of land from 3.3 hectares to 5.6 hectares, for which he was paid.

The main difference between bribery and corruption is that the latter lacks a negotiation phase or language crime scene. In police offices and courts, the negotiations between the parties are not considered a focus area of the crime. As we stated in case 2, the negotiation phase is not described, but in the bribery case, the negotiation phase certainly contains the oral agreement between the parties. This does not mean that corruption always ignores the language of the crime scene,⁸ but the guilt of corruption cases is primarily related to official duties, and prosecutor witnesses are asked to respond to questions as to how a suspect abuses his/her official power.

4.2. Schema

This sub-part of the study concerns identifying the identity of the suspects as revealed by the expressions they use. Schema is an account of world knowledge in discourse understanding and other cognitive tasks. Many inferences are made in discourse comprehension that is schema-driven. However, some inferences appear to be necessary and others are less certain (van Dijk and Kintsch 1983:48–49). In case (1), there were three main participants: *Ato* Yilma, *W/ro* Aregash, and *W/ro* Bizunesh. The first two are guilty of Fifty thousand Ethiopian Birr (50,000), and *W/ro* Bizunesh is the accuser of the suspects. In Case (2), the suspect's name was not clearly stated, as he has not given it. However, he fragmentarily explained his official responsibility as an Ethiopian Road Authority Consultant Agent in Afar.

⁸ The phrase ‘‘language of the crime scene’’ was coined in my Ph.D. dissertation (Zinawork Assefa, 2021). It refers to the oral statements of suspects and witnesses before, during, and after a crime is committed.

In forensic linguistics, speech events and schema phases are considered like smoke or a clue. In each phase, the researcher observes an indication like smoke out of a gun, i.e., based on a few signs, forensic linguists dig out more linguistic evidence from the text; besides, the study identified important linguistic cues detected from the expressions. These are presented under the following topics.

4.3. Linguistic Cues in Bribery Case

The study finds linguistic cues that show deception or a problem of commitment to explain the story about a particular bribery event. To identify the cues, the study employed three steps: (1) Measuring typical truth expressions or statements based on the linguistic rules (2) Assessing deviation from this norm; (3) Counting the frequency of the deviating collocations. The linguistic norm refers to the contradiction of expressions, tense of verb, noun, and pronoun (introducing the name, improper use of pronoun), irrelevant information becoming important, missing information (unnecessary connection), out of the sequence of information, time, and an unbalanced statement. All these linguistic cues are tested by Grice's (1975) cooperative principles (Maxims) and Amharic grammar norms. The details of the data presentations and discussions are presented as follows:

4.3.1. Avoiding Liability or No Denial of Allegation

Avoiding liability is the main linguistic manifestation of a bribery case. For example, the following examples are taken from the extracts of the bribery cases (1) and (2).

No	Statements	Info. structure
(9)	ከእኔ ጋር ምንም የሚያገናኝቸው ነገር የለም kə ine gar minnim jəmmi-jaggən-ən-ətʃ-əw nəgər jəlləm CONJ IS with nothing REL- connect:IPFV-1S-3S:HON.3MS.OBJ issue nothing (That) they have/there Nothing to do with me	Negation
(10)	የአጽዳቂ ኮሚቴ አባል አይደለሁም jəʔas'dak'-i komite ʔabal ʔaj-dəll-əhu-mm approve-1S committee member NEG- be-1S-Ncm I am not a member of the approval committee	Negation
(11)	በቅርብ ኃላፊዬ እማካኝነት በታዘዝኩት መሰረት bə-k'irb halafi-je ʔammakənninət bə-t-azzəz-ku-t məsərət, CONJ-close boss-POSS:1S in order to CONJ-PASS-order-1S-3MS.OBJ. based As I was ordered by my immediate boss	Word formation (passive)

(12)	<p>ኃላፊ አይደለሁም halafi ʔaj-dəll-ə-hu-mm manager NEG- be: :PFV-3MS-1S-NCM I am not (the) manager</p>	Negation
(13)	<p>በእካ ሥራ ላይ ምንም አይነት ኃላፊነት የሌለኝ bə- izza- sira laj minnim ʔajnət halafi-ɲət jə-lell-ə-ɲɲ LOC- that-work on nothing kind power-1S- FOC REL-nothing:PFV-1S I have no responsibility having with that job</p>	Prosody and intonation
(14)	<p>የመወሰን አቅም የሌለኝ jə-mə-wəss-ən ʔak'k'im jə-lell-ə-ɲɲ REL-NOM-decide:PFV-ACC power REL-nothing-3MW-1S I do not have/have no power to decide</p>	Prosody and intonation
(15)	<p>ጩረታውን የመሰረዝ ሥልጣን እንደሌለኝ c'ərətaw-u-n jə-mə-sərrəz silt'an innidə-lell-ə-ɲɲ bid- DEF -ACC REL-NOML-cancel:PFV power CONJ-nothing-3MS-1S I do not have/have any authority to cancel the bid</p>	Prosody and intonation
(16)	<p>አማካሪ ድርጅቱ በሚሰጠኝ መመሪያ ነው ስራ መስራት ያለብኝ ʔammakari diridʒdʒit-u bə- imm-i-sət'-ən məmmərɪja nəw Consultancy organization-DEF CONJ- REL-3MS-give:IPFV-1P instruction COP sira mə-sira-t jə-all-ə-bb-ɲɲ work NOML-doing-3MS.OBJ REL-be:PFV-3MS-APPL:1S I will be doing a job by the instructions the Consultant Agency gives me.</p>	Word formation (passive)

