**VISION**
To establish and maintain a world-class Judiciary.

**MISSION**
To superintend the administration of justice.

**VALUES**

*Integrity and Independence*
Public trust and confidence in the Supreme Court rests on its integrity and the transparency of its processes. The public must be assured that court decisions are fair and independent, court staff are incorruptible, and court records are accurate.

*Quality Public Service*
As a public institution dedicated to the administration of justice, the Supreme Court seeks to tailor its processes to meet the needs of court users, with an emphasis on accessibility, quality and the timely delivery of services.

*Learning and Innovation*
The Supreme Court recognises that to be a world-class Judiciary, we need to continually improve ourselves and our processes. We therefore encourage learning and innovation to take the Supreme Court to the highest levels of performance.

*Ownership*
We value the contributions of our staff, who are committed and proud to be part of the Supreme Court.
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MESSAGE FROM THE CHIEF JUSTICE
MESSAGE FROM
THE CHIEF JUSTICE

Response by the Honourable the
Chief Justice Sundaresh Menon
Opening of the Legal Year 2013 and
Welcome Reference for the Chief Justice

Mr Attorney,

Mr Lok Vi Ming SC, President of the Law Society of Singapore,

Members of the Bar,

Ladies and Gentlemen:

On behalf of the Judiciary, it gives me great pleasure to welcome you all to this morning’s ceremony. There are a number of guests I would especially like to mention. First, I am delighted that Mrs David Marshall is with us today. Jean Marshall’s husband was one of Singapore’s greatest advocates ever. He left an indelible mark on the profession and was a historical figure in his own right. I am also delighted to welcome Professor Tan Sook Yee, the former Dean of the Faculty of Law of the National University of Singapore and widow of Mr Tan Boon Teik. Boon Teik was the longest-serving Attorney-General of independent Singapore, having held that office for 25 years at a critical time in our history. Boon Teik passed away last year. His many achievements and contributions have been noted in a number of tributes.

I am also grateful to the Chief Registrar of the Supreme Court of Brunei, Pengiran Hajjah Rostaina binte Pengiran Haji Duraman, and our guests from Malaysia, Brunei and Hong Kong representing their respective professional associations, for taking the trouble to travel here for this morning’s proceedings. We also have in our midst other guests from Singapore and abroad including, in particular, the Honourable James Spigelman, who retired in 2011 as the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of New South Wales. It is my pleasure to welcome you all.
Mr Attorney and Mr Lok, thank you for your extremely kind and generous words. I do not in the least pretend that they are deserved. It is, of course, an immense privilege to be entrusted with the responsibility of leading the Judiciary and, by extension, the legal community. And I am assured by and grateful for the pledges of support and commitment you have each extended. In the weeks following the announcement at the end of August last year that I would succeed Chief Justice Chan Sek Keong, I also had the opportunity to meet many stakeholders and I very much appreciate the time each of them took and the many ideas that they offered. The challenge now is to make something worthwhile out of all this goodwill. In the final analysis, perhaps more stock should be placed on what is said at the end of one’s tenure than at the beginning.

**Felicitations**

Mr Attorney, you succeeded me as the Attorney-General on 25 June 2012. The range of issues faced by the Attorney-General, the quality and dedication of the officers serving in the Legal Service and the opportunity to make a positive difference all combine to make it a truly unique calling. You bring the experience of more than 25 years practising with distinction at the highest levels of the Commercial Bar as well as almost three illustrious years on the Supreme Court Bench. I know that with this wealth of experience, your sense of compassion, your warm heart and your commitment to do the right thing, you will do your utmost for the honourable discharge of this critical office.

Mr Lok, we had not the faintest inkling when we entered Law School together as students more than 30 years ago, that we would one day be speaking in these circumstances, and that too in the company of a third member of our class and now the Senior Minister of State for Law and Education, Ms Indranee Rajah. You have taken over from Mr Wong Meng Meng SC, in what has famously been described as the “least enviable legal job in town”. Notwithstanding the challenges it will undoubtedly bring, the Presidency will afford you a valuable platform from which to serve our community by providing leadership on a number of issues that are of importance to the practising profession and to our wider society.

Let me offer my heartfelt congratulations to each of you, and also, pledge my support for the worthwhile work you will be doing.

**Farewells**

Mr Attorney, you spoke about the momentous changes in Singapore’s legal landscape. In this context, I would like to acknowledge Justice Philip Pillai, who retired from the Supreme Court last December. Justice Pillai had been the Vice Dean of the Faculty of Law during my student days and was instrumental in persuading me to go into private practice upon my graduation. We later became partners at Shook Lin & Bok and I was delighted to have had the opportunity to serve with him in the Supreme Court. I congratulate him on four successful decades in the law and wish him a fulfilling retirement.
I have spoken previously on the retirement of Chief Justice Chan Sek Keong and the immense legacy he leaves behind. Today, I reiterate my heartfelt gratitude to him as well as my greatest respect and affection; and I repeat my wishes that he will have a long, active and very happy retirement.

**The Quest to Improve**

When Chief Justice Chan spoke at his Welcome Reference in 2006, he said that he drew confidence to face the “daunting responsibilities” that come with this appointment, among other things, from “the motivation of any responsible public office holder to leave to his successor a legacy better than the one he has inherited.”

There is profound truth in this. Chief Justice Wee Chong Jin laid the foundations for an independent Judiciary, so essential to the establishment of the rule of law in a new nation. His successor, Chief Justice Yong Pung How, took the administration of justice to the next level with sweeping reforms that conquered the delays and cleared the backlog of cases that had come to bedevil the Judiciary. And Chief Justice Chan led the Judiciary to even greater heights, with his profound contributions to our jurisprudence and his particular devotion to the ideal that justice be dispensed efficiently, and also humanely. It is on the shoulders of these giants that I stand, as I set out to bequeath to my eventual successor an even stronger institution.

This is a supremely worthwhile quest because law is foundational to society. Far from restricting liberty, law assures it. By law, we establish order, and order is key to liberty. In the preface to the 1915 edition of “Robert’s Rules of Order Revised”, a work on the law applicable to meetings, the author observes:

> Where there is no law, but every man does what is right in his own eyes, there is the least of real liberty.

The legal profession, led by the Judiciary, is the custodian of the sacred trust to uphold the rule of law. Its essence is the assurance that no one is above the law; that everyone is answerable to it; that corruption will not be tolerated; that every citizen should have the greatest equality of opportunity; and that the ideals of our national pledge should be pursued by each citizen exerting his personal efforts and relying on the strength of his abilities, not on his race, language or religion. This has been the hallmark of our nation’s soul throughout its independent existence. My own story authenticates this. My late father landed on these shores 60 years ago with nothing but the clothes he wore, a spare set in his bag and a very modest amount of money. He came seeking a better future for his offspring but it would have been beyond his wildest and most audacious dreams to imagine that his son would one day be the Chief Justice. Yet it has come to pass and only because of our national commitment to the rule of law and equal opportunity. As a real beneficiary of this commitment, I am heavily invested in it. We have much to be grateful for as a people and it is vital that we remain rooted to these notions which are embodied in the Constitution and encapsulated in the judicial oath of office.
But we must guard against the danger of relegating these ideals to the realm of the theoretical. The real subject of these ideals is the common citizen who depends on the legal framework and the integrity and commitment of those entrusted with its administration for the assurance of fairness. The vast majority of those who encounter the law do so primarily at what we refer to as the Subordinate Courts. It is an unfortunate appellation, as it may be construed to suggest that the work of that arm of the Judiciary is somehow unimportant. Nothing could be further from the truth. It is there that the core business of dispensing justice is carried out on a daily basis. That is our engine room, managing an annual case load in the region of 350,000 cases. The quest to ensure that access to meaningful justice is a realistic end for all Singaporeans must start there.

The Chief District Judge Tan Siong Thye and his management team have excelled in leading the Subordinate Courts. Beyond the notable achievement of clearing 80% of criminal cases within six months and 90% of civil and family cases within 18 months, they have instilled a culture of seeking to minimise the burden of those who must interface with the judicial system. When I visited the Subordinate Courts recently, I was impressed by the many innovations in place and it is unsurprising and commendable that these efforts have been recognised in a number of national and international awards. But the quest to improve demands that we consider how we can enhance the efforts of the Subordinate Courts to meet their objective of delivering justice to the average Singaporean. Four specific areas have been identified.

The first is family justice – an area of paramount interest to all Singaporeans. The Minister for Law and I have discussed this and we have agreed that an inter-agency group be established, consisting of some Supreme Court Judges, Family Court Judges and representatives from the Ministry of Law and the Ministry of Social and Family Development, to work with academics and family law practitioners to consider possible reforms. The family is the basic unit in our society and every breakdown is traumatic. The reforms should be aimed at reducing the acrimony inherent in family disputes to the greatest extent possible. Without in any way limiting the outcomes that may emerge out of the work of the inter-agency group, the following changes might be considered:

(a) A radical shift towards a much greater emphasis on counselling and mediation aimed at the consensual resolution of the majority of family disputes;

(b) Instituting a profession of family justice practitioners who need not be lawyers but would be trained in elements of family law and more importantly, in counselling, psychology, mediation and conciliation. Such practitioners would be sensitive to the trauma faced by those caught in a family break-up and be committed to helping them to work their way through it;
(c) Even with these efforts, it will remain necessary to seek an outcome from the Courts in many cases. Although we have already evolved many practices to reduce the contentiousness that commonly infects these proceedings, the fact remains that our system of litigation is an adversarial one. It is time to consider why we should not move to an inquisitorial system in the field of family justice, where the Judge leads the process of establishing what happened and designing solutions geared towards providing appropriate closure; and

(d) Finally, the possibility of establishing a separate Family Justice Court dealing with the entire suite of family justice issues.

This will require a substantial effort and the inter-agency group will be established soon to study and report on these matters in the course of this year.

Secondly, I have asked the Chief District Judge to simplify the procedural rules for smaller civil cases. Around 89% of writs filed in the Civil Justice Division involve sums of $60,000 or less. This is the jurisdictional limit of the Magistrates’ Courts. The Rules of Court prescribe a single regime that assumes every case will be prepared for trial in the same manner without regard to the monetary value in dispute. This is untenable. Steps have already been taken to reduce the expense of trying these cases and the Chief District Judge and his team will seek further ways to reduce the cost of litigating these matters, with greater emphasis on consensual outcomes, and, failing that, by developing simpler and faster processes.

In criminal justice, Mr Attorney, you have spoken of measures you have either continued or initiated with a view to achieving some of these same objectives. I am delighted that you have persevered in the effort to collaborate closely with the Criminal Bar. I look forward to your joint projects coming to fruition. I also welcome the news that the Pamphlet of Rights, an initiative that emerged from a dialogue I had with the Criminal Bar when I was the Attorney-General, will soon be issued. In this area also, the Chief District Judge and his team will seek ways to simplify the procedures for less serious cases. He will consult your Chambers and the Bar before making recommendations.

Lastly, I have asked the Chief District Judge to consider how we can enhance the standing of his Courts. This, after all, is where most Singaporeans encounter the judicial system. The Chief District Judge has proposed a number of changes, including renaming his Courts as the State Courts of Justice, and to provide that Judges wear robes in open Court. He has also raised the need for more resources to ensure that all these initiatives can be effectively implemented.

I will work closely with him to carefully evaluate all the detailed proposals as these are developed in the coming months with a view to their realisation. We will be guided by the prime objective of securing the ends of fair, accessible and customised justice for all.
The Legal Profession

Just as the bulk of the judicial case load is at the Subordinate Courts, so it is with the professional work of lawyers. Lawyers practising individually or in small firms do much of this work. I came to know some of them in my work as the Attorney-General and found several who best embody the ideals of lawyering. They do their bit for the poor and the marginalised, and bear a disproportionate load of the pro bono initiatives of the profession, as your statistics bear out, Mr Lok. I am deeply grateful to these practitioners. Their engagement contributed greatly to the richness of my work then, as I am sure it will to yours, Mr Attorney. In the brief time I have been in the Court of Appeal, I have, at times, also seen the quality of submissions and the seriousness of purpose that these practitioners are capable of. This now needs to be extended across the board so that it becomes the norm. There are three specific points I would like to highlight.

The first is in relation to continuing legal education and professional development. This was introduced in April last year starting with young lawyers of up to five years’ standing. We have had a promising start, and by the end of last year, more than 90% had fulfilled the requirements in so far as participation in accredited CPD activities is concerned. I urge the Bar to embrace the numerous opportunities for learning that will be provided, including some superb offerings from the Singapore Academy of Law (“the Academy”). Take pride in your vocation as lawyers, and the commitment to upgrade yourselves through continuing education will naturally follow.

Secondly, the Bar’s first duty is to the Court. There are many aspects to this, but the duty to ensure one is well and diligently prepared, courteous and cooperative must rank among the more fundamental ones as you, Mr Lok, have observed. As we embark on a number of changes in the administration of justice, it is paramount that you approach these in the right spirit and cooperate with us in these efforts. In the run-up to my appointment, I met a group of practitioners from the small law firms. This proved to be an animated session that went on longer than any of the other sessions. I took away several ideas and I encourage the more senior of these practitioners to take the lead in continuing the conversation about what else can be done to further raise standards with a view to realising their fullest potential.

