RDS ADVOCATES & SOLICITORS

In Business Collaboration: AMT / ANDERSON MORI & TOMOTSUNE

Restraining Assets Under Section 53 Of The AMLA: High Court Clarifies The Evidential Threshold

5 August 2026

For more information, please contact:

Datuk D P Naban
naban@rdslawpartners.com

Austen Emmanuel Pereira
austen@rdslawpartners.com

Bahari Yeow Tien Hong
bahari@rdslawpartners.com

Farah Shuhadah Razali
farah@rdslawpartners.com

Tan Sri Datuk Harmindar Singh Dhaliwal
harmindar@rdslawpartners.com

Kenny Lam Kian Yip
kenny@rdslawpartners.com

Lim Zhi Jian
jian@rdslawpartners.com

Michael Soo
michaelsoo@rdslawpartners.com

Rosli Dahlan
rosli@rdslawpartners.com

Steven Perian KC
speriankc@rdslawpartners.com

Vinayak Sri Ram
vinayak@rdslawpartners.com

Asset restraint orders are among the most powerful tools available to enforcement agencies under the Anti-Money Laundering, Anti-Terrorism Financing, Anti-Restricted Activity Financing and Proceeds of Unlawful Activities Act 2001 (AMLA). A successful application under Section 53 effectively freezes a person's ability to deal with assets situated outside Malaysia, often long before any determination of criminal liability.

Given the far-reaching consequences of such orders, a critical question arises: what must the Public Prosecutor establish before the court can exercise its powers under Section 53 of the AMLA?

The High Court recently addressed this issue in *Public Prosecutor v Kinbrace Properties Limited & Ors*, where it refused to grant a restraint order over assets situated in Singapore. In doing so, the court clarified that Section 53 is not merely an investigative tool. Rather, the Public Prosecutor must satisfy strict statutory and evidential requirements before the court will interfere with proprietary rights.

Background

The application arose from an investigation into alleged money laundering involving several corporate entities and Malaysian individuals. The Public Prosecutor applied under Section 53 for an order restraining the Respondents from disposing of, or otherwise dealing with, their assets situated in Singapore.

The Public Prosecutor alleged that the Singapore properties were connected to unlawful activities and relied on two alleged predicate offences:

(a) tax evasion under Section 113 of the Income Tax Act 1967; and

(b) making a false declaration of assets under Section 36 of the Malaysian Anti-Corruption Commission Act 2009.

The Respondents opposed the application on several grounds, including that:

(a) the Public Prosecutor had failed to identify the specific limb of Section 4(1) of the AMLA relied upon;

(b) the alleged predicate offences were themselves the subject of pending legal challenges; and

(c) there was no evidential basis linking the Singapore assets to any proceeds of unlawful activity.

After considering the affidavits and submissions filed by the parties, the High Court dismissed the application, holding that the statutory requirements under Sections 4(1) and 53 of the AMLA had not been satisfied.

The Statutory Threshold Under Section 53 Of The AMLA

Section 53 empowers the Public Prosecutor to seek an order restraining the disposal of, or any dealing with, property held or deposited outside Malaysia. The provision is interlocutory and preservatory in nature. It does not constitute a final determination of either the character of the property or the respondents' culpability.

The High Court held that four cumulative requirements must be satisfied before a restraint order may be granted:

(a) Situs – the property must be held or deposited outside Malaysia;

(b) Character – the property must fall within one of the statutory categories, namely proceeds of unlawful activity, instrumentalities of an offence, terrorist property or proliferator property;

(c) Predicate offence – the Public Prosecutor must establish, on a prima facie basis and on the balance of probabilities, that an offence under Section 4(1) of the AMLA has been committed; and

(d) Nexus – the Public Prosecutor must establish, through cogent and objective evidence, a demonstrable link between the specific property sought to be restrained and the alleged unlawful activity.

Importantly, the High Court clarified that although the Public Prosecutor is not required to prove the offence to the criminal standard at the restraint stage, it must nevertheless place before the court "*credible and objective evidence which, if accepted and unrebutted, would be capable of supporting a finding—on the civil standard of a balance of probabilities—that a Section 4(1) offence has been committed and that the property sought to be restrained is connected to it*."

Applying these principles, the court held that the Public Prosecutor had failed to satisfy the statutory threshold.