Table 2: The role of the information package in the witness's testimony

The expressions in the table above show that the suspects are appealing to save themselves from accountability and to escape from the state of being criminals. Consciously, they use two techniques: (1) Negative information structure, to avoid responsibility; for example in (10) /ʔajdəlləhum/ meaning "I am not", in (13) and (14) /jələlləɲɲ/ meaning "having no", /ɲləlləɲɲ/ meaning "That I do not have." All these negative expressions are used to avoid responsibility but when suspects use many of such phrases their statements may contradict each other. For example, in annex 1, DBS 8 *W/ro* Aregash said "I was the organizer of the auction" and then she contradicts it in the table above (13), stating /bəzza sira laj minnim ʔajnət halafinət jələlləɲɲ/ meaning "I have no responsibility having that job". These statements violate the maxim of manner, are manipulated to deceive the truth, and contradict the individual gist effect. (2) Passivizing information structure helps the defendants avoid responsibility, and the suspect's role is changed from agent to patient. In this process, suspects substitute others in their place (most substitutes are unknown or have no legitimacy in that particular context). In (11), *W/ro* Aregash said /bək'rb halafije ʔammakəɲɲinət bətazzəzkut məsərat/ meaning "as I was

ordered by my immediate boss" and after she said that in BDS8, she said, "*I was the organizer of the auction*". This shows that when she changed sentence eight (8) to nine (9) she replaced the *boss* as the agent of the action. And yet the speech event of the boss or agent is unfamiliar to the hearer.

In case 2, *Ato Tesema* was assigned by the Ethiopian Road Authority to estimate and report farmland in Afar Regional State, Abala Woreda. The Authority paid compensation to the farmers based on the report by *Ato Tesema*. But he denied liability and said /ʔammakari d̪ir̪id̪z̪d̪z̪itu b̪əmmis̪ət̪ən m̪əmm̪ərija nəw s̪ira məsr̪at jall̪əb̪ij̪j̪/ meaning "*I have to work based on the guidelines of the consulting agency*". The message that the suspect is trying to convey is manipulated in a way to make the judges feel comfortable. He adjusts the message's transmission path. One of these is to keep the doer of the action from appearing invisible. As noted in the above example *w/ro* *Aregash* and *Ato Tesema* have passivized sentences or manipulated the transmission path of the message they conveyed. Besides the judge, the prosecutor and the suspects are not conscious of the information structure of the phrases and sentences.

4.3.2. The Contradiction of the Testimony

In semantic theory, meaning relations do not only exist between words; they also occur among phrases and sentences. Phrasal and sentential levels of semantic relations are classified into (1) Tautology and (2) Contradiction (Lyons 1996:149). Tautology is traditionally defined as the propositions of sentences that are necessarily true under their logical form (Lyons 1996:149). On the other hand, contradiction refers to propositions in sentences that are necessarily false in their logical form.

This section of the study focuses on the contradictions or logical incompatibilities of the utterances of suspects. The utterances have been taken from suspects and defense witnesses who have shared knowledge of the event. Therefore, the study classified contradiction into two categories: (1) Contradiction between two or more suspects when they appear as defense witnesses; and (2) Contradiction of oneself (self-contradiction). In bribery case 1, *W/ro* *Aregash* contradicted her testimony with *Ato Yilma*. In (17), *Ato Yilma* said that:

(17) ምና እልያዝኩም፡፡ አብረን እንወጣ በሚል ተያይዘን በአጋጣሚ ሄድን
 misa silə-all-jaz-ku-ገገጎ ጎabrə-n inn-iwt'-a
 lunch CONJ-NEG-hold-1S-1S.OBJ together-2P 1PL-out:IPFV-1PL
 bə-immi-l tə-jajzə-n bə-ጎagat'ami hed-n
 CONJ-REL-say:IPFV PASS- hold:RECP-2P CONJ- incident go: PFV-2P
 "I did have lunch. By chance, we decided to go out together."

Table 3: Contradicting Testimony of W/ro Aregash

However, W/ro Aregash in 18, said that

(18) ወደ ቤቴ ምና ልባላ እየሄድኩ እያለሁ
 wədə bet-e misa li-bəll-a ijja-hedk-u ij-all-əhu
 CONJ- house-POSS:1S lunch 1S-eat:IPFV-1S PROG-go:IPFV-1S while-be:IPFV-1S
 "While I am going to my home for lunch"

The contradiction between suspects and defense witnesses refers to testimonies that are opposed to one another. From the sentences given above, the study infers that suspects went out to eat lunch together, which is necessarily false under the logical form of the sentence that she was going home to eat lunch. Thus, if she went out to have lunch with *Ato Yilma*, there is no need to say *I was going home for lunch*. *Ato Yilma* and W/ro Aregash have shared knowledge of the event. This means that the semantic memory of suspects is responsible for the main reason why suspects appeared at that place (*Ras Hotel*), and there is no aggravating cause to check the gist effect of the suspect. The contradiction of oneself refers to the question of why one does or says something that is opposite in meaning to something else that one said or did earlier. During a defense testimony in bribery case 1 (19), W/ro Aregash said that:

(19) እኔ ሰትደውልልኝ ከሰላት ላስተናግዳት ስለ ማልቸል ያንን ደብዳቤ ለማየት ምክንያቱም ቢሮ
 ልንቀይር ስለ ሆነ እና በዛ አጋጣሚ ለመተባበር አስቤ
 iss^wa si-tti-dewill-ijገገጎ kəssəጎat l-as-tə-nagg-id-at -
 PRON:3SF CONJ-3FS-call-1S.OBJ afternoon CONJ-CAUS-PASS-serve-1S-3SF
 silə-mm-al-tfīl jann in dəbdabbe l- m-aj-ət miknjatum
 CONJ-REL-NEG-able:1S that-ACC letter to-NOM-see-3MS.OBJ because
 biro li-nni-k'əjr silə-hon-ə inna bə-zza ጎaggat'ami lə-mə-tə-babər ጎassib-e
 office CONJ-1PL-change CONJ-become:PFV-3MS and by-that- incident to-NOML-PASS-
 help-think-1s

When she called me I told her can't serve her in the afternoon and see that letter because I was going to change office and I thought to collaborate on that occasion".

However in the cross-examination, she denied what she had said above,

Then, in the cross-examination session, the prosecutor asked her a similar question after an hour.