Thirdly, let me touch on pro bono initiatives. I think the profession can justifiably be proud of the work that has been done in this area, particularly in the last decade. The Pro Bono Promotion Committee set up by the Ministry of Law has been and will remain instrumental in charting strategic plans for the growth of these efforts. We can expect more when Justice Rajah’s group completes its work and reports on ways to best ensure the availability of community legal services to those who need it. Whatever form the measures to ensure such availability may finally take, I ask the profession to rest assured that these will not undermine the immensely valuable efforts of those who are already putting their heart and soul into volunteering for the cause of ensuring access to justice. The sole practitioners and small law firms have been especially generous with their time.
in *pro bono* cases and initiatives, and it is time for the large commercial law firms and the Senior Counsel to share the load to a greater extent. This should entail more participation in cases as well as more generous financial support. Each year, the Law Society raises funds for *pro bono* initiatives through a golf game. This year, the Attorney-General invited the larger local and international firms to commit to a medium-term pledge so as to establish a pipeline of predictable funding for this critical effort. The response so far has been underwhelming. Lawyers have a vital responsibility to ensure that there is access to justice. From those to whom much has been given, much will be expected. And as we move towards an increasingly integrated legal profession consisting of both the local and international law firms, I echo your hope and expectation, Mr Lok, that the latter will also do their fair share and contribute to these initiatives.

Before leaving the subject of lawyers, let me refer briefly to some work I started last year when I was the Attorney-General, chairing a Committee to explore possible changes to the regulatory framework that governs lawyers. This affects international lawyers working in Singapore, as well as local law firms wanting to internationalise. The Committee also studied the possible use of alternative business structures in legal practice. The Committee will complete its work shortly and submit its report which will address a number of these issues and propose a new framework to assure a level playing field for all lawyers based here.

**Legal Service**

Mr Attorney, you have spoken about your work as the Chief Legal Advisor and Counsel to the Government. Your greatest help in this respect will come from the corps of Legal Service Officers who work in your Chambers, and in the Ministries and the Statutory Boards. I am familiar with their quality and dedication. I commend your commitment to continue the emphasis on their training and development. Officers in the Legal Service play a critical role in fearlessly upholding the rule of law. During his Welcome Reference in 1990, Chief Justice Yong spoke of his desire to groom the best officers for appointment to the Supreme Court Bench. This is a sound aspiration for those who have chosen to invest a lifetime in the public service and I will welcome anything you do to better prepare the best officers for this.

**Supreme Court**

Turning to the Supreme Court, I am happy to say that through the efforts of previous Chief Justices and the Registrars, it is in very good shape. I must give particular credit to the Registrar and his team of outstanding judicial as well as non-legally trained supporting officers for their commitment and diligence. It is they who ensure the smooth running of the Court. They have been immensely helpful to me in every way and I am very grateful to each of them. Thanks to their efforts and the work of the Judges, I am happy to report that we remain in the happy situation of not having a backlog of cases to contend with; we continue to meet our rigorous key performance indicator of clearing 85% of all writ actions within 18 months. Appeals are disposed of timeously, and judgments have become more learned over time, if also somewhat longer.
There are nonetheless some priorities that we will work on initially. First, on the electronic front, eLitigation was previewed last October, and the first electronic filing phase for cases at the Supreme Court was launched just two days ago. We have set the standard internationally in this area for some years and I am confident that eLitigation will come to be seen as yet another pivotal point in the use of technology by the Supreme Court. The eLitigation system brings the use of electronic tools in litigation to a higher level, by introducing a suite of changes targeted at reducing inefficiencies. By allowing lawyers to obtain online access to case files, it will reduce their dependence on physical files and allow them to conduct searches electronically regardless of where they might be. An extensive review of the procedural rules and processes has also been undertaken to do away with many unnecessary procedural steps and to more effectively utilise information that has already been filed in Court. These shortcuts, integrated within eLitigation, will ease some of the burden for all users by enabling Court documents to be generated electronically from information that already resides in the system.

Next, there are the issues arising from the discovery process when working with electronic documents. The Practice Directions on electronic discovery provide a set of procedures for the discovery of such documents. They encourage the exchange of electronic documents in their native electronic format and establish standards for adapting discovery principles to new media. The Courts have also delivered a number of decisions which interpret these Practice Directions. To facilitate the acceptance and implementation of these changes, a Call for Collaboration was issued last year by the Singapore Academy of Law, with the support of the Infocomm Development Authority of Singapore, the Supreme Court, the Subordinate Courts, the Attorney-General’s Chambers and the Law Society. The successful bidder will make available, to all lawyers at a subsidised rate, a cloud-based document review platform for conducting electronic discovery through LawNet. They will also establish a capacity building programme for lawyers and paralegals.

The key driver for these two initiatives is the push to enhance the productivity of lawyers. The Courts have streamlined the procedural rules and processes with the launch of eLitigation. The challenge now is for the Bar to embrace the use of technology and adopt efficient practices. With the right skills, lawyers will be able to make use of the full range of electronic tools to search, tag and manage documents. This, together with the streamlined procedural rules and the case management features that are embedded within eLitigation, will help to alleviate the potentially disproportionate and prohibitive expense associated with reviewing large numbers of documents manually.

The third major priority will be to review our case management processes. The most fundamental change will be the shift to a modified docket system of litigation in the High Court. Cases will be assigned, at an early stage, to specific Judges and Registrars who will manage and prepare them for trial. We stand to derive many advantages from this. Judges would have been involved in dealing
with the interlocutory processes along the way and will be fully familiar with the case by the time it is fixed for trial. Judges will also ensure by active management that cases are disposed of efficiently, and that adjournments and the disruption of having matters part-heard are minimised, if not avoided. This will also enable a degree of judicial specialisation with each Judge being assigned to specific lists. We will also change aspects of *ex parte* processes; and review our approach to costs awards so as to incentivise appropriate behaviour in litigation.

In the Court of Appeal, we will also see some changes in the coming months. Among them will be measures to do away with excessive prolixity in written Cases with the introduction of page limits; as well as a greater degree of case management by requiring counsel to provide specific information at an early stage so that the issues are distilled and adequate time is allocated for oral arguments. Lead Counsel should not be surprised if I ask to see them some weeks before the hearings in order to better customise the time allocation for cases. This may require a change of practice and mindset, as senior lawyers will need to review the case and the associated documents at an earlier stage than might hitherto have been the practice. Where difficult and important issues of law arise, the Court of Appeal may more readily appoint *amicus curiae* and where appropriate, they may be drawn from the ranks of our academics.

The last major priority I want to mention pertains to the tremendous opportunity that I believe exists for the profession in Singapore to service a wider region. We have seen the great success of the efforts to promote Singapore as a hub for international arbitration. Much of this work emanates from abroad, but parties have chosen to arbitrate here. There are many factors that account for this and it is time to take fuller advantage of them. I have discussed the matter with the Minister for Law and we have agreed that Justice V K Rajah, together with the Senior Minister of State for Law, should lead a group that will include other Judges of the Supreme Court as well as representatives from the Ministry of Law and other stakeholders to study the viability of developing a framework for the establishment of the Singapore International Commercial Court. From my preliminary consultations, it appears there will be strong interest in this from the community of legal corporations operating throughout Asia. This promises to be an exciting and important step in our efforts to grow the legal services sector and to expand the scope for us to internationalise and export Singapore law. I look forward to the detailed recommendations of the working group that will soon be established.
Let me turn to the Academy. This year marks its 25th anniversary and several activities have been lined up to commemorate this. Later today, we will launch the 25th anniversary logo and a microsite detailing the Silver Jubilee programme. A number of conferences have been lined up as the Academy continues to brand itself as a premier provider of world-class conferences bringing together thought-leaders from Singapore and elsewhere. Among the most outstanding of these is a joint conference of the Academy and the Chancery Bar Association of England and Wales that will be held in April this year and will bring together some of the most illustrious practitioners and thinkers from here and England to speak on “Finance, Property and Business Litigation in a Changing World”. In July, the Academy will provide the public with an insight into the law with a week-long series of law seminars, free legal clinics and an exhibition on our legal history. And in October, a charity concert is planned to showcase the profession’s talents while raising funds for the Yellow Ribbon Project. I look forward to the active participation of the membership in these events.

Beyond this, I think it is timely for us to consider ways of ensuring that the Academy remains relevant and vital to its members as we face the future together. I have accordingly asked that a dialogue be convened with the key stakeholders to this end.

Finally, the Academy will also introduce a new and improved LawNet portal by the end of this year. The most innovative features will include the facility for members to make and store their personalised annotations on the resources they use. Using personalised identification data, members will have permanent and secured access to their own library of annotations and in keeping with the times, they will be able to access LawNet using their tablet devices.

I have reached that stage of the proceedings when it falls upon me to announce the appointment of Senior Counsel. This year, we have appointed two advocates as Senior Counsel. As they join the highest ranks of the Bar, it will be incumbent on them to meet the expectations that come with this. They are Mr Narayanan Sreenivasan and Mr Lionel Yee. On behalf of the Judiciary, I congratulate them on their appointments.
Conclusion

This brings me to the close of this morning’s proceedings. I return at this stage to the quest I have mentioned, to persist in the effort to make things even better than they already are. This is a quest that must unite all of us in the legal community. If the law is foundational to society, then we, who are the servants of the law, must constantly reflect on how we can make it more responsive to the needs of our evolving society. We must ensure that we do not price the law out of the reach of the average Singaporean; that we are guided by our care and concern for those whose lot it is to come face to face with the law; and that we do not allow the law to become the preserve of the rarefied few as a result of systems, processes and outputs that seem obscure or even confounding to the reasonably informed lay person.

I have been blessed with a superb Bench and I have been assured by the commitments that I have received from all those I have spoken to. The Courts will remain responsive to the needs of our citizens by working to ensure the fair and efficient administration of justice. We will continue to upgrade our processes and also our skills. We look forward to corresponding efforts from the entire profession. If we work hard together in pursuit of these goals, we will enhance the quality of justice for all who may have occasion to seek recourse from the Courts and that would be a most worthwhile objective.

I thank you for your presence and I wish you all a very happy and successful new year.

Sundaresh Menon
Chief Justice
Supreme Court of Singapore
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The Judiciary is one of the three branches of government in Singapore, the other two being the Executive and the Legislature. Under Art 93 of the Constitution of the Republic of Singapore, judicial power in Singapore is vested in the Supreme Court and in such subordinate courts as may be provided for by any written law for the time being in force. The Chief Justice is the head of the Judiciary.

Structure of the Supreme Court

The Supreme Court consists of the Court of Appeal and the High Court, and hears both civil and criminal matters. The Supreme Court Bench consists of the Chief Justice, the Judges of Appeal, Judges and Judicial Commissioners. The Supreme Court Registry is headed by the Registrar who is assisted by the Deputy Registrar, Senior Assistant Registrars and Assistant Registrars. Justices’ Law Clerks, who work directly under the charge of the Chief Justice, assist the Judges and Judicial Commissioners by carrying out research on the law.
Court of Appeal

The Court of Appeal hears appeals against the decisions of High Court Judges in both civil and criminal matters. It became Singapore’s final appellate court on 8 April 1994, when appeals to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council were abolished.

The Chief Justice sits in the Court of Appeal together with the Judges of Appeal. A Judge of the High Court may, at the request of the Chief Justice, sit in the Court of Appeal. The Court of Appeal is presided over by the Chief Justice and, in his absence, a Judge of Appeal or a Judge of the High Court.

The Court of Appeal is usually made up of three Judges. However, certain appeals, such as those against interlocutory judgments, may be heard by only two Judges. In exceptional cases, the Court of Appeal may comprise five or any greater uneven number of Judges.

High Court

The High Court consists of the Chief Justice and the Judges of the High Court. A Judge of Appeal may also sit as a Judge of the High Court. Proceedings in the High Court are heard before a single Judge, unless otherwise provided by any written law. The High Court may also appoint one or more persons with expertise in the subject matter of the proceedings to assist the court.

The High Court hears both criminal and civil cases as a court of first instance. The High Court also hears appeals from the decisions of District Courts and Magistrates’ Courts in civil and criminal cases, and decides points of law reserved in special cases submitted by a District Court or a Magistrate’s Court. In addition, the High Court has general supervisory and revisionary jurisdiction over all subordinate courts in any civil or criminal matter.
The High Court has jurisdiction to hear and try any action where the defendant is served with a writ or other originating process in Singapore, or outside Singapore in the circumstances authorised by the Rules of Court; or where the defendant submits to the jurisdiction of the High Court. Generally, except in probate matters, a civil case is commenced in the High Court if the value of the claim exceeds S$250,000. Probate matters are usually commenced in the High Court if the value of the deceased’s estate exceeds S$3 million or if the case involves foreign assets. In addition, ancillary matters in family proceedings involving assets of S$1.5 million or more are heard in the High Court.

The following matters are also exclusively heard by the High Court:
- Admiralty matters
- Company winding-up proceedings
- Bankruptcy proceedings
- Applications for the admission of advocates and solicitors

The High Court has jurisdiction to try all offences committed in Singapore and may also try offences committed outside Singapore in certain circumstances. In criminal cases, the High Court generally tries cases where the offences are punishable by 10 years’ imprisonment or more per charge, and where the offences carry capital punishment.