As a threshold issue, the application was fundamentally defective because it failed to identify the particular limb of Section 4(1) upon which it relied. The court held that this was not merely a procedural omission but a substantive defect that deprived the Respondents of knowing the precise case they were required to meet, thereby offending principles of natural justice.

Given that a restraint order immediately interferes with proprietary rights, the court emphasised that the Public Prosecutor must identify with precision the statutory basis upon which such extraordinary relief is sought. Accordingly, the failure to particularise the applicable limb of Section 4(1) was, in itself, sufficient to render the application defective.

Establishing The Predicate Offence And The Nexus To The Property

The High Court observed that a money laundering offence under Section 4(1) presupposes the existence of an identifiable unlawful activity from which proceeds are derived, or to which the relevant property is connected. Without establishing both the predicate offence and a demonstrable nexus between that offence and the property, there can be no Section 4(1) offence capable of supporting a restraint order under Section 53.

Tax Evasion

In relation to the alleged tax evasion, the High Court held that the Public Prosecutor must adduce objective evidence tracing the assets to the alleged unlawful activity.

The mere existence of a predicate offence does not, by itself, justify restraining any property owned by the Respondents. Where the alleged unlawful activity is tax evasion, the Public Prosecutor must go further and demonstrate that the property sought to be restrained is connected to that offence, for example, by showing that it was acquired using the proceeds of the tax evasion, purchased during the relevant period, or otherwise linked through a discernible financial trail.

Absent such evidence, the property cannot be restrained solely because its owner is alleged to have committed tax evasion.

False Declaration Of Assets

The High Court reached the same conclusion in relation to the alleged offence under Section 36 of the MACC Act. The court held that a false declaration of assets, without more, cannot establish the requisite nexus under Section 4(1). Although such a declaration may conceal the existence of assets, it does not demonstrate that those assets constitute proceeds of unlawful activity or explain how they were acquired.

Accordingly, unless the Public Prosecutor is able to identify and establish the underlying unlawful activity that generated the assets and demonstrate the connection between those assets and that unlawful activity, a contravention of Section 36 cannot, on its own, constitute a sufficient predicate offence to support a restraint order under Section 53.

Conclusion

The significance of this decision lies in its reaffirmation that the extraordinary powers conferred by Section 53 must be exercised consistently with the statutory safeguards built into the AMLA.

Although a restraint order is interlocutory in nature, it immediately interferes with a person's ability to deal with his or her property. The High Court therefore emphasised that its role is not merely to endorse investigative suspicion, but to independently determine whether the statutory preconditions for restraining assets have been satisfied. In this regard, the court aptly observed:

> *"The phrase 'be satisfied' is language of judicial determination, not investigative suspicion. 'Satisfied' contemplates a reasoned judgment, not a hunches-based inquiry. Moreover, Section 53 AMLA is an asset freezing tool with immediate and severe consequences. An investigative standard protects public safety and enables the state to inquire; a deprivation standard must protect individual property rights, which are constitutionally entrenched."*

The court's emphasis on constitutionally protected property rights is particularly significant. The right to property is guaranteed under Article 13 of the Federal Constitution. While Parliament has empowered the Public Prosecutor to seek restraint orders to preserve assets pending investigation, those powers must be exercised within the statutory limits prescribed by the AMLA. This timely decision in *Public Prosecutor v Kinbrace Properties Limited & Ors* serves as an important reminder that the court's role is to ensure that those safeguards are rigorously observed before proprietary rights are curtailed.

KUALA LUMPUR
Level 16, Menara 1 Dutamas No. 1, Jalan Dutamas 1, Solaris Dutamas, 50480 Kuala Lumpur
T: +603 6209 5400
F: +603 6209 5411
enquiry@rdslawpartners.com

PENANG
Suite S-21E & F21st Floor, Menara Northam, No. 55, Jalan Sultan Ahmad Shah, 10050 Penang
T: +604 370 1122
F: +604 370 5678
generalpg@rdslawpartners.com

JOHOR BAHRU
8-35, Menara Delima Satu, Jalan Forest City 1, Pulau Satu, 81550 Gelang Patah, Johor Bahru
T: +607 585 6414
F: +607 509 7614
generaljb@rdslawpartners.com