(23) አቃቤ ህግ፡- ከዛ በፊት ትደዋወሉ ነበር?

Prosecutor: kə-zza bəfit ti-ddəwawwəl-u nəbbər?

from-tha- before 2P- call:REC-2P AUX:PFV Q

"Before that, were you calling one another?"

ወ/ሮ አረጋሽ፡ እንደሚሆንኛውም ተጫራች ትደውላለች በብዛት ቢሮዬ ጋር ትመጣለች

W/ro A : ində mannjawm təc'aratf ti-əwwilil-ijj-*all-ətʃtʃ* bə-bzat biroj-e gar

like anyone bidder 3FS-call-1S.OBJ-be:NPST -3FS CONJ-many

office-POSS:1S with ti-mət'-all-ətʃtʃ 3FS-come-be:IPFV-3FS

"She often calls me like any other bidder and she often comes to my office"

The above examples show that *W/ro* Aregash contradicted herself when she gave her responses to the judge and the Prosecutor. The types and objectives of the questions that were asked by the judge and the Prosecutor were different. The judge asked simple and direct questions to clarify the statements of the suspect, while the prosecutor asked a cross-examination question to impeach the fact that she was presenting against the charge made against her and *Ato* Yilma.

4.3.3. The tense of the Verb

In Amharic, there are a set of rules and forms for the appropriate use of language. The tense of verbs has a significant role in transmitting a message. Deviating from the norm or rule makes the message vague and ambiguous. In courtrooms, the sequence of actions should follow proper linguistic rules; otherwise, it will invite ambiguous interpretations and a loss of credibility. In this context, the proper linguistic rule refers to procedures at the court that always come after the events have already occurred. Therefore, it should be stated in the past tense (Susan 1996:8). In addition, the tense of verbs has been used as a cue for manipulation. Very often, a suspect in criminal cases violates the quality and manner of the conversation by changing the narration of the past event into the present and future. The following data was taken from Bribery Case 2:

No	<i>Present Tense of Verbs</i>
(24)	ኮንታክት ማድረግ ያለብኝ <i>Kontakt ma-dræg jə-all-ə-bb-ijj</i> <i>Contact NOML-does REL-exist: PFV-3MS-APPL:1S</i> <i>I have to contact</i>

(25)	መኖሪያችንም ለዛው ለማካሪ ድርጅቱ ጋር ነው <i>Mənorij-atfj-in-m izzaw ?ammakari dīrdzdzit-u gar nəw</i> <i>residence- POSS-IPL-FOC there consultant organization-DEF with COP</i> <i>Our residence is with the consultant agent</i>
(26)	ድርጅቱ በሚሰጠኝ መመሪያ <i>dīrdzīt-u bə-immi-sət'-ən məmmərīja</i> <i>organization-DEF via-REL-give:IPFV-IS guideline</i> <i>As per a guideline given by the organization</i>
(27)	መሥራት ያለብኝ <i>mə-srat jə-all-ə-bb-ijj</i> <i>NOML-work REL-exist:PFV-3MS.OBJ-APLL -IS</i> <i>I have to work</i>
(28)	ደንቡም ለኔ ነው <i>dənbu-m ihe nəw</i> <i>rule- FOC this-COP</i> <i>this is the convention</i>

Table 5: The role of the present tense of verbs

As shown under the topic speech event, *Ato* Tesema was assigned by the Ethiopian Road Authority to estimate the compensation fee for farmland in the Afar Regional State, Abala Woreda, and he accomplished this two years ago. Therefore, the courtroom expected the testimony to be narrated in simple past and past perfect forms. However, the phrases in the table above show that the reports are in the present state of mind. The suspect was using these phrases to explain his wish and not to narrate what happened or what he did in his official duties. These clues lead to explanations for the cause of deviation from linguistic norms and trigger the study to ask the following questions: (1) Did *Ato* Tesema know the place that was designated by the Ethiopian Road Authority? (2) Did he stay with the consultant agency in the place called Abala?

In 24, *Ato* Tesema said, "*I have to Contact*". The modal verb "*have to*" has in Amharic the equivalent "*jalləbiḥḥ*", which he uses to express possibility or an opinion about something that is logically very likely. The second word "*contact*" is in simple present form. The speaker is logically correct, but it does not indicate the exact moment he contacted the consultant. The other verb is "*do*" and the Amharic equivalent is "*madrəg*", which is a verbal noun in Amharic. It used to explain an action's future timing.

To come to the above discussion and the charge made, auditors reported that *Ato* Tesema did not go alone to Abala Woreda of Afar Regional State to know

the exact place before he went with the auditing committee. The committee members measured the farmland at 3.3 hectares for the compensation payment. Compared to what was reported by *Ato Tesema*, there was a 2.3-hectare difference. The auditors concluded that *Ato Tesema* did not know the place. By the same token, when *Ato Tesema* presented the testimony, he said that:

(28) ቦታውን አያውቀውም የሚል ነው ቃለ ጉባኤ ላይ የተፈረመው እኔ ግን ቦታውን ወስኜ አሳይቻለሁ።

bota-w-n ʔaj-awk'ə-w-imm jəmm-i-l nəw k'aləgubaʔe-w laj jə-tə-
 place-DEF-ACC NEG-know-3MS-NCM REL-3MS-say:IPFV COP minute-DEF on REL-PASS-
 fərrəmə-w ine gin bota-w-n wəsɪdʒdʒ-e ʔas-ajj-itʃtʃ-all-əhu
 sign-DEF 1S but place-DEF-ACC take-1S CASS-see-1S-NPST-1S.OBJ

"The committee members in their minutes reported that he does not know the place, but I took them and showed them the place".

This implies that there was doubt as to when he showed the place to the auditors. This invites the study to investigate whether *Ato Tesema* knew the place or not. The following topic shows how the deceptive defendants fail to explain the people, places, and events involved in a scene.