**The Supreme Court Registry**

The registrars perform judicial functions. They preside over hearings of various pre-trial and post-trial matters in chambers. These include applications for summary judgment, bankruptcy applications, taxation of costs, assessment of damages, discovery of documents and striking out of pleadings. They also conduct pre-trial conferences and criminal case disclosure conferences; and take charge of case management, including the scheduling of cases. In their concurrent appointments as Magistrates or District Judges, they conduct committal hearings in criminal cases. Some registrars also hold appointments in tribunals and various committees.
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Opening of the Legal Year
By Ms Chee Min Ping, Assistant Registrar

Both the Honourable Attorney-General Sundaresh Menon Senior Counsel (SC), and the President of the Law Society Mr Wong Meng Meng SC, reaffirmed their commitment to uphold the rule of law on behalf of the Attorney-General's Chambers (AGC) and the practising Bar respectively at the Opening of the Legal Year ceremony on 6 January 2012.

The Attorney-General began his address by commenting on the successfully-implemented changes introduced by the new Criminal Procedure Code. He highlighted the AGC’s intense efforts at establishing a framework to refine and formalise the existing practice with regard to negotiating consensual outcomes. He also mentioned the various initiatives to promote collaboration between the Bar and the Prosecution, such as the inaugural Criminal Law Conference. He further spoke on the increasing numbers and diversity within the profession. In order to keep abreast of developments in the law and to remain competitive, lawyers will be introduced to the Mandatory Continuing Professional Development scheme.

Outlining the Law Society’s initiatives to enhance the quality of the criminal Bar, Mr Wong Meng Meng SC stressed the need to ensure that only experienced lawyers are assigned the role of lead counsel under the Legal Assistance Scheme for Capital Offences. Amongst other initiatives, he also said that the Forum of Senior Counsel has offered assistance in mentoring younger criminal lawyers.
The Honourable the Chief Justice Chan Sek Keong lauded the efforts of both the Law Society and the AGC, stating that their attempts are consistent with the public interest of maintaining law and order.

Speaking on measures to increase *pro bono* work participation, Chief Justice Chan said that it was imperative that law firms, especially the larger ones, support the lawyers in the form of incentives, or by setting up specialised departments dedicated to *pro bono* work. He then commented on the effective measures introduced to prevent errant lawyers from absconding with clients’ moneys.

Chief Justice Chan further brought up the need for diversity in the Singapore legal sector. New legislation introduced will allow the *ad hoc* admission of expert counsel to ameliorate the situation where litigation lawyers in the larger law firms are frequently conflicted out from acting for large corporate clients.

In closing, the Chief Justice announced the appointment of three Senior Counsel and declared the new legal year open.

**2nd Joint Judicial Conference**

By Ms Sngeeta Devi d/o Surannad, Assistant Registrar

Hosted by the Supreme Court of Singapore, the Judiciaries of Brunei Darussalam, Malaysia and Singapore congregated on 3 March 2012 for the 2nd Joint Judicial Conference. The inaugural conference was hosted by the Malaysian Judiciary in 2011.

The conference was extremely well-received, with the Chief Justices of all three countries in attendance, together with about 70 Judges and judicial officers from the participating countries.

In his opening address, the Honourable the Chief Justice Chan Sek Keong hailed the conference for providing a good platform for participating Judges to interact with one another, and in the process, acquire a better appreciation of the diverse approaches employed by their countries in dealing with cases under differing socio-economic and political environments.

The conference culminated in a meaningful discussion amongst the participants revolving around the two pre-identified topics, namely, recent trends in judicial review and the court’s role in the arbitral process.
Mass Call
By Ms Wendy Yap, Senior Assistant Registrar

It was the largest ever Mass Call ceremony in Singapore’s history, as 363 law graduates were admitted as advocates and solicitors of the Supreme Court on 28 July 2012.

Conducted at the University Cultural Centre, National University of Singapore, the newly-called officers and their parents were congratulated by the Honourable the Chief Justice Chan Sek Keong on their appointments. He reminded them that this was only the first milestone in their professional career and also urged the new lawyers to live up to the values and ideals of the profession, using their legal education meaningfully in contributing to the community.

President of the Law Society, Mr Wong Meng Meng Senior Counsel, was also there to address the gathering. Pointing to the grim realities of practice for young lawyers, he advised the new lawyers to be prepared for a tighter job market as competition for jobs and deals increased. The Chief Justice, however, urged them not to be discouraged by these challenges, but to overcome them with grit, perseverance and honesty.

Amongst other valuable advice, the new lawyers were also reminded by the Chief Justice that their breadth and depth of legal knowledge was no substitute and could not compensate for lack of common sense, lack of prudential judgment and hasty decision making.

The Chief Justice concluded by reminding the new lawyers that their primary calling was not the singular pursuit of wealth, but to be guardians of the law in the service of society, whose roles are not to advance the interests of their clients at all costs, but in accordance with the law.
Launch of *The Learning Court*

By Mr Jam Chee Chong, Senior Assistant Director (Corporate Communications Directorate)

29 October 2012 marked the launch of the Supreme Court’s *The Learning Court*. Attended by more than 80 guests that included staff, members of the legal fraternity and the media, the initiative marked another milestone in the Supreme Court’s public education and outreach programme.

Officiated by the Honourable the Chief Justice Chan Sek Keong, *The Learning Court* is aimed primarily at students between the ages of 13 and 18. It is a technology-enhanced, interactive learning space designed to showcase, in a simple yet dynamic way, the work of the courts; and explain to students the various processes involved in the administration of justice.

Prior to the launch, the Supreme Court staff also had the opportunity to be one of the first to experience the new features of *The Learning Court* during two “lunchtime preview” sessions.
Legal Assistance Scheme for Capital Offences (LASCO) Dinner
By Mr Jeyendran Jeyapal, Assistant Registrar

The Legal Assistance Scheme for Capital Offences (LASCO) has been a key feature in Singapore’s *pro bono* landscape since 1992. The scheme ensures that all unrepresented accused persons facing capital charges receive free legal representation. As of 30 October 2012, LASCO had 218 registered lawyers who render their assistance in capital trials and appeals.

To acknowledge and recognise their contributions, the members were invited to a dinner hosted by the Honourable the Chief Justice Chan Sek Keong on 30 October 2012 at the Holiday Inn Singapore Orchard City Centre. Held biennially, this was the second LASCO dinner, with the inaugural event in 2010. This year’s dinner was also particularly special as it commemorated 20 years of LASCO.

During his speech, the Chief Justice remarked that the practice of assigning counsel to accused persons actually dated back to pre-independence days. It was under LASCO that the practice developed to the current structure. He also highlighted that a new LASCO Selection Panel had been set up. This panel helps to oversee the selection and appointment of counsel to LASCO and their assignment to cases.

Mr Manoj Nandwani was the proud recipient of this year’s LASCO Award. He received the award based on the six cases that he had conducted between 1 January 2010 and 30 June 2012 and other criteria such as his standing in the Criminal Bar and the quality of representation rendered. The Chief Justice commended Mr Nandwani for his professionalism and active participation in LASCO, noting also that he had been a member of the Criminal Legal Aid Scheme for the past 13 years.
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Changes to the Bench

By Ms Charmain Lee, Senior Head (Corporate Communications Directorate)

Re-appointment of Mr Chao Hick Tin as Judge of Appeal

Re-appointed for another two years with effect from 11 April 2012, the Honourable Judge of Appeal Justice Chao Hick Tin continues his stint as a Judge of Appeal of the Supreme Court of Singapore. He was also re-appointed as Vice-President of the Court of Appeal by the Honourable the Chief Justice Chan Sek Keong with effect from 11 April 2012.

Prior to his re-appointment, Justice Chao was appointed Judicial Commissioner on 1 October 1987, Judge of the Supreme Court on 15 November 1990 and Judge of Appeal on 2 August 1999. On 11 April 2006, he was appointed the Attorney-General of Singapore and later returned to the Supreme Court as Judge of Appeal on 11 April 2008.

Appointment of Mr Steven Chong Horng Siong as Attorney-General

Mr Steven Chong Horng Siong Senior Counsel (SC), former Judge of the Supreme Court, was appointed Attorney-General with effect from 25 June 2012. Mr Chong SC sat on the Bench as Judicial Commissioner from October 2009 to June 2010 and was appointed Judge of the Supreme Court from June 2010 to June 2012.

Mr Chong SC succeeds the Honourable Attorney-General Sundaresh Menon SC (as he then was) as the next Attorney-General of Singapore.

Appointment of Mr Vinodh Coomaraswamy as Judicial Commissioner of the Supreme Court

Judicial Commissioner Vinodh Coomaraswamy was appointed with effect from 1 August 2012.

Graduating with a Bachelor of Laws from Nottingham University in 1990, Judicial Commissioner Coomaraswamy later obtained a Bachelor of Civil Law from Oxford University in 1998. In 2005, he was appointed Senior Counsel.
Retirement of the Honourable the Chief Justice Chan Sek Keong

The Honourable the Chief Justice Chan Sek Keong retired on 6 November 2012 after 26 years of being in the public service, including six years as Chief Justice.

In his career, Chief Justice Chan made outstanding and exceptional contributions to the Supreme Court and the legal profession. He was appointed the first Judicial Commissioner of Singapore in 1986. Two years later, he was appointed Judge of the Supreme Court. Thereafter, he was the Attorney-General of Singapore from 1992 to 2006, before being appointed the Chief Justice of Singapore.

On 19 November 2012, His Excellency the President Tony Tan Keng Yam hosted a farewell dinner for Chief Justice Chan at the Istana that was attended by political leaders, Judges, judicial officers from the Supreme Court and the Subordinate Courts, as well as members of the legal fraternity.

The book “The Law in His Hands: A Tribute to Chief Justice Chan Sek Keong” was published as a tribute to his accomplishments. Speaking at the launch of the book, Minister for Law, Mr K Shanmugam, said Chief Justice Chan had “left his mark on our legal history, our legal landscape and the Bar, the profession loved him and will continue to love him”.

Staff of the Supreme Court lined the lobby to give a rousing send-off to the Chief Justice as he walked out of the Supreme Court for the last time in his official capacity on 5 November 2012.

Chief Justice Chan is succeeded by the Honourable the Chief Justice Sundaresh Menon, who took office with effect from 6 November 2012.
Appointment of the Honourable the Chief Justice Sundaresh Menon

The Honourable the Chief Justice Sundaresh Menon was sworn in as Chief Justice of Singapore at a ceremony held at the Istana on 7 November 2012. Appointed by the President of the Republic of Singapore, he succeeds the Honourable the Chief Justice Chan Sek Keong with effect from 6 November 2012.

Graduating with first class honours from the National University of Singapore Faculty of Law in 1986, and thereafter obtaining his Master of Laws from Harvard University, Chief Justice Menon began his career at Shook Lin & Bok in 1987. He later became a partner in 1990. He went on to join the law firms of Wong Partnership, Rajah & Tann and Jones Day as a partner between 1996 and 2006. From April 2006 to March 2007, he was appointed Judicial Commissioner of the Supreme Court, before he became the Managing Partner of Rajah & Tann in August 2009.

Chief Justice Menon was the Attorney-General of Singapore from 1 October 2010 to 24 June 2012 and was subsequently appointed as Judge of Appeal of the Supreme Court on 1 August 2012.

Retirement of the Honourable Justice Philip Pillai

12 December 2012 marked the retirement of the Honourable Justice Philip Pillai as a Judge of the Supreme Court. Justice Pillai was first appointed as Judicial Commissioner on 1 October 2009 and then as Judge of the Supreme Court on 1 June 2010.

Graduating with first class honours from the University of Singapore with a Bachelor of Laws in 1971, Justice Pillai subsequently obtained his Master of Laws and the Doctor of Juridical Science at Harvard University.
Highlights of Judges’ Events

11th General Assembly and the 34th Governing Council Meeting of the ASEAN Law Association in Bali, Indonesia

By Ms Eunice Chua, Assistant Registrar

The 11th General Assembly and the 34th Governing Council Meeting of the ASEAN Law Association (ALA), held in Bali, Indonesia, from 15 to 18 February 2012, saw the participation of the Honourable the Chief Justice Chan Sek Keong and 26 other representatives from various legal sectors in Singapore, including the Honourable Judge of Appeal Justice Chao Hick Tin, the Honourable Justice Lee Seiu Kin, and Registrar Foo Chee Hock.

“Embracing the New Role of ALA after the ASEAN Charter” was the conference theme for the 11th General Assembly. In line with this theme, Justice Lee presented a paper entitled “Establishment of Center of ASEAN Law Information” during the conference. Registrar Foo and Deputy Registrar Teh Hwee Hwee also presented papers on the topics “Framework for Judicial Cooperation in Case Management: The Experience of each ASEAN Country” and “Mediation Practices: ASEAN’s Experiences” respectively.

The event provided an excellent platform for the ASEAN representatives to not only share their experiences, but to also strengthen their ties of friendship over golf and good food. It further afforded the opportunity for delegates to discuss strategies for cooperation and collaboration between the legal sectors of the various ASEAN countries for the benefit of ASEAN as a whole.
**Dinner for the Judiciary and Forum of Senior Counsel**
By Mr Jam Chee Chong, Senior Assistant Director (Corporate Communications Directorate)

It was the Supreme Court Bench’s turn to organise the annual dinner for the Judiciary and the Forum of Senior Counsel (Forum). On 18 May 2012, the Bench hosted the event for the 3rd time since 2008, at the Novus Poltrona Frau Dining Room, in an effort to strengthen the ties between the Judiciary and Senior Counsel. The dinner was graced by 33 Senior Counsel and 13 members of the Supreme Court Bench.

The dinner commenced with the Honourable the Chief Justice Chan Sek Keong paying tribute to Tan Boon Teik Senior Counsel (SC), Palakrishnan SC and KS Rajah SC. Noting that 2012 marked the 10th Anniversary of the founding of the Forum, he suggested that the Forum come up with a new set of objectives to keep up with the changes in the legal, economic and social environments.

Making several suggestions to the Forum, Chief Justice Chan said that it was necessary to grow the pool of Senior Counsel, noting that competition will be good for them as well as the younger generation of litigation lawyers. He also said that he hopes that the Forum, together with the Law Society, will be the first source from which the media seeks comments on legal developments.

Chief Justice Chan also lauded the efforts of the Forum in reaching out to the general public. He made special mention that since 2011, the Forum has taken an active role in the appointment of lawyers to the Legal Assistance Scheme for Capital Offences (LASCO). Within the Forum, a Criminal Bar Working Committee has also been established such that Senior Counsel will be involved in the appointment of lawyers when the Supreme Court refers criminal matters to be dealt with on a *pro bono* basis under LASCO.
The 9th Conference of Chief Justices of the Supreme Court of the Portuguese Speaking Countries and Territories was held in Dili, Timor Leste from 22 to 24 October 2012.

Both Singapore and the Northern Territory (Australia) have legal systems based on the common law tradition. This is in contrast with the Portuguese speaking countries and territories, which are based on the civil law tradition. The Honourable the Chief Justice Chan Sek Keong and the Honourable the Chief Justice Trevor Riley of the Supreme Court of the Northern Territory (Australia) were the presenters from non-Portuguese speaking jurisdictions, and shared their experiences on safeguarding judicial independence.

During the conference, simultaneous translation services were provided to allow communication amongst the participants who spoke Portuguese, Tetum, French or English. The linguistic, cultural, economic, ideological and systemic differences amongst the participating jurisdictions brought forth engaging presentations and debates.

This positive experience was amplified by the impeccable hospitality and cordiality of the participants and the Timorese hosts. Despite the varied views presented at the conference, the participants were unified by their fervent desire to safeguard judicial independence.
## Judges’ Participation in Local and Overseas Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Attending Judge(s)</th>
<th>Host Country</th>
<th>Name of Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 – 14 Jan 2012</td>
<td>Chan Sek Keong CJ</td>
<td>Putrajaya, Malaysia</td>
<td>Opening of the Legal Year 2012 of the Supreme Court of Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 21 Jan 2012</td>
<td>V K Rajah JA</td>
<td>New Delhi, India</td>
<td>Singapore International Arbitration Centre Conference and Roundtable Discussion with Judges of the Delhi Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• V K Rajah JA was a panelist for the session entitled “Exploring &amp; Understanding the Role and Approach of Courts in Arbitral Proceedings”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 27 Jan 2012</td>
<td>Chao Hick Tin JA</td>
<td>Jakarta, Indonesia</td>
<td>Regional Workshop on Judicial Integrity in Southeast Asia: Integrity-based Judicial Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Judith Prakash J delivered a talk at the Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Jan – 1 Feb 2012</td>
<td>Philip Pillai J</td>
<td>Wilmington, Delaware</td>
<td>Conference of Chief Justices – Business and Commercial Law Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Feb 2012</td>
<td>V K Rajah JA</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>The 2012 Singapore National Round of the Jessup International Law Moot Court Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• V K Rajah JA was an adjudicator for the oral arguments in the competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 – 19 Feb 2012</td>
<td>Chan Sek Keong CJ</td>
<td>Bali, Indonesia</td>
<td>11th General Assembly and the 34th Governing Council Meeting of the ASEAN Law Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chao Hick Tin JA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lee Seiu Kin J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Attending Judge(s)</td>
<td>Host Country</td>
<td>Name of Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• V K Rajah JA delivered the Chairperson’s speech for the panel discussion on “Measuring the Rule of Law”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Chan Sek Keong CJ delivered the opening address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• V K Rajah JA was a panelist for the panel discussion “Recent Trends in Judicial Review”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Steven Chong Horng Siong J chaired the panel discussion “The Court’s Role in the Arbitral Process”, and Judith Prakash J was a panelist for this panel discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Chan Sek Keong CJ delivered the keynote address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Mar 2012</td>
<td>V K Rajah JA</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore Chamber of Maritime Arbitration Conference 2012: Insolvency of a Global Shipping Principal - Understanding and Unravelling the Complications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• V K Rajah JA delivered the Conference remarks and chaired a panel discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Attending Judge(s)</td>
<td>Host Country</td>
<td>Name of Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 28 Apr 2012</td>
<td>Chan Sek Keong CJ V K Rajah JA</td>
<td>Ankara &amp; Istanbul, Turkey</td>
<td>50th Anniversary of the Constitutional Court of Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Apr – 1 May 2012</td>
<td>Chao Hick Tin JA Lee Seiu Kin J</td>
<td>Kuching, Sarawak, Malaysia</td>
<td>Annual Bench and Bar Games 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 5 May 2012</td>
<td>Quentin Loh Sze-On J</td>
<td>Bali, Indonesia</td>
<td>6th Regional Arbitral Institutes Forum Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 – 16 May 2012</td>
<td>Lee Seiu Kin J</td>
<td>London, UK</td>
<td>7th International Conference on Electronic Disclosure and Information Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 May 2012</td>
<td>V K Rajah JA</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore Management University (SMU) Yong Pung How Professorship of Law Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 19 May 2012</td>
<td>Chan Seng Onn J</td>
<td>Saint-Petersburg, Russia</td>
<td>2nd Saint-Petersburg International Legal Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 24 May 2012</td>
<td>Lai Siu Chiu J</td>
<td>Seoul, Korea</td>
<td>Inaugural Congress of the Association of Asian Constitutional Courts and Equivalent Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Jul 2012</td>
<td>Woo Bih Li J</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Regional Insolvency Conference 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Jul 2012</td>
<td>Andrew Phang Boon Leong JA</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Legal Histories of the British Empire Conference: Law, Spaces, Cultures &amp; Empire: Engagements &amp; Legacies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Sundaresh Menon JA delivered the keynote address

• Woo Bih Li J chaired the final plenary session at the Conference on “Cross-Border Issues in Insolvency”

• Andrew Phang Boon Leong JA delivered the keynote address entitled “Which Road to the Past? Some Personal Reflections on Legal History”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Attending Judge(s)</th>
<th>Host Country</th>
<th>Name of Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Quentin Loh Sze-On J delivered the keynote address entitled “The Role of the Court in Construction Disputes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Jul 2012</td>
<td>Andrew Phang Boon Leong JA</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>SMU School of Law Commencement Ceremony 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Andrew Phang Boon Leong JA delivered the commencement address at the ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Aug 2012</td>
<td>Andrew Phang Boon Leong JA</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>National University of Singapore (NUS), Faculty of Law, Freshmen Inauguration Ceremony 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Andrew Phang Boon Leong JA was the Guest of Honour at the ceremony and delivered an address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Belinda Ang Saw Ean J attended the Lecture in her capacity as Chairperson of the Singapore Mediation Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Tan Lee Meng J attended the Lecture in his capacity as Chairman of the SAL Annual Lecture Organising Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Attending Judge(s)</td>
<td>Host Country</td>
<td>Name of Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Sep 2012</td>
<td>Judith Prakash J</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>International Academy of Matrimonial Lawyers’ Annual Meeting 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Judith Prakash J delivered a paper entitled “Scrutinising Marital Agreements on the Division of Matrimonial Assets”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 – 12 Sep 2012</td>
<td>Chan Sek Keong CJ V K Rajah JA</td>
<td>Melbourne, Australia</td>
<td>Careers@Singapore: Legal Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Chan Sek Keong CJ and V K Rajah JA met with Singapore law students in Melbourne, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 15 Sep 2012</td>
<td>Lai Siu Chiu J</td>
<td>Monyonyo, Kampala, Uganda</td>
<td>Commonwealth Magistrates’ and Judges’ Association 16th Triennial Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 – 14 Sep 2012</td>
<td>Andrew Phang Boon Leong JA</td>
<td>Brisbane, Australia</td>
<td>Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration Appellate Judges’ Conference 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Sep 2012</td>
<td>Tan Lee Meng J Lee Seiu Kin J</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>International Law Speaker Series 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lee Seiu Kin J was the speaker for the topic “Justification for Criminal Sanctions on Intellectual Property Offences”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Sep 2012</td>
<td>Chan Sek Keong CJ Vinodh Coomaraswamy JC</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Launch of Wee Chong Jin Scholarships at NUS and SMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Chan Sek Keong CJ was the Guest of Honour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Attending Judge(s)</td>
<td>Host Country</td>
<td>Name of Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Sep –</td>
<td>Sundaresh Menon JA</td>
<td>London, UK</td>
<td>Seminar on Contemporary Challenges in International Arbitration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Oct 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sundaresh Menon JA explored some of his ideas presented in his keynote address delivered at the ICCA Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Oct 2012</td>
<td>Sundaresh Menon JA</td>
<td>London, UK</td>
<td>Opening of the Legal Year Ceremony of England and Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Judith Prakash J Belinda Ang Saw Ean J Lee Seiu Kin J Vinodh Coomaraswamy JC</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Chan Sek Keong CJ delivered the keynote address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Judith Prakash J was a panelist for the third plenary session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Collaborative Law – Resolving Disputes without Trial”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Belinda Ang J was a panelist for the opening plenary session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The Future of ADR in 2020”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Vinodh Coomaraswamy JC was a guest speaker and gave a presentation on “Remedies for Breach of an Arbitration Clause”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Oct 2012</td>
<td>Vinodh Coomaraswamy JC</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>NUS Mallal Moots Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Vinodh Coomaraswamy JC was the Presiding Judge for the competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Oct 2012</td>
<td>Vinodh Coomaraswamy JC</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Professor Chao Tzee Cheng Memorial Lecture 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Oct 2012</td>
<td>Vinodh Coomaraswamy JC</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Herbert Smith Freehills-SMU Asian Arbitration Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Oct 2012</td>
<td>Quentin Loh Sze-On J</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Chartered Institute of Arbitrators (Singapore) - Arbitration Surgery Workshop on Emergency Arbitrator Relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Quentin Loh Sze-On J attended the workshop as a member of the Expert Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Attending Judge(s)</td>
<td>Host Country</td>
<td>Name of Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Chao Hick Tin JA gave a welcome address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sundaresh Menon JA gave a speech to launch the book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Nov 2012</td>
<td>Vinodh Coomaraswamy JC</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore Trustees Association Annual Conference 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Nov 2012</td>
<td>Quentin Loh Sze-On J</td>
<td>Montreal, Canada</td>
<td>2012 McGill Dispute Resolution Lecture Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Tan Lee Meng J attended the Lecture in his capacity as Chairman of the SAL Distinguished Speaker Lecture Organising Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Nov 2012</td>
<td>Sundaresh Menon CJ</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore Institute of Arbitrators 31st Annual Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sundaresh Menon CJ delivered a speech during the event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 21 Nov 2012</td>
<td>Lee Seiu Kin J</td>
<td>Manila, Philippines</td>
<td>ASEAN Law Association Philippines Testimonial Dinner Reception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Nov 2012</td>
<td>Vinodh Coomaraswamy JC</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Townhall Session for Law Society of Singapore Members Committee to Review the Regulatory Framework for the Legal Services Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Attending Judge(s)</td>
<td>Host Country</td>
<td>Name of Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sundaresh Menon CJ delivered a speech during the event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 – 29 Nov 2012</td>
<td>Vinodh Coomaraswamy JC</td>
<td>Beijing, China</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Competition Workshop for Judges in Asia-Pacific Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 10 Dec 2012</td>
<td>Sundaresh Menon CJ, Woo Bih Li J</td>
<td>Melaka, Malaysia</td>
<td>2nd Roundtable of ASEAN Chief Justices on Environmental Law and Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sundaresh Menon CJ presented a paper on “Alternative Dispute Resolution in Environment Law and Enforcement”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Woo Bih Li J presented a paper on “Delay and Case Management in Environmental cases in Singapore”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Quentin Loh Sze-On J spoke on the topic “The Court’s Role in the Recognition and Enforcement of Awards - A Practical Application”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ranking in International Surveys
By Mr Jam Chee Chong, Senior Assistant Director (Corporate Communications Directorate)

Singapore continued to do well in international surveys conducted by the International Institute for Management Development (IMD) and the Political and Economic Risk Consultancy (PERC).

According to the 2012 IMD World Competitiveness Yearbook, Singapore was ranked second for the “Legal and Regulatory Framework” category. Scoring 8.07, Singapore was ranked closely behind Hong Kong, which received a score of 8.08.

Under the “Justice” category which determines whether justice is fairly administered in a country, Singapore moved up two ranks - from 12th to 10th, out of 59 countries.