4.3.4. Social Introduction and Use of Pronouns

According to Sapir (1987), deceptive persons often fail to introduce people involved in events. Susan (1996:3) discussed that truthful people produce statements in the first person singular pronoun "I" deviating from the norm, which invites lawyers or police officers to ask carefully. Susan's suggestion does not always work in Amharic because Amharic speakers prefer to use the third person "issu/issua/ijjina" he/she/we instead of /ine/ "I". There are two reasons why they use third-person singular and first-person plural pronouns. The fact is that (1) in Amharic, speakers use the pronoun "we" to show humbleness, in contrast to "I" which shows arrogance, overconfidence, self-importance, etc., and culturally, it is not preferred by speakers. (2) The second is to obscure the subject; mostly 3rd person singular or plural pronouns are used to make things impersonal.

In the courtroom, defendants use the pronoun "I", but it is not used in discourse. For example, in bribery case 2, during the defendant's testimony, *Ato Tesema* frequently said /ine/ meaning "I" to show faithfulness to the court. However, the pronoun "I" was collocated for irrelevant information in this particular case. The following table shows the bigram collocations taken from bribery case (2), and the examples have been selected based on the level of

frequency among a total of collocated phrases. The study found that it was the second most frequent word used in Ato Tesema’s testimony.

No	words	Transcription	Gloss	Frequency
(29)	ነው	nəw COP	Is	94
	እኔ	ine IS	I	53
	በኋላ	bəhuala ADV	Later	22

Table 6: The use of the pronoun "I"

No	Collocations	Transcription	Gloss
(30)	('እኔ', 'አሁን')	(ine, ?ahun)	(I, at this time)
	('እኔ', 'ግን')	(ine, gin)	(I, but)
	('በኋላ', 'እኔ')	(bəhuala, ine)	(later, I)
	('እኔን', 'እኔ')	(ihenn,ine)	(this one, I)
	('እኔ', 'በወቅቱ')	(ine,bəwək'tu)	(I, at that time)
	('እኔ', 'ፍጹም')	(ine,fis's'um)	(I, absolutely)

Table 7: Bigram Collocations

The phrases in the above table show the context of "I" used by Ato Tesema. During the testimony, "I" does not collocate with the action done by Ato Tesema. Therefore, the use of the pronoun "I" does not guarantee the directness of suspects.

In addition, the suspect fails to introduce the place, event, and people involved in the events. The following data was taken from a bribery Case (2).

No	Phrases	Glosses
(31)	የተጠቀሰው ቦታ jə-tə-t'ək'k'əs-əw bota REL-PASS-mention:PFV-3MS.OBJ place	<i>the place mentioned</i>
(32)	ሰለ ተጠቀሰው ቦታ መግለጽ ብሎልግ silə-tə-t'ək'k'əs-əw bota məgləs' bi-fəllig CONJ-PASS-mention-3SM.OBJ place describe CONJ-want:IPFV	<i>If I want to describe the place mentioned</i>
(33)	ሊፈታ ሊፈቱ ያልቻሉ ሥራዎች ነበሩ li-ffət-a, li-ffət-u, jə-al-tʃtʃ-al-u sira-wotʃtʃ nəbbəru CONJ-solve-3MS.OBJ CONJ-solve-3PL REL-NEGable:PFV-3PL	<i>There were jobs that could not have been solved.</i>

	work: PL AUX :PFV	
(34)	ማንኛውንም ነገር ፈትቼ mannijpawwinm nəgər fət-itʃtʃe everything issue solve-1S	having solved everything
(35)	እሄ ነገረ ተከሰተ በተባለበት ሰዓት ihe nəgər tə-kəssət-ə bə-tə-bal-ə-bb-ət səʔat this thing PASS-happen-3MS CONJ-PASS-say-3MS-APPL- 3MS.OBJ time	At the time this thing is said happened"

Table 8: Fail to introduce the name of the place and time

As we have seen in (31) and (32), Ato Tesema repeatedly said "bota" meaning "location or place". But the court and the hearers are not familiar with the location of what the suspect wanted to indicate. In other words, he failed to state the location. In 33 and 34, he was assigned the job of solving problems, and he said, "There were jobs that could not have been solved," without specifying the problem. Again, he said, "I have solved everything," but there was no problem given that required solution. In addition, there is no clear statement that refers to a way out of the problem.

In bribery case (1), (35), *Ato Yilma* said "At the time this thing is said to have happened". This statement fails to state the specific event. It is a way to evade the event because, as we have seen in the speech event of *W/ro Aregash* and *Ato Yilma*, they directly participated in the event, and they know what happened to them and when it happened. To conclude the discussion, failure to introduce the name of place, person, and event occurs if (1) the suspects have not been to the particular place and event and (2) they want to avoid themselves from the crime scene.

4.3.5. Unimportant Information Becomes Important

In the courtroom, defendants and witnesses explain details of personal information that are seemingly not important or relevant to the cases. The researcher observed such information being given deliberately by defendants who try to shift the focus of judges or prosecutors. In bribery case 1, *Ato Yilma* was arrested by the police officers when he received 50,000 birr from the accuser, but during the testimony, he tried to shift the focus of the lawyers'. The following table shows examples of irrelevant information.

No	Phrases
(36)	<p>አዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ በዚህ ሙያ ሲቀጥረኝ ክፍያውም በ ዩኒቨርሲቲ ለንዲከፈል ተደርጎ ተስማምተን የኮንትራት ግዥ ሰራተኛ ነኝ።</p> <p>ጎadis ጎαβጎβa junivərsiti bə-zzih muja si-k'ət'rə-ጎጎ kifijja-w-m Addis Ababa university in-this profession CONJ-employe-1S payment-3MS.OBJ-FOC bə UNICEF ind-i-kəffəl tə-dərg-o tə-smamt-ən jə-kontrat CONJ- UNICEF COMP-3MS-pay PASS -done-CVB :3MS PASS-agree:RECP-1P GEN-contract sərratəጎጎna nəጎጎ. employee COP:1S <i>I am a contract purchaser, when I was employed by Addis Ababa University, we agreed the salary to be paid by UNICEF,</i></p>
(37)	<p>እስፕሻሊ ደግሞ የኔ ስራ የመድሃኒት ጫረታ ነው።</p> <p>İspejalı dəgmo jə-ine sira jə-mədhanit c'ərəta nəw. especially again GEN-1S work GEN- medicine bid COP <i>Especially, my work is an auction of pharmaceuticals.</i></p>
(38)	<p>እኔ የማዘጋጀው በወቅቱ 55 ሚሊዮን ብር ሊንተርናሽናል ጫረታ የመደሃኒት ግዥ እያዘጋጀሁ ነው።</p> <p>İne jəmm-a-zzəgad3d3-əw bə-wək'tt-u 55 mılıjon bIRR in(t)ərnəʃnəl c'ərəta 1S REL-1S-prepare:IPFV-3MS.OBJ via-time-DEF 55 million bIRR international bid jə-mədəhanit gızz ij-j-azegad3d3-ə-hu nəw. GEN- medicine purchase while-prepare:-3MS-1S COP <i>at the time, I was preparing a 55 million bIRR international tender for medicine</i></p>

Table 9: Using unimportant information to overrun/hide the fact

Phrases and words in bold, such as "be paid by UNICEF", "pharmaceutical auction," and "I was preparing a 55 million bIRR international tender for medicine," are not important for the testimony. These phrases contain dual meanings or dual text, i.e., the statements have dual (more than two) meanings.

- a. My salary is paid by UNICEF, which implies I earn more than those who are paid by local institutions, so I am rich.
- b. I was preparing a 55 million bIRR international tender, which implies I have not been concerned with local bids; I am an international purchaser.

Finally, *Ato Yilma* said that the accuser did that to deliberately dismiss him from his job,

(39) ሆን ተብሎ ደኖዛችን ጥሩ ስለሆነ ከአዛ ስራ ለማፈናቀል የታቀደ መሆኑን እንድትረዱልኝ እስገንዝባለሁ።
 hon tə-blo dəmoz-at[ʃtʃ-in t'iru silə-hon-ə kə-izza sira
 deliberate PASS-say:CVB:3MS salary-POSS-1P good CONJ-become-3MS from- that-
 work
 lə-m- affənək'əl jə-ta-k'k'əd-ə mə-hon-u-n
 getoff CONJ NOML-- REL-PASS-plan:PFV-3MS NOML-become-3MS.OBJ-ACC
 indi-t-rədd-u-li-ገገ ጎas-gənəzb-all-ə-hu
 CONJ-3PL-understand-3PL-APPL-1S CAUS-explain- AXU:NPST-3MS-1S
 "I call you to understand, since our salary is good, this is done deliberately to
 Dismiss from our job".

Therefore, the above extra responses are used to shift the focus of the judge and reduce the severity of the punishment. In addition, in bribery case 2, Ato Tesema was asked contingency questions by the judge, and he responded to the questions with statements of no relevance. The responses of the suspect violated the maxims of quality and quantity. The following table shows the questions and responses between the judge and Ato Tesema.

No	The Contingency Questions by Judge	Responses by Ato Tesema	Maxims
(40)	የተጠቀሰው ቦታ የሚሉትን እየጠቀሱት ይሂዱ። <i>Jə-tə-t'ək'k'əs-əw bota jəmm-i-l-u-tn</i> REL-PASS-mention-3MS:OBJ place REL-3MS-say:IPFV2S _{HON} -3MS.OBJ <i>ijjə-t'ək'əs-u-t ji-hid-u</i> REL-mention:IPFV-2S _{HON} -3MS.OBJ 2S _{HON} -go-:IPFV-2S _{HON} <i>You said that, the place was mentioned, mention the name of the place</i>	እኔ.. ማን ነው እሄ የመሰኘ ቦታ ማለት ነው። <i>ii..man-nəw ihe jə-məsno</i> bota IDEO:who COP this GEN- irrigation place <i>malət nəw</i> means COP <i>Hmm what was it, it was an irrigation land</i>	Quantity
(41)	የአቶ መ ኪንንት የሰራ ድርሻ ምንድን ነው? <i>Jə-ʔato mekuannit jə-sra dirja mindin nəw?</i> GEN-title- Mekuanint REL-work:PFV role what COP Q <i>What is the job description of Ato Mekuannit?</i>	ሹፊር ነው በወቀቱ ግን የድርጅት ተጠሪ ነኝ፣ እኔ ኢህዴግ ነኝ በሎኛል <i>jufer nəw bə-wək'tu gin jə-dridzɔɔɪt</i> driver COP at-time but GEN- organization <i>tət'əri nəገገ ine ʔihadeg</i> nəገገ bil-o-ገገ-all responsible-COP:Is:POSS I EPRDF COP-IS:POSS say:CVB- IS-be:3MS:NPST <i>He is a driver, but at that time he said that I am a representative of EPRDF</i>	Quantity

(42)	<p>ሲለካ ነበሩ እርስዎ <i>Si-llək-a nəbbər-u irswə?</i> CONJ- measure-3MS exist:PFV-2S_{HON} 2S_{HON} Q <i>Were you there when they measured it?</i></p>	<p>አእ.. ii...! Hmm...</p>	Quantity
(43)	<p>ሲለካ ነበሩ እርስዎ <i>Si-llək-a nəbbər-u irswə?</i> CONJ- measure-3MS exist:PFV-3MS.OBJ 2S_{HON} Q <i>Were you there when it was measured it?</i></p>	<p>አእ.. በሜትር ሲለካ ii... bə-metr sil-lək-a? IDEO by-meter CONJ -measure- 3MS.OBJ Q Hmm.. When it is measured by a meter?</p>	Quality
(44)	<p>ክፍያ ከመፈጸሙ በፊት ከነበሩ ከኮሚቴዎች ጋር አብረ ሂጄ ለክፍላሁ ነው የሚሉት። <i>Kiffja kə-mə-ffəs'əm-u bəfit kə-nəbbər-u</i> Payment CONJ-NOML-pay-3MS.OBJ before CONJ-exist:PFV-3S_{HON} <i>komite-wotftf gar ?abrre hedzdz-e</i> committee-PL with together go-1S <i>lakkätf-tf-all-əhu nəw jəmmi-l-u-t?</i> measure-be:NPST-1S COP REL- say:IPFV -2S_{HON}-3MS.OBJ Q <i>Before the government paid the</i> <i>compensation, had you measured it with the</i> <i>committee members?</i></p>	<p>ኤግዛክትሊ በትክክል እንደዛው ነው። <i>egzaktli bə-tikkil indəzaw</i> exactly CONJ-correct IDEO:like that Exactly, correct like that</p>	Quality