Singapore was also placed second out of the 12 Asian countries surveyed in the 2012 PERC report. Based on a survey of expatriates’ perceptions of the different judicial systems in Asia, PERC noted that expatriates were impressed by Singapore’s efficiency and were confident that the system can be used to protect their interests and to settle commercial disputes.

The report also commented that international law firms gravitate to Singapore as a regional base, which can be attributed to Singapore’s ability to protect and enhance the reputation of its own judicial system.

Overseas Conferences, Attachments and Speaking Engagements

Attachment to the Royal Courts of Justice in the United Kingdom
By Mr Kevin Tan, Assistant Registrar; Ms Elaine Liew, Assistant Registrar

As part of the training and development programme, four Assistant Registrars (ARs) of the Supreme Court were attached to the Queen’s Bench Division of the Royal Courts of Justice (RCJ) in London in 2012.

Spending two weeks with the RCJ in June, ARs Shaun Leong and Kevin Tan managed to observe chamber hearings before the Masters of the RCJ. Other than gaining insights into the handling of interlocutory applications and other case management skills, they also spent a day at the Willesden County Court to observe how the District Judges conduct hearings. They also met with the Chief Executive Officer of the Supreme Court of the United Kingdom to better understand the workings of the highest court of the land.

ARs Chee Min Ping and Elaine Liew also had a one-week attachment with the RCJ in October. They had the privilege of witnessing one of the oldest ceremonies (other than the coronation) held in the United Kingdom, in attending the Quit
Rents ceremony as guests of Senior Master Steven Whitaker, who presided over the ceremony in his capacity as the Queen’s Remembrancer.

They also spent another week of their attachment with the Technology and Construction Court (TCC) in October. Apart from observing open court hearings and applications dealt with by the TCC judges, ARs Chee Min Ping and Elaine Liew also had the opportunity to tour the Rolls Building and meet the key members of staff of the TCC to exchange ideas on best practices on case management.

**Attachment to Supreme Court of Victoria**

By Ms Carol Liew, Director (Legal Directorate)

The Supreme Court of Victoria received Assistant Registrar (AR) Louis Ng, AR Ang Feng Qian and Ms Carol Liew, Director (Legal Directorate) for their attachment programme from 21 to 25 May 2012.

During the attachment programme, they were introduced to the various offices and functions of the Supreme Court of Victoria. They were mainly hosted by the Associate Justices and Judicial Registrars, whose roles are mainly to hear and determine issues arising before and after trial in civil cases. Amongst other responsibilities, several Associate Justices and Judicial Registrars are also actively involved in mediating cases.

The Singapore delegation also visited the various courts in Victoria such as the Court of Appeal, Commercial Court and County Court, and sat in with the hearing judges to observe proceedings.

Although Singapore and Australia share a similar common law heritage, not all court processes are similar. As such, it was a particularly insightful visit to the Juries Commissioner’s Office as the delegation had the chance to observe the process of jury selection for a criminal trial, and also the Funds in Court Office to understand the management of funds paid into court for persons under a disability.

The Australian hosts shared information regarding the various practices in the area of case management and court administration, such as judiciary-led mediation, the management of directions hearings, judiciary-led reform in the management of criminal appeal matters and the management of self-represented litigants in Victoria. The numerous dialogues and exchanges on the best practices in case management and court administration were instructive and invaluable in gaining a better understanding of various initiatives in the Supreme Court of Victoria.

The Singapore delegation also had the privilege to meet with the Honourable Chief Justice of Victoria Marilyn Warren, the President of the Court of Appeal, various Judges of the Supreme Court of Victoria, as well as the Chief Executive Officer and the staff of the various registries.
The Australian hosts were warm and most generous in sharing their time and knowledge, and the Supreme Court looks forward to extending the friendship, exchanges of information and attachments between the Supreme Court of Victoria and the Supreme Court of Singapore.

**International Conference on Electronic Disclosure and Information Governance**

By Ms Chee Min Ping, Assistant Registrar

The Honourable Justice Lee Seiu Kin, Registrar Foo Chee Hock and Assistant Registrar Chee Min Ping attended the International Conference on Electronic Disclosure and Information Governance from 14 to 16 May 2012.

Held at London’s Millennium Gloucester Hotel, the three-day event saw industry players showcasing their newest technology and software that enabled faster processing, searching and reviewing of electronically-stored information. Such technologies achieve savings in costs and time, which would often be expended in modern litigation where the voluminous electronically-stored information generated and stored by litigants is usually manually reviewed.

Several distinguished speakers such as Magistrate Judge Frank Maas (District of New York), Magistrate Judge David Waxse (District of Kansas) and Senior Master Steven Whitaker of the Queen’s Bench Division of the Royal Courts of Justice also engaged in a panel discussion on the legal and technological developments in the area of electronic disclosure.

It was an informative and rewarding conference. Speaking on their areas of expertise, practitioners and vendors also shared their experience with regard to the use of the latest technology in assisting their clients to provide discovery in litigation, and providing disclosure in the event of regulatory action taken against their clients.

---

**Brunei Darussalam Opening of the Legal Year 2012**

Registrar Foo Chee Hock and Assistant Registrar Colin Seow attended the Brunei Darussalam Opening of the Legal Year (OLY) ceremony on 13 March 2012.

Registrar in a dialogue session with the Chief Justice of Brunei Darussalam and his judicial officers, after the OLY ceremony.
## Visits by Distinguished Guests in 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Guest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 Feb</td>
<td>The Baroness O’Neill of Bengarve, House of Lords, United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mar</td>
<td>The Right Honourable Lord Philip Hope Brodie, Judge of the Supreme Courts of Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Mar</td>
<td>The Honourable Justice Dr Willy M. Mutunga, Chief Justice/President of the Supreme Court of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Mar</td>
<td>The Honourable Mr Justice Surendra Kumar Sinha, Chairman of Bangladesh Judicial Service Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Apr</td>
<td>Hon.-Prof Dr Karl-Heinz Danzl, Presiding Judge of the Austrian Supreme Court of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Apr</td>
<td>Mr Yury Sidorenko, Chairman of the Council of Judges and Justice of the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 May</td>
<td>Ms Huang Ermei, Vice President and Justice of the Supreme People’s Court of the People’s Republic of China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Jun</td>
<td>The Honourable Murray Gleeson AC QC, former Chief Justice of the High Court of Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Honourable Judith S. Kaye, former Chief Judge of the State of New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Honourable Dominique Hascher, Presiding Judge at the Court of Appeal of Reims in France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Honourable Robert Ribeiro, Permanent Judge of the Hong Kong Court of Final Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Honourable Ellen Gracie Northfleet, former Chief Justice of the Federal Supreme Court of Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Jul</td>
<td>Dr Beh Swan Gin, Permanent Secretary of Ministry of Law, Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Jul</td>
<td>Mr Eric H. Holder, Jr., Attorney General of the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Aug</td>
<td>Mr Roger N. Traves SC, President of the Bar Association of Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Aug</td>
<td>The Honourable Chief Justice Benjamin J. Odoki, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Aug</td>
<td>His Excellency Antony Phillipson, British High Commissioner to Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Sep</td>
<td>The Right Honourable The Lord Igor Judge, Lord Chief Justice of England and Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Nov</td>
<td>The Honourable Y. K. J. Yeung Sik Yuen, GOSK, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Mauritius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Nov</td>
<td>The Honourable Mr Justice Ivars Bickovics, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Latvia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT
Launch of eLitigation
By Ms Cornie Ng, Senior Assistant Registrar

The Electronic Filing System (EFS) has been in use since 2000 to electronically file (e-file) civil cases in Singapore. It revolutionised the litigation process and hastened the adoption of Information Technology in the legal sector. Today, close to two-thirds of the law firms in Singapore subscribe to EFS; more than 3 million documents have been e-filed; and over 2,000 documents are processed daily.

In 2008, the Judiciary embarked on its journey to replace EFS with a new system. The focus was on improving the litigation process through the simplification of procedures and the removal of unnecessary steps. This can be done by *inter alia* re-using the information supplied by litigants as far as possible to generate subsequent documents in the litigation process.

Expected to be launched in stages over 2013, the Integrated Electronic Litigation System (eLitigation) can be used to file documents in the Supreme Court from January 2013.

The Registry staff have been heavily involved in the review of the Registry workflow for the filing and processing of documents in tandem with the launch of eLitigation. They have started to upgrade their skills, and their jobs will be redesigned for them to become Case Management Officers. With this new role, they can shoulder more value-added responsibilities in the management of cases.
Launch of the Centralised Display Management System (CDMS)
By Mr Shaun Leong, Assistant Registrar

Launched on 23 July 2012, the Centralised Display Management System (CDMS) replaced the Electronic Queue Management System (EQMS) to provide lawyers and litigants with a more convenient process to register for court hearings.

Members of the public may also access the interactive kiosks to find out about the main services offered by the Supreme Court, view latest information on events, and browse information such as the Weekly Law Notices.

With this new system, lawyers are provided with real-time access to the Court’s hearing schedules and notices.

Supreme Court Staff Workplan Seminar
By Mr Prakash Ravi, Assistant Director (Learning and Management Directorate)

The Supreme Court’s annual Staff Workplan Seminar was held on 20 April 2012 to provide a two-year road map for the Supreme Court to achieve its goals.

Explaining the theme for the year, the Honourable the Chief Justice Chan Sek Keong said that it was selected because the Workplan would be driven by the staff and connoted the ambition to make things happen and succeed. He then elaborated on the five strategic thrusts of the Workplan, namely Documentation Review, Re-engineering Bridges, Innovation, Valuing Talent, and Excellence. Together, the culture of self-direction and the five strategic thrusts make up the theme acronym “iDRIVE”.

Documentation Review / Re-Engineering Bridges
The Chief Justice stressed the importance of documentation, running the gamut from administrative procurement documents to replies to letters from litigants and other members of the public. He further mentioned that re-engineering bridges would involve identifying gaps, creating new linkages and strengthening existing ones.

Innovation
The recently-launched Centralised Display Management System was cited as an example of an innovation method called Service Design Thinking in action.

Using Service Design Thinking as the innovation tool for the present Workplan, the Chief Justice explained that the emphasis would be on designing and delivering services that will optimally satisfy public needs.

Valuing Talent
It was also mentioned that the organisation would be re-assessing the talents of every officer. Following which, necessary training will be provided to enhance and upgrade the skills and expertise of the staff.

Excellence
The Chief Justice commented that attitude and ownership are crucial elements for a successful workplan. In order to achieve all the targets set for the current Workplan, he said that all staff must go beyond operational excellence (i.e. excellence in their specific job tasks and area of work) to attain organisational excellence in the Supreme Court.

Registrar Foo Chee Hock then touched on the operational aspects and the implementation of iDRIVE. Adding on to the Chief Justice’s words, he said that passion is the fuel for iDRIVE. The seminar then concluded with a presentation from each directorate, sharing their respective workplans for the next two years.
It was a mix of work and play at the Supreme Court Legal Colloquium, the annual gathering for the registrars and Justices’ Law Clerks.

Held on 21 September 2012, the Justices’ Law Clerks and registrars discussed and exchanged views on recent criminal law updates. Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Law, Dr Beh Swan Gin, also gave an insightful talk on re-positioning Singapore’s economic development and what this means for the legal industry in Singapore.

It was not all talk though. Participants later bonded over a thrilling game of Laser Quest at the National Service Resort and Country Club Sea Sports Centre. Exercising teamwork, they unleashed their battle cries and fought fiercely in the various exciting missions.
Organisational Accolades
The Supreme Court was presented the following three awards in 2012:

National Safety and Security Watch Group Award 2012 (Cluster Category)
The National Safety and Security Watch Group (SSWG) Award is given in recognition of the efforts of individual organisations or cluster organisations in enhancing security and safety measures. As the Supreme Court received the award in 2012, the Supreme Court will receive priority for free training opportunities on emergency-preparedness conducted by the Singapore Civil Defence Force.

Total Defence Awards – Distinguished Defence Partner Award
The Supreme Court is honoured to be awarded the Distinguished Defence Partner Award at the Total Defence Awards 2012. The award is intended as recognition for employers who have shown exemplary support for the operational readiness and defence of the nation.

Community Chest – SHARE Bronze Award
The Community Chest Award recognises organisations that have gone beyond their business interests to invest in the social service sector. The SHARE Award is conferred by the Community Chest in recognition of the Supreme Court’s outstanding contributions in helping the less fortunate within the community.

The Supreme Court is privileged to be awarded the SHARE Bronze Award in 2012.
TIMELINESS OF JUSTICE
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Workload Statistics

**Case Load and Disposal in 2012**
The Supreme Court received a total of 15,234 new civil and criminal matters in 2012. A total of 14,270 matters were disposed of in the same period. The clearance rate for all civil and criminal matters for 2012 was 94%.

The following charts show the breakdown of the case load and disposal of the civil and criminal proceedings for 2012. The resultant clearance rates\(^1\) are reflected accordingly.

### Civil Jurisdiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>&gt; Filed</th>
<th>&gt; Disposed</th>
<th>&gt; Clearance Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>90%</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,068</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,387</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Originating Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>95%</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,704</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,376</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Interlocutory Applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>108%</strong></td>
<td><strong>796</strong></td>
<td><strong>860</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals before the High Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>82%</strong></td>
<td><strong>174</strong></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals before the Court of Appeal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>99%</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications before the Court of Appeal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The percentage stated may exceed 100% when the case disposal figure is greater than the filing figure. Disposal figures may include cases filed in previous year(s) which were disposed of in the current year.