Table 10: Contingency questions of the Judge and Ato Tesema’s responses

Ato Tesema’s responses are not relevant to the contingency questions and violate the maxims of quantity and quality for the contingency questions. For example, the judge asked, "What is the job description of Ato Mekuann?" Ato Tesema answered, "He is a driver, but at that time he told me that he was a representative of EPRDF". The correct response should be that he was a driver, but Ato Tesema added the extra information to deviate from the focus of the judge: "He told me that he was a representative of EPRDF". Then, the judge asked further questions: "Before the government paid the compensation to the farmers, did you measure the land with the committee members?" The defendant said "Exactly, correct like that". The word "exactly" suggests agreement with the questions, but the phrase "like that" denotes uncertainty, which implies that Ato Tesema agrees with the questions of the judge but is not confident with the response he gave. This means that he did not measure the farmland before the government paid the compensation money to the farmers.

5. Conclusion

In general, in a bribery case, oral negotiations between the two parties are considered the language of a crime scene, and they take place through speech events and their structural requirements. However, language crimes are less frequent, and while conducting the observation, the researcher has not seen a criminal charged with asking orally for money, directly or indirectly. On the other hand, all of the perpetrators in the study directly abused their power and received the money.

Also, the study discussed the use of various linguistic methods that assist in detecting a suspect when he or she is trying to escape or protect himself or herself from the suspected case. These linguistic methods are speech events, schema, tense, pronouns, contradictions, and social introductions. Finally, the study has shown that when suspects desist from the facts, they violate the maxims of quality and manner frequently through the tense of verbs and contradict shared knowledge and episodic memories. Also, they have been denying the allegation of their duties.

References

- Austin, J. L. 1962. *How to do things with words*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University.
- Baye Yimam .2010E.C.[2017 G.C]. *Amharic Grammar*. Addis Ababa University,
- Black, Henry Campbell. 1996. *Black's law dictionary*. United States of America: West Publishing Co.
- Burke, Roger Hopkins. 2009. *An Introduction to criminological theory*. Canada: Willan Publishing Company.
- Carson, Thomas L. 2010. *Lying and deception: Theory and practice*. New York: Oxford University.
- Hymes, D.H. (1972) *On Communicative Competence* In: J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds).
- Hutton, Christopher. 2009. Language, meaning, and the law. *International Journal of Speech-Language and Law* 16, 2.
- Lyons, John. 1996. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Rabon, Don and Tanya Chapman. 2018. *Investigative Discourse Analysis: Statements, Letters, and Transcripts*. Durham, North Carolina: Carolina Academic Press.

- Searle, J. R. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University.
- Shuy, Roger W. 1993. *Language Crimes: The use and abuse of language evidence in the Courtroom*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Shuy, Roger W. 2013. *Language of bribery cases*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Susan, Adams H. 1996. Statement analysis: What do suspects' words really reveal <https://www2.fbi.gov/publications/leb/1996/oct964.txt> (Accessed date 10/10/2016).
- Peter Tiersma. 2005. *Speaking of Language and Law Conversations on the Work of Peter Tiersma*. Eds, Lawrence Solan, Janet Ainsworth, and Roger W. Shuy. New York: Oxford University.

Abbreviations

ABL	Ablative	M	Masculine
ACC	Accusative	NCM	Negative clause marker
CAUS	Causative	NEG	Negation
CL	Cognitive Load	NOML	Nominalizer
ADVZ	Adjectiviser	OBJ	Object
APPL	Applicative	PFV	Perfective
AUX	Auxiliary	PL	Plural
CONJ	Conjunction	POSS	Possessive
COP	Copula	Q	Question
CVB	Converb	REL	Relativizer
FL	Forensic Linguistics	S	Singular
GEN	Genitive	1	First-person
IDEO	Idiophone	2	Second person
LOC	Locative	3	Third person

Annexes

Annex1 Bribery Case 1: Defendant’s Testimony

Defendant 1

Ato Y (Mr. Y)

BDS1. እኔ ኮንትራት የግዢ ባለሙያ ነኝ፤ አዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ፣ አዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ በዚህ ሙያ ሲቀጥረኝ ክፍያውም በ UNICEF እንዲከፈል ተደርጎ ተስማምተን የኮንትራት ሰራተኝ እንጂ ሃላፊ አይደለሁም።

, I am a contract worker, and I am not an officer. when I was employed by Addis Ababa University we agreed the salary to be paid by UNICEFBDS2.

BDS2. ገለሰሲ ወይም የግል ተባብሮአል ባይኖርም ምንም የሚያገናኛቸው ነገር የለም። እኔ የማዘጋጀው በወቅቱ 55 ሚሊዮን ብር International የመድሃኒት ግዥ ጫረታ እያዘጋጀሁ ነው። ከዛን በፊት መድኃኒት ላይ ነው የምሰራው እና ከሲትዮዎ ጋር ሊያገናኙኝ የሚችል ምንም ነገር የለም።

The person, or the one who is claiming to be the victim, has nothing to do with me. I prepare at the time 55 million birr worth of international tender, I prepare a tender for the purchase of medicine. Before that, I worked for the purchase of medicine and there was nothing that could connect me with the woman.