### Criminal Jurisdiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>&gt; Filed</th>
<th>&gt; Disposed</th>
<th>&gt; Clearance Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>116%</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>96%</strong></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
<td><strong>102</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Motions*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>104%</strong></td>
<td><strong>221</strong></td>
<td><strong>229</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magistrate’s Appeals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>93%</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Revisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>135%</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Appeals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures include Criminal Motions before the Court of Appeal.
Case Load and Disposal Trends
2012 saw a 16% increase in the volume of case load as compared to 2011. This was attributable to the higher volume of civil originating and interlocutory applications filed in 2012.

There was a drop in clearance rate for civil and criminal matters in 2012; from 98% in 2011 to 94% in 2012. However, the volume of cases disposed of in 2012 increased by 11% as compared to 2011.

A comparison of case load and disposal between 2011 and 2012 is illustrated in the charts that follow.

Civil Jurisdiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Originating Processes</th>
<th>7,068</th>
<th>5,757</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Interlocutory Applications</td>
<td>6,704</td>
<td>6,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals before the High Court</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals before the Court of Appeal</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications before the Court of Appeal</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

> 2011 | > 2012

Civil Jurisdiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Originating Processes</th>
<th>6,387</th>
<th>5,609</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Interlocutory Applications</td>
<td>6,376</td>
<td>5,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals before the High Court</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals before the Court of Appeal</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications before the Court of Appeal</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

> 2011 | > 2012
### Criminal Jurisdiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Cases Filed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criminal Cases</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criminal Motions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Magistrate’s Appeals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criminal Revisions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criminal Appeals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures include Criminal Motions before the Court of Appeal.*

### Criminal Jurisdiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Cases Disposed Of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criminal Cases</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criminal Motions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Magistrate’s Appeals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criminal Revisions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criminal Appeals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures include Criminal Motions before the Court of Appeal.*
Waiting Periods

The Supreme Court has set targets for waiting periods in various court processes as part of its commitment to provide quality public service.

These targets are reviewed annually to ensure that they are realistic and match international benchmarks. The Supreme Court endeavours to achieve 90% compliance with all targets set; and for the past few years, the set targets have all been consistently met.

The tables below show the average timelines for waiting periods achieved in the years 2011 and 2012. Trial dates for civil cases, in particular, were given within four weeks of the date of set down.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Proceedings</th>
<th>Target set by Department</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trials in Writ Action</strong></td>
<td>8 weeks from the date of set down to trial</td>
<td>3.1 weeks</td>
<td>2.3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Originating Summons (OS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) <em>Inter partes</em></td>
<td>5 weeks from the date of filing of the OS</td>
<td>4.3 weeks</td>
<td>4.1 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) <em>Ex parte</em></td>
<td>3 weeks from the date of filing of the OS</td>
<td>1.0 week</td>
<td>1.4 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bankruptcy OS</strong></td>
<td>6 weeks from the date of filing of the OS</td>
<td>3.4 weeks</td>
<td>4.3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Company Winding-Up OS</strong></td>
<td>4 weeks from the date of filing of the OS</td>
<td>3.4 weeks</td>
<td>3.5 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probate OS</strong></td>
<td>5 weeks from the date of filing of the OS</td>
<td>4.1 weeks</td>
<td>4.2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summons (SUM)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Summons for summary judgment pursuant to Order 14 of the Rules of Court</td>
<td>5 weeks from the date of filing of the SUM (statutory minimum period of 4.4 weeks)</td>
<td>4.6 weeks</td>
<td>4.7 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) All other summonses</td>
<td>3 weeks from the date of filing of the SUM</td>
<td>Before Judge 1.9 weeks</td>
<td>Before Judge 1.9 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Before Registrar 1.2 weeks</td>
<td>Before Registrar 1.3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probate SUM</strong></td>
<td>4 weeks from the date of filing of the SUM</td>
<td>3.1 weeks</td>
<td>2.8 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Achievement" refers to the average timelines attained for the year and excludes court vacations.

This item refers to applications for bankruptcy orders (known as bankruptcy petitions prior to April 2006) only.
### Original Criminal Jurisdiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Proceedings</th>
<th>Target set by Department</th>
<th>Achievement&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankruptcy SUM&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4 weeks from the date of filing of the SUM (statutory minimum period of 3 weeks)</td>
<td>3.9 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trials of Criminal Cases</td>
<td>6 weeks from the date of the preliminary inquiry</td>
<td>5.0 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appellate Civil Jurisdiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Proceedings</th>
<th>Target set by Department</th>
<th>Achievement&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeals to the Court of Appeal</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Civil appeals heard before 2 Judges</td>
<td>Ready to be heard within 12 weeks from the date of notification to collect the record of proceedings (ROP)</td>
<td>12.0 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Civil appeals heard before 3 Judges</td>
<td>Ready to be heard within 16 weeks from the date of notification to collect the ROP</td>
<td>15.9 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Registrar’s Appeals to the High Court Judge in Chambers      | 3 weeks from the date of filing of the appeal  
4 weeks from the date of filing of the appeal (against assessment of damages) | 2.2 weeks | 2.2 weeks       |
|                                                            |                                                               | 2.8 weeks | 2.9 weeks       |
| Appeals to the High Court from the Subordinate Courts        | 4 weeks from the date of receipt of the ROP                   | 3.3 weeks | 3.6 weeks       |

### Appellate Criminal Jurisdiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Proceedings</th>
<th>Target set by Department</th>
<th>Achievement&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeals to the Court of Appeal</td>
<td>8 weeks after the week of receipt of the last confirmation of the ROP</td>
<td>6.7 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals to the High Court from the Subordinate Courts</td>
<td>8 weeks from the date of receipt of the ROP</td>
<td>5.9 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Load and Disposal of Cases relating to Disciplinary Proceedings

By Mr Louis Ng, Assistant Registrar

Under the Legal Profession (Disciplinary Tribunal) Rules, the Disciplinary Tribunal Secretariat is established by the Supreme Court to provide administrative support to a Disciplinary Tribunal.

In 2012, the Honourable the Chief Justice appointed 11 Disciplinary Tribunals, as compared to 16 Disciplinary Tribunals in 2011. Together with seven cases brought forward from 2011, the case load of the Disciplinary Tribunal Secretariat stood at 18 cases. Of these 18 cases, the hearings for 13 cases have been completed, leaving five outstanding cases to be heard in 2013.

In the year under review, the Court of Three Judges heard 11 cases involving 10 advocates and solicitors. Of these, two advocates and solicitors were struck off the Roll of Advocates and Solicitors, one was suspended for two years, three were suspended for three months, one was fined $15,000 and one was censured. In addition, one advocate and solicitor was reinstated with conditions imposed. The Court of Three Judges also reserved judgment on a hearing involving one advocate and solicitor.
QUALITY OF JUSTICE
Significant Decisions of the Court of Appeal and the Court of Three Judges

Als Memasa and another v UBS AG [2012] 4 SLR 992
By Mr Russell Low, Justices’ Law Clerk

The appellants opened three non-discretionary accounts with the respondent, UBS AG (UBS), after two UBS officers managed to persuade them to move their funds and investments from Oversea-Chinese Banking Corporation Limited over to UBS.

Various transactions and investments were carried out under these accounts. Russian bonds, which had a face value of US$4 million at a cost of about US$3.8 million, were purchased for one of the appellants’ accounts. Their value dropped drastically less than a month after they were purchased, and the appellants’ accounts entered into margin call situations. UBS liquidated a large portion of the appellants’ investments as the appellants were unable to meet all the margin calls.

The appellants brought an action against UBS, but their action was struck out by the High Court Judge (the Judge) on the basis that the appellants had abused the court’s process by advancing a false case, in pleading “a cause of action which they knew must be untrue for many, if not all, [of] the transactions executed by UBS,” and subsequently tailoring their claims to suit the evidence disclosed by UBS in its striking out application.

The appellants’ application to amend the Statement of Claim was also dismissed. While the Judge found that there was some evidence that one of the Russian bonds transactions might have been executed without the appellants’ prior instructions, he held that the first appellant had subsequently affirmed the transaction.

The Judge held further that the appellants were precluded from relying on any misrepresentation because of the non-reliance clauses found in the bank documents. The Judge also considered the appellants’ arguments on the defence of non est factum and held that they were bound to fail. The appellants then appealed.

The Court of Appeal allowed the appeal as there was insufficient documentary evidence showing that the first appellant had authorised the purchase of the bonds. The appellants’ limited claim based on the losses arising from the purchase of the Russian bonds was therefore allowed to go to trial.

If the purchase of the Russian bonds was indeed unauthorised, and UBS’s officer had misrepresented the nature of and risks inherent in the Russian
bonds in order to induce the first appellant to affirm the transaction and continue holding the bonds, it would not amount to a valid affirmation of the unauthorised purchase in law; there could be no affirmation by the first appellant without a sufficient understanding of what she was affirming.

The Court of Appeal also stated that the non-reliance clauses contained in the bank documents could not immunise UBS from liability for unauthorised transactions, even though they were intended to immunise the banks and financial institutions from liability for post-contractual representations made by their officers.

In light of the allegations made against many financial institutions for “mis-selling” complex financial products, uninformed customers might have been persuaded to sign documents containing non-reliance clauses without truly understanding their potential legal effect on any form of misconduct or negligence on the part of the officers who have recommended the investments to them.

Therefore, it might be desirable for the courts to reconsider whether financial institutions should be accorded full immunity for such “misconduct” by relying on non-reliance clauses.

Centillion Environment & Recycling Ltd (formerly known as Citiraya Industries Ltd) v Public Prosecutor and others and another appeal [2013] 1 SLR 444

By Ms Melissa Mak, Justices’ Law Clerk

Ng Teck Lee (Ng) was the Chief Executive Officer of Citiraya Industries Ltd (Citiraya) – now renamed Centillion Environment & Recycling Ltd (Centillion). He misappropriated computer chips sent to Citiraya for the recovery of precious metals. He made profits of over US$51 million from this fraudulent scheme and later absconded from Singapore.

This appeal arose from an application by the Public Prosecutor (PP) for a confiscation order against Ng under the Corruption, Drug Trafficking and Other Serious Crimes (Confiscation of Benefits) Act (CDSA).

The PP obtained a confiscation order against Ng for US$51 million, the value of the benefits derived from his criminal conduct, and sought to realise various assets to satisfy the confiscation order. Centillion also filed a suit against Ng for breach of his fiduciary duties as a director and obtained a default judgment for the sum of S$51 million.

Under s 13 of the CDSA, a third party who asserts “an interest in the property” may apply to court for an order declaring the nature, extent, and value of his interest if he: (a) was not involved in the defendant’s criminal conduct; and (b)
acquired the interest for sufficient consideration and without knowing that the property was involved in or derived from criminal conduct.

Centillion and other parties intervened in the proceedings brought by the PP to realise assets held in Ng’s and his wife’s names. Centillion argued that it had an “interest” on the basis of its right to execute its judgment debt against Ng’s property.

The Court of Appeal observed that assets were attached to strip wrongdoers of their ill-gotten gains, not to deprive innocent third parties of their legitimate property rights. Section 13 sought to balance the efficacy of the enforcement of the confiscation order with the interests of third parties.

However, Centillion’s right to execute the judgment debt was an *in personam* right that did not give Centillion a proprietary interest in Ng’s properties; Centillion had not acquired any “interest” in Ng’s properties for sufficient consideration. Thus, Centillion’s unsatisfied judgment debt did not give Centillion an “interest” for the purposes of s 13. Centillion was nonetheless able to establish an “interest” in various other properties which were traceable to the illegal proceeds and therefore held on constructive trust for Centillion.

The Court of Appeal also considered the definition of “realisable property” in the CDSA and held that the definition covered all properties held by a third party, whenever acquired, if that third party had received certain types of gifts from the defendant.

The PP was therefore entitled to realise all the properties held by Ng’s wife as she had received various gifts of money from Ng. This was subject to the qualifications that the PP was not entitled to realise more than the value of the gift, and that the Court had discretion to order how such assets were to be realised in satisfaction of the confiscation order.

---

**Kim Gwang Seok v Public Prosecutor [2012] 4 SLR 821**

*By Mr Elgin Tay, Justices’ Law Clerk*

The appellant was charged under the Misuse of Drugs Act for engaging in a conspiracy to export diamorphine from Singapore to Australia. The High Court dismissed his criminal motion seeking leave to allow five Korean nationals to testify for him at his impending trial via video link from Korea. The High Court held that s 346A of the Criminal Procedure Code (s 364A) only allowed witnesses physically present in Singapore to testify via video link in criminal proceedings if its prescribed conditions were met. The appellant subsequently appealed.

The appeal was dismissed by the Court of Appeal, which held that s 364A should not be applied to allow witnesses who were physically outside Singapore to give evidence via video link for criminal proceedings in Singapore because of the potential problem of foreign witnesses giving false evidence to exonerate accused persons, particularly in cases involving drug offences.
Noting other difficulties with the appellant’s application, the Court said that since none of the witnesses were below 16 years of age, the appellant could not satisfy s 364A(1)(a), which allowed witnesses below 16 years of age to give evidence in a criminal proceeding through video link. Neither could the appellant rely on s 364A(1)(b), as it only applied to the specific offences prescribed under s 364A(2). An offence under the Misuse of Drugs Act was not one such offence. The Court held that there was no room for judicial discretion to allow witnesses to testify via video link in circumstances outside those prescribed by s 364A.

In relation to the respondent’s argument that the Court did not have the jurisdiction under s 29A(2) of the Supreme Court of Judicature Act (s 29A(2)) to hear the appeal, the Court opined in obiter that the nature of the criminal motion was very different from that of the applications made in the previous cases in which s 29A(2) was considered and applied. The criminal motion was an interlocutory decision made by a Judge of the High Court in relation to a case which was pending, and if the criminal motion was made at the time of the trial, it would appear that the High Court’s decision would be one made in exercise of the High Court’s “original criminal jurisdiction” under s 29A(2).

**Low Chai Ling v Singapore Medical Council [2013] 1 SLR 83**

*By Ms Kok Li-en, Justices’ Law Clerk*

Low Chai Ling (the applicant) was a general practitioner who carried out non-invasive aesthetic treatments. She was charged with seven counts of professional misconduct for not treating patients according to generally accepted methods, and offering treatments which were not generally accepted by the medical profession, in violation of the Singapore Medical Council’s (SMC) Ethical Code and Ethical Guidelines.

The SMC’s Disciplinary Committee (DC) convicted her of five of the seven charges on the basis that those treatments did not meet the threshold required by evidence-based medicine (EBM). The applicant later appealed against the DC’s decision, and the High Court allowed the appeal.

The charges against the applicant were deemed to be inadequate for failing to accord with the reason given for the initiation of the disciplinary proceedings. At the hearing, the SMC stated that the proceedings arose because the applicant had failed to stop the procedures despite receiving a letter from the Ministry of Health. In actuality, the charges related to the applicant allegedly carrying out non-EBM aesthetic procedures prior to the first letter to her. In addition, the charges were vague and did not give the applicant adequate notice of what she was being charged for. There was also a failure to make clear whether the alternative and distinct elements in the charges were supposed to be considered as cumulative requirements.
The SMC’s position towards which aesthetic treatments were acceptable was ambiguous before the Guidelines on Aesthetic Treatments for Doctors released in 2008 (the 2008 Guidelines) were issued. Given those circumstances, doctors should not have been punished for administering aesthetic procedures which were deemed by the SMC not to be evidence-based only well after the alleged offences. It was a cardinal tenet of the rule of law that a person should only be punished for offending laws, regulations or professional practices that had been both known and clearly established at the time of offending.

The DC also failed to explain how the applicant’s conduct corresponded to its own understanding of what constituted professional misconduct. Instead of using abstract explanations, the focus ought to have been on the actual conduct of the applicant in relation to her patients. Even if the applicant’s conduct was seen as defiant by the SMC, it was not of sufficient gravity to constitute professional misconduct.

In addition, it was also observed that the 2008 Guidelines were meant to target conduct disreputable to the medical profession, rather than professional misconduct. There was no health or medical reason why a doctor may not provide beauty treatments; the only reason why he/she should not was that he/she may bring the medical profession into disrepute.

**Mano Vikrant Singh v Cargill TSF Asia Pte Ltd**

*By Ms Ailene Chou, Justices’ Law Clerk*

The Court of Appeal clarified that a provision forfeiting bonuses earned in the event that an employee left employment and competed with his ex-employer (the Forfeiture Provision) was in restraint of trade.

The crucial issue was whether the content of the Forfeiture Provision involved a restraint, and not whether the employee had a choice to compete.

The Forfeiture Provision was in restraint of trade because it dealt with monies to which the appellant was legally entitled under his deferred bonus scheme, and it sought to restrain the appellant from leaving the employer to join a competitor by threatening to forfeit substantial monies which had already vested in the appellant.

Additionally, the Court emphasised that this approach did not dictate methods for employers to retain their top talent, as the Forfeiture Provision would be valid if it had also been reasonable.

The Forfeiture Provision was also different from a Payment-for-loyalty clause, which was an additional payment made to the employee as an incentive for
him or her to continue in the employment of the employer. A Payment-for-loyalty clause did not deal with vested monies or purport to govern the post-termination activities of an ex-employee.

The Court finally observed that if the facts resulted in a reasonable expectation on the part of the employee that he or she would be entitled to the benefit concerned, then the clause which sought to forfeit such a benefit might still come within the scope of the restraint of trade doctrine even if it did not deal with vested monies. This would only apply in exceptional circumstances drawing from the criteria that governed the doctrine of equitable estoppel.

**PT Prima International Development v Kempinski Hotels SA & other appeals [2012] 4 SLR 98**

By Ms Andrea Gan, Justices’ Law Clerk

Kempinski Hotels SA (Kempinski) commenced arbitration proceedings against PT Prima International Development (Prima) alleging that Prima had wrongfully terminated a Management Contract under which Kempinski was to manage Prima’s hotel in Indonesia.

Prima pleaded the defence of supervening illegality and *force majeure* arising from earlier decisions of the Indonesian Ministry of Tourism which made it illegal for foreign entities to manage hotels in Indonesia unless they complied with certain conditions (which Kempinski did not).

The arbitrator issued four interim arbitral awards with the eventual result that Kempinski’s claims wholly failed. The arbitrator also issued an award on costs in favour of Prima.

Kempinski applied to court to set aside the third and fourth awards and the costs award on the basis that: (a) the third and fourth awards dealt with issues that had not been formally pleaded; (b) the arbitrator was *functus officio* when he issued those awards; (c) Prima should have been barred by issue estoppel from raising a new fact after the second award was issued; and (d) there was a breach of natural justice.

The High Court Judge (the Judge) set aside both the third and fourth awards on the basis that they were based on unpleaded matters, while Kempinski’s other three arguments were rejected. The costs award was set aside as a corollary. Prima appealed against the Judge’s decisions and Kempinski cross-appealed.

The Court of Appeal held that the scope of the parties’ submission to arbitration was determined by the parties’ pleaded case. It was unnecessary for Prima to plead the new fact by way of amendments to the Points of Defence and Counterclaim because any new fact or change in the law arising in the course of the arbitration which would affect Kempinski’s right to the remedies sought must fall within the scope of the parties’ submission to arbitration.
The Court of Appeal also held that the *functus officio* and issue estoppel arguments failed because the issues decided in all the awards were distinct from one another. The allegation of breach of natural justice was also not made out on the facts.

The Court of Appeal further held that public policy was a question of law which an arbitrator must take cognisance of if he became aware of it. The remedies which an arbitrator could award were limited by public policy considerations.

In the result, Prima’s appeals were allowed while Kempinski’s cross-appeal was dismissed.

---

**Ramalingam Ravinthran v Attorney-General [2012] 2 SLR 49**

By Ms Sarah Shi, Justices’ Law Clerk

The Court of Appeal was asked to consider the interaction between the prosecutorial discretion in Art 35(8) of the Constitution of the Republic of Singapore (the Constitution), and the right to equality before the law under Art 12(1) of the Constitution (Art 12(1)).

Even though the applicant had failed to avail himself of two prior opportunities to raise the constitutional point, the Court heard the criminal motion as it was a novel point. The Court affirmed the exceptions to the finality principle in criminal cases as stated in *Yong Vui Kong v PP* [2010] 2 SLR 192 at [15]–[16].

Under Art 12(1), the Prosecution was required to give unbiased consideration to all potential defendants and not to take into account irrelevant considerations.

All other things being equal, potential defendants involved in the same criminal conduct should be charged with the same offence. However, the Prosecution was entitled and obliged to take into account many factors in its charging decisions. Where those factors applied differently to different potential defendants, this would justify differential treatment between them.

Until proven otherwise, the courts should presume that the Attorney-General’s prosecutorial decisions were constitutional or lawful. This presumption stemmed from the separation of powers doctrine, as well as the constitutional standing of the Attorney-General’s office.

If the defendant who alleged that his prosecution was unconstitutional could produce *prima facie* evidence of the alleged unconstitutionality, the Attorney-General would then come under an evidentiary burden to justify his prosecutorial decision. There was, however, no general obligation for the Attorney-General to disclose his reasons for making a particular prosecutorial decision.
The Prosecution’s practice of reducing the quantity of drugs specified in a charge under the Misuse of Drugs Act in order to charge a defendant differently from his co-offender was permitted by law, provided that such a decision was made for legitimate reasons.

The differentiation in charges between co-offenders of equal guilt was not in itself enough to constitute *prima facie* evidence of bias or the taking into account of irrelevant considerations.

The criminal motion was dismissed as the applicant had not proved a *prima facie* case of violation of Art 12(1).

The Court also observed that the Attorney-General was required to use the prosecutorial power in the public interest to maintain law and order, and this did not require that every offender be prosecuted, or that an offender be prosecuted for the most serious possible offence.

*Sarika Connoisseur Cafe Pte Ltd v Ferrero SpA* [2013] 1 SLR 531

By Ms Jurena Chan, Justices’ Law Clerk

The appellant, owner and operator of the TCC café outlet chain, was sued by the respondent for using the sign “Nutello” in the course of trade on a beverage it sold. The respondent was the manufacturer and retailer of the “Nutella” cream spread, and was also the registered proprietor of the “Nutella” trade marks.

The claims on appeal involved trade mark infringement under s 27(2)(b) of the Trade Marks Act (TMA), infringement of well-known trade mark under s 55(2) TMA, infringement by damaging connection of well-known trade mark under s 55(3)(a) TMA, dilution by blurring of well-known trade mark under s 55(3)(b)(i) TMA, and the tort of passing off. The appeal was dismissed by the Court of Appeal.

The Court clarified that for a trade mark infringement claim under s 27(2)(b) TMA, the proper comparison in determining similarity of goods was not that between the alleged infringing goods and the actual goods of the trade mark owner, but rather, the comparison should be made between the alleged infringing goods and the products for which the trade mark was registered. In this case, the Court compared the “Nutello” beverage and the “chocolate product” registration specification. Additionally, the Court observed that the factors listed in *British Sugar plc v James Robertson & Sons Ltd* [1996] RPC 281 (at 296) were not entirely helpful in conducting the similarity analysis as they were premised on comparing two actual products, whereas the specification of the “Nutella” trade marks extended to products that had not yet been produced by the respondent. Separately, in determining whether there was a likelihood of confusion on the facts of a case, the Court observed that it would take a holistic view of the circumstances, including a consideration of “extraneous factors” (these were matters outside and beyond the trade marks and goods themselves, such as steps taken to differentiate one’s goods from that of the registered proprietor’s).
In relation to the dilution by blurring claim under s 55(3)(b)(i) TMA, the Court observed that the essence of this claim was the weakening of the trade mark's ability to identify goods. Such a claim could be made in relation to both similar and dissimilar products. The Court made clear that both a trade mark infringement claim and a trade mark dilution claim could be made out on a given set of facts, explaining that both these perceptions were possible amongst various members of the public as to a given trade mark. The Court also said that for a dilution by blurring claim under s 55(3)(b)(i) TMA, it was sufficient to show a real or serious probability of damage, rather than actual damage, to the well-known trade mark's advertising quality or symbolic function. The relevant public must be shown to make a connection or link between the sign and the trade mark, and that a real and serious likelihood of damage to the distinctive character of the mark would therefore result.

In this case, the Court found that it was highly likely that the relevant public would draw a link between the “Nutello” sign and the “Nutella” trade marks. The appellant, in using the “Nutello” sign on its beverage, created a real and serious likelihood that the distinctiveness of the respondent’s “Nutella” trade marks would be weakened and lost over time, diminishing their ability to conjure immediate association with the respondent’s products.

**Tan Eng Hong v Attorney-General [2012] 4 SLR 476**

By Ms Sarah Shi, Justices’ Law Clerk

The applicant was granted leave to pursue a constitutional challenge against s 377A of the Penal Code (s 377A) for an arguable inconsistency with Arts 9, 12 and 14 of the Constitution of the Republic of Singapore (the Constitution).

Specifically targeted at sexually-active male homosexuals, the plain language of s 377A excluded both male-female acts and female-female acts. This arguably violated its target group’s rights under Art 12(1) of the Constitution. As a member of that group, the applicant’s rights had arguably been violated by the mere existence of s 377A. There was also a real and credible threat of prosecution under s 377A.

Under Art 9(1) of the Constitution (Art 9(1)), an accused person had a right not to be detained under an unconstitutional law. As s 377A was arguably unconstitutional, the applicant’s right to personal liberty under Art 9(1) would have been violated by his arrest and detention under s 377A, if s 377A was indeed unconstitutional.

The “real interest” requirement was *prima facie* made out once there was a violation of a constitutional right.

A real controversy had been constituted in the present case by the applicant’s arrest, investigation, detention and charge under s 377A; and the real and credible threat of prosecution under s 377A.
While the applicant’s arrest and detention under s 377A could equally have proceeded under s 294(a) of the Penal Code, the critical difference lay in the legality of the actual detention. It was only through a strained process of *ex post facto* rationalisation that one could say that an alternative lawful avenue for detaining the applicant was available at the material time.

*Tan Hwee Lee v Tan Cheng Guan and another appeal and another matter [2012] 4 SLR 785*

By Mr Koo Zhi Xuan, Justices’ Law Clerk

The Court of Appeal laid down the general rule that, under s 112(10) of the Women’s Charter (the Act), “pure” inter-spousal gifts, meaning assets given by one spouse to the other during marriage which did not originate from a third-party or inheritance, were considered matrimonial assets for the purposes of division.

However, third-party gifts, inheritances, and inter-spousal gifts which originated from a third-party gift or inheritance, would not be included in the pool of matrimonial assets.

In this case, the wife had submitted that the property, abbreviated as “32 SHD”, was gifted to her by the husband which brought it outside the pool of matrimonial assets.

The Court of Appeal however decided that since 32 SHD did not originate from a third-party gift or inheritance, it was a “pure” inter-spousal gift and was therefore considered a matrimonial asset for division.

The Court stated that *de minimis* inter-spousal gifts were the only exception to the general rule, and may be excluded from the pool of matrimonial assets. The concepts of “proprietary interests” and “inequity”, however, no longer constituted exceptions to the general rule.

In order to achieve a fair, equitable division of the matrimonial assets, the Court held that the nature and context of the inter-spousal gift could be taken into consideration via s 112(1) of the Act. In cases where it would be “clearly inequitable” to award a donor spouse a substantial share in the asset constituting the inter-spousal gift (or in the form of other assets), the Court could take this into account under s 112(1) of the Act, and award the donee spouse a greater percentage of the overall matrimonial assets.

However, the Court held that it would only be “clearly inequitable” for a donor spouse to benefit from the asset constituting the inter-spousal gift under the s 112(1) approach if it was evidentially certain that the gift was made in contemplation of divorce.
In this case, the Court found the purpose behind and the circumstances surrounding the inter-spousal gift to be objectively unclear.

Given the ambiguous evidence, the Court decided that the wife had failed to show that it would be clearly inequitable for the husband to benefit from 32 SHD being in the pool of matrimonial assets.

Lee Wee Lick Terence (alias Li Weili Terence) v Chua Say Eng (formerly trading as Weng Fatt Construction Engineering) and another appeal [2013] 1 SLR 401
By Ms Choo Yi Ming, Justices’ Law Clerk

The Court of Appeal held that the Building and Construction Industry Security of Payment Act (the Act) did not require a payment claim to state that it was made under the Act. If a payment claim satisfied all formal requirements found in s 10(3)(a) of the Act and reg 5(2) of the Security of Payment Regulations (the SOPR), the absence of such a statement would not make it any less of a payment claim. Since the payment claim in question satisfied these requirements, it was a valid payment claim under the Act.

The Court of Appeal held that reg 5(1) of the SOPR did not compel a claimant to make monthly payment claims for work done in the previous month. Rather, it imposed a maximum frequency of one payment claim per month. On the facts of the case, the payment claim in question was not served out of time.

The Court of Appeal also outlined the respective roles of the authorised nominating body, the adjudicator and the court in the scheme of the Act. The authorised nominating body’s function was largely administrative in nature when appointing an adjudicator. It was for the court to decide if the adjudicator was validly appointed to adjudicate the matter. Even if the adjudicator was validly appointed, the court might still set aside the adjudication determination on the ground that the claimant, in the course of making an adjudication application, had not complied with one (or more) of the provisions under the Act which was so important that it was the legislative purpose that an act done in breach of that provision should be invalid.

The “Bunga Melati 5” [2012] 4 SLR 546
By Mr Koo Zhi Xuan, Justices’ Law Clerk

The appellant alleged that it had entered into a contractual relationship based on the doctrine of agency by estoppel with the respondent, under which the appellant would supply bunkers to several of the respondent’s vessels.

When the appellant did not receive full payment in respect of the bunkers supplied, it took legal action against the respondent. Its claim was however struck out by the Assistant Registrar and the High Court Judge under O 18 r 19 of the Rules of Court (the ROC).
The Court of Appeal overturned the High Court Judge’s decision and laid down some guiding principles on when a claim should be struck out. A claim should be struck out only if it was legally unsustainable or factually unsustainable. A legally unsustainable claim was one which would not entitle a party to the remedy sought as a matter of law even if the party succeeded in proving all the facts. A factually unsustainable claim was one where the factual basis for the claim was entirely without substance.

In this case, the Court held that the appellant’s claim could not be said to be factually unsustainable, as a court should not in a striking out application choose between conflicting accounts of crucial facts. It also held that the appellant’s claim was not legally unsustainable, as it was not clear beyond question that the legal elements of the appellant’s claim could not be satisfied should the matter proceed to trial.

The Court also clarified that its decision in The Vasily Golovnin [2008] 4 SLR(R) 994 did not introduce a new merits requirement for the invoking of admiralty jurisdiction. The distinction drawn by the High Court Judge between challenging admiralty jurisdiction under O 12 r 7 of the ROC vis-à-vis striking out a plaintiff’s claim under O 18 r 19 of the ROC was affirmed.

Finally, the Court of Appeal restated the five-step process that a plaintiff had to undergo to establish admiralty jurisdiction when challenged by the other party:

(a) Prove, on the balance of probabilities, that the jurisdictional facts under the limb it was relying on in s 3(1)(d) to (q) of the High Court (Admiralty Jurisdiction) Act existed; and show an arguable case that its claim was of the type or nature required by the relevant statutory provision;

(b) Prove, on the balance of probabilities, that the claim arose in connection with a ship;

(c) Identify, without having to show in argument, the person who would be liable on the claim in an action in personam;

(d) Prove, on the balance of probabilities, that the relevant person was, when the cause of action arose, the owner or charterer of, or in possession or in control of, the ship;

(e) Prove, on the balance of probabilities, that the relevant person was, at the time when the action was brought: (i) the beneficial owner of the offending ship as respects all the shares in it or the charterer of that ship under a demise charter; or (ii) the beneficial owner of the sister ship as respects all the shares in it.
Yong Vui Kong v Public Prosecutor [2012] 2 SLR 872
By Mr Tan Zhongshan, Justices' Law Clerk

Having been convicted of drug trafficking and sentenced to the mandatory death penalty, the applicant alleged that the decision of the Prosecution to charge him with a capital offence was contrary to Art 12(1) of the Constitution of the Republic of Singapore (the Constitution) because it had obtained a discontinuance not amounting to an acquittal of both the capital and non-capital charges against his boss and supplier, Chia Choon Leng (Chia). It was Chia who instigated the applicant to transport drugs from Johor Bahru into Singapore. Chia was instead detained under the Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) Act (CL(TP)A).

The applicant asked the Court of Appeal to rule that his right under Art 12(1) of the Constitution to equality before the law and equal protection of the law had been violated by the Prosecution’s decision.

The Court of Appeal held that the applicant had not proven that his right under Art 12(1) of the Constitution had been breached. Chia was detained under the CL(TP)A not because the Prosecution had practised unlawful discrimination, but because it was of the opinion that there was insufficient evidence to convict him even though it had reason to believe that he might have been involved in drug trafficking activities in Singapore. Further, even if the Prosecution had proceeded with the capital charges against Chia, he would have been acquitted because the alleged instigation by Chia of the applicant had taken place outside Singapore.

The Court of Appeal observed that even if the applicant had proven that his right under Art 12(1) of the Constitution had been breached, it had no power to set aside the applicant’s conviction for that reason alone since there was nothing wrong in law or in fact with the conviction.

Recent amendments to the Practice Directions and Rules of Court
By Ms Eunice Chua, Assistant Registrar

Various amendments were made to the Supreme Court Practice Directions (the Practice Directions) and the Rules of Court in 2012.

With effect from 1 March 2012, Part IVA of the Practice Directions relating to electronic discovery (e-Discovery) was amended following feedback from public consultation. The amendment clarified the Court’s power to order e-Discovery, as well as the scope of e-Discovery. It also recommended the categories of cases where e-Discovery should be considered, provided definitions of technical terms, introduced a checklist of issues to facilitate discussions between parties, and permitted parties to conduct discovery by the direct exchange of electronic copies.
Practice Directions Amendment No. 2 of 2012, with effect from 16 April 2012, introduced paragraph 88A, which reflected a practice recently implemented in the Supreme Court for the Court to fix costs at the end of a hearing or trial, in lieu of ordering taxation.

Practice Directions Amendment No. 3 of 2012, to be read together with the Rules of Court (Amendment No. 5) Rules and the Criminal Procedure Code (Electronic Filing and Service) Regulations 2012, was enacted to facilitate the implementation of the Integrated Electronic Litigation System (eLitigation) in the Supreme Court on 1 January 2013. These amendments simplified and streamlined existing procedures by leveraging on technology. Due to the various amendments required to the Practice Directions, a second edition of the electronic Practice Directions (e-PD) was published in December 2012.

On 24 February 2012, 28 May 2012, 16 July 2012, 30 November 2012 and 5 December 2012, amendments to the Rules of Court were gazetted. The amendments were necessitated by the implementation of eLitigation, as well as amendments to the Evidence Act, the International Arbitration Act, and the Voluntary Sterilization Act.

These amendments enacted a new Order - Order 104. This order provides the necessary framework when making an application to the Court for a declaration that sterilization is necessary in the best interests of the relevant person.

Other significant amendments include amendments to Order 40A, where expert evidence is now allowed to be given concurrently with the consent of the parties and the leave of the Court. The procedure for the taking of concurrent expert evidence is outlined in the new Order 40A rule 6, where the Court is given discretion to give such directions as necessary. Order 34A was also amended to allow trial Judges to have access to communications during pre-trial conferences that have not been marked “confidential” or “without prejudice”.

Order 55C was amended to bring in line the procedure for further arguments in the Subordinate Courts with that in the High Court, pursuant to a suggestion made by Quentin Loh Sze-On J in Lim Kok Boon (Lin Guowen) v Lee Poh King Melissa [2012] 2 SLR 1082.

Since the introduction of the e-PD and the electronic Rules of Court (e-ROC), the Supreme Court has captured all amendments to the Practice Directions and the Rules of Court online in real time.
ACCESSIBILITY TO THE COURTS
ACCESSIBILITY TO THE COURTS

By Mr Khurshed Haron, Head (Corporate Communications Directorate)

Public Outreach and Engagement

In a bid to increase accessibility of the Courts to the public, the Supreme Court conducted various educational and awareness programmes that focused on the role of the Judiciary and the Singapore legal system.

In 2012, the Supreme Court welcomed over 12,000 local and foreign visitors. The visitors ranged from foreign Judges and law practitioners to students and teachers. Through the visits, the visitors were able to gain an insight into Singapore’s legal history and the work of the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court also continued to engage its authorised educational partners such as the Singapore History Consultants to conduct guided tours of the Supreme Court, in a bid to reach out to a wider audience.

*The Learning Court*, an interactive platform designed for users to learn about the judicial system and the different kinds of court proceedings, was launched on 29 October 2012 to better educate and engage the younger generation.

Students from CHIJ St. Nicholas Girls’ School were some of many who have benefitted from the Public Outreach and Engagement programmes organised by the Supreme Court. Aside from learning about the Court’s heritage and facilities, they also participated in role-playing games in a mock courtroom setting in *The Learning Court*, watched video enactments of a criminal trial, and had the chance to try on Judges’ gowns from different jurisdictions such as Hong Kong and South Korea.

 Visitors have provided feedback that learning is made more effective through the combination of a guided tour around the Supreme Court and the hands-on experience they get while visiting *The Learning Court*. This has allowed them to share with others what they have learnt about the Singapore legal system and the Supreme Court.
Corporate Challenge
By Mr Noah Chan, Organisational Development Specialist

64 members of the Supreme Court’s management team spent a day at Sentosa for the annual Corporate Challenge on 23 March 2012.

Beginning with a highly-competitive Hextium Pricing Exercise, the staff reinforced their values of collaboration through role-play. They then had the chance to reflect on ways in which greater success could be achieved in real situations through collaboration instead of competition.

For the second part of the programme, they were divided into smaller teams for the thrilling Geo-caching Challenge. Like the Amazing Race, this team-building game had the participants running around Sentosa to complete various tasks at different challenge stations.

Some of the key activities the staff had the opportunity to try were the Sea Kayak, Luge and Skyride, and the Segway Personal Transporter. For many, it was their first attempt on the Segway, a two-wheeled self-balancing means of personal transport.

These activities were aimed at taking participants out of their comfort zones for an impactful learning experience. It encouraged each team to consider the strengths and limitations of its members, as well as to think outside the box to achieve success.
Learning Day
By Ms Katy Tay, Assistant Director (Corporate Services Directorate)

The Learning Never Stops
Supreme Court’s Learning Day took place on 8 May 2012. It was a day dedicated to encourage continual learning and sharing of both work- and non-work-related topics in a fun and interactive way.

Through experiential learning activities organised at nine booths, the staff had the opportunity to try their hand at an array of activities such as learning to play Go (Wei Qi), learning musical instruments like the keyboard and the ukulele, deciphering cryptography, and appreciating the English Premier League and Formula One car racing.

Other highlights included learning the art of Chinese tea brewing and tea appreciation, and learning and testing out the various QR codes, digital transcription services, and upcoming IT systems. The staff also