BDS3. በሌላ መልኩ እንኳን እንዳይታሰብ የቴክኒክ ኮሚቴ አይደለሁ። ውል የምፈርም ላት ሃላፊ አይደለሁም፤ የግዥ ክፍል ሃላፊም አይደለሁም እንዲሁም አጽዳቂ ኮሚቴ ለባል አይደለሁም። እነዚህ በግዥ ላይ ወሳኝ ነገሮች ናቸው፤ የቴክኒክ ኮሚቴ፣ የውል አፈራራሚ፣ አጽዳቂ እነዚህ በሙሉ የኮንትራት ሰነድ ማዘጋጀት፣ ጫረታ ክፍቶ ለቴክኒክ ማሳለፍ፣ ቴክኒክ ኮሚቴ ያሳለፈውን ውጤት ለአጽዳቂ ኮሚቴ መላክ ነው።

Do not even think about it, I am not a technique committee, I am not the contractor who signed the collateral, I am not the head of a purchasing office and I do not belong to the approval committee. These are the crucial organs for purchasing, technique committee, contract amendment, and approvals, all these prepare documents, open for the bid to the technical committee, and the result approved by the technical committee is sent to the executive committee.

BDS4. እስፕሪት ደግሞ የኔ ስራ የመድኃኒት ጫረታ ላይ ነው። በአጋጣሚ ለሂ ነገር ተከሰተ በተባለበት ሰአት የቅርብ አለቃዬን የግዥ ክፍል ሃላፊዋን ወይም አልጋነሽዬ አስፈቅጂ የጓደኛዬ ልጅ ሞቶ ቀብር እየወጣሁ ነበር። *Especially, my business is on the auction of medicines. By chance when this thing happened, my immediate boss, the procurement Officer Mrs Alganesh, asked for permission and was going out to my friend's child's funeral.*

BDS5. አስፈቅጂ በምወጣበት ሰዓት የስራ ባልደረባዬ የሆኑት ወይም አረጋሽ፣ ምሳ ስላልያዝኩኝ አብረን እንደገና በሚል ተይይዝን በአጋጣሚ ሄድን። ደወለችላት ስልክ፣ ጡብቂኝ ስላለችኝ እራስ ሆቴል፣ ብሄራዊ ትያትር ነበርን ብሄራዊ ትያትር ለዛ አካባቢ በዛን ሰዓት ጥር 30/2008 ዓ.ም ዝግ ነበር። ባዛ መደዳ ክፍቱ ራስ ሆቴል ነበር፤ እኔ ወደ ቤት በምሄድበት ሰአት እራስ ሆቴል በረንዳ ላይ ተቀጣጠሩ። እኔ አብራ ቁጭ አልኩኝ። አምጥታ የሰጠቻት ተወዳድራ ስላለፈች፣ ማስያዣውን ወይም ከላተራል ጥቃቅን እና እነስተኛናት መሰል ደብዳቤ ነው የሚጻፈው። *PLC* ምን ገንዘብ ሲያሰኩ፣ ጥቃቅን እና እነስተኛ ደብዳቤ ነው። ደብዳቤውን በትክክል መጻፉን እያልኝ እና ትክክል ከሆነ እሰይ ካልሆነ ግን ሁለት ሰአት እዚህ ቁጭ ብዬ ከምጡብቅ ስምንት ሰአት የምትገቢ ከሆነ፣ እዚህ ቁጭ ብዬ ከምጡብቅ ምንምን ብላኛለች ብላ መጣች።

When I was about to leave, my staff, Mrs. Argesh said, let's go out together because I didn't have lunch. She called her, and she said to wait for me, we were at the National Theater, and hotels and cafés around National Theater were closed at that time on January 30 /2008. There was only Ras Hotel in that row. Then, when I was going to home they appointed at Ras Hotel. I sat with them. She brought it and gave it to her. I think she is a small business enterprise owner, letter or collateral letter is written and uses as a bond. PLC gives cash as a bond, small enterprises attach a letter.

BDS6. እንዳለችውም ሰጠቻት ወረቀቱን፣ ማስያዣ ወረቀቱ የተጻፈው ልክ ነው። መጥተሽ የሚፈራረረምበት ቦታ ሄደሽ አፈራርሚ። የግዥ ክፍል ሃላፊዋ ነው የምትፈርመው አስፈርሚ አለቻት።

As she said She gave her the paper and she said that, the bond is written correctly, come and go to the place where you can make a sign, the procurement officer does that.

BDS7. እሄንን ተባብለው ጨርሰን እኔ ሂሳብ ከፍጹ ልነሳ ስል የሆኑ ሁለት ታጣቂዎች መጥተው እሷን ያዟት ካኪ ፖስታ መንጭቀው ከሴትየይቱ ያዣ አትያዣ ድብደባ ፈጸሙበት፣ እኔንም ደብድበው በካቴና አስረው ወደፖሊስ ጣቢያ ወሰዱኝ።

Having said this, when I was about to pay the bill and leave the hotel, two armed men came and caught her, stabbed an envelope from her, and committed assault. They beat me, arrested me, and took me to the police station.

Defendant 2

Mrs. Aregash

BDS8. ስሚ ወ/ሮ አረጋሽ ቱተከሰስኩበት ከስ እንጻር ለተከበረው ፍርድ ቤት የሚሰረዳው ጨረታውን ያዘጋጀሁት እኔነበርኩኝ ማለትነው በወቅቱ ማለት ነው።

My name is Aregash. In the case of my allegation I explain to the respected court, I am the one who prepared the auction or bid that is at that time that is.

BDS9. ለአዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ ጤና ሳይንስ ኮሌጅ የደረቅ ምግብ ለማቅረ ጨረታውን በአዲስ ዘመን ጋዜጣ እንዲወጣ ያደረሁት፣ በቅርብ ሃላፊዬ አማካኝነት በታዘዝኩት መሰረት ማለትም በግዢ ክፍል ሃላፊዋ፣ በወይዘሮ አማዋይሽ ቱሉ ታዝዣ ጨረታውን ያዘጋጀሁት እኔ ነበርኩ እና ጨረታው ተከፍቶ ቱክኒክ ኮሚቴ እኛ አይደለንም የምንገመግመው ማለትነው።

On behalf of Addis Ababa University Health Science College, I announced a bid for dried food in Addis Zemen newspaper at the instruction of my immediate boss, That means by procurement head Mrs. Alagaensh, I had been instructed and held the auction and we are not technical committee, meaning the one who evaluates.

BDS10. ማለት የቱክኒክ ኮሚቴ ማለት ስለሚያቀርቡት እቃ ጥራት የሚገመገም ማለት ነው። ነገር ግን እኔ የግዢ የኮንትራት ሰራተኛ ነኝ ለጤና ሳይንስ ኮሌጁ ማለት ነው።

Meaning technical committee is who assessed the quality of the items they provide, but I am a contract sales, to the College of Health Science.

BDS11. በዛ ስራ ላይ ምንም እይነት ሃላፊነት የሌለኝ፣ ጨረታ ሰነድ ከማዘጋጀት ውጭ የመወሰን እቅም የሌለኝ፣ ጨረታ የመሰረዝ እቅም የሌለኝ፣ እንዲሁም የቱክኒክ ኮሚቴ አባል እንዳልሆንኩኝ ክቡር ፍርድቤቱ እንዲገነዘብልኝ።

I have no liability on that job, except preparing auction documents I cannot decide, I do not have the power to cancel the bid and I am not a technique committee member, let me hear the honor of the court.

BDS12. ነገርግን ክሴ በሚነብብበት ሰዓት የግዢ ክፍል ሃላፊ ተደርጌ እና ያንን ብር ካላመጣች ወይዘሮ አስቴር የተባለችው የግል ተባብሮ ጨረታውን እንደምናሰርዝ እንዳስፈራራናት ተደርጎ ነው የቀረበው። ነገርግን እኛ ጨረታውን የመሰረዝ፣ ስልጣን እንደሌለን ክቡር ፍርድቤቱ እንዲረዳልን አፍልጋለሁ።

But, when my charge is read I have been considered as a procurement officer and if she does not bring that money Aster, the abuser, has suggested that we warn her to cancel the bid. But we wanted to hear from the Court that we had no authority to cancel the tender.

BDS13. በሌላቱ ጥር 30 በተባለው ቀን አቶ ይልማ መሃመድ የጓደኛው ልጅ ሞቶበት ወደለቅሶ ለየሂደ ባለበት ሰዓት እኔ በወቅቱ ምሳ ለመብላት ወደ ቤቱ ለየሂድኩኝ እያለሁ ተገናኝን፣ ለየወጣን እያለ ስልክ ተደውሎልኝ።

On that day January 30, Mr. Yilma while he was going to the funeral of his friend's chilled and

we met, while I was going to my home for lunch, she called me while we are leaving.
 BDS14. በአለቱ ቢሮ እንደገና ተሳታፊ ከሆነው ሰዓት በኋላ ሲገኝኝ ሲሆን ከነበርኝበት ፍሎር ወደ ላይ ለታ ትቀይራለችሁ ስለተባልኝ ከሰዓት ሥራ እንደማይኖር አውቄኝው የነበረው እና ወደቤቱ ምሳልበላ እየሄድኩ እያለሁ ደወለችልኝ፤
On that day, we had been told by the officer to change the office, from the floor now we were, we had been told that you would be changed to the upper floor, I knew that there was no work in the afternoon and she dialed when I was going to my house to eat lunch.

Annex 2: Bribery Case 2 Defendant’s Testimony

BDS15. የተከበረው ፍርድ ቤት እኔ 2007 ጥር ወር 2007 ዓ.ም ነው ወደቦታው የሄድኩት ፕሮጀክቱ የተጀመረው 2005 ዓ.ም ላይ ነው እና ከእኔ በፊት የነበሩ ኤጀንቶችም ነበሩ
The respected court, It was in 2007 the month of January 2007 that I went to the site the project was started in 2005 and some agencies were before me.
 BDS16. እኔ ወደቦታው እንደሄድኩ የተደረገው በወቅቱ ውስብስብ የሆነ ስራ ነበረ ሊፈታ ሊፈቱ ያልቻሉ ስራዎች ነበሩ
When I was moved to a place, there was a complicated job at the time.
 BDS17. በስራው ላይ ትንሽ የቆየሁ ስለነበርኩ እንደፈታ ነበር የሄድኩት ፈታሁት ደግሞ ማንኛውንም ነገር ፈትቼ
I was a little bit experienced in that work. I went to solve, I resolved I fixed everything.
 BDS18. የሄድኩት ወደዛ ቦታ ከሄድኩ በኋላ:: consultant አማካሪ ድርጅቱ ጋር ነው የመንገድ ባለ ስልጣኑ አማካሪ ድርጅት እዛ ነው ያለው
I went after I was going to the place. As a consultant, I was with the advisor of the organization, and the advisor of the road authority was there.
 BDS19. ከሱ ጋር ነው መጀመሪያ contact ማድረግ ያለብን ከሱጋር መኖሪያችንም እዛው ከአማካሪ ድርጅቱ ጋር ነው
We need to contact him first, with him, our residence is with the consultant
 BDS20. ከዛ በመነሳት ነው አማካሪ ድርጅቱ በሚሰጠን መመሪያ ነው ስራ መስራት ያለብኝ ደንብም እሄ ነው
Then, it is up to the guidance of the consultant, and the rule is that I have to work
 BDS21. በዛ መሰረት አሁን የተጠቀሰው ቦታ፣ ስለተተቀሰው ቦታ መግለጽ ብራልግ የተጠቀሰው ቦታ ላይ according to the location is specified, if I want to mention about the location is specified and on the location is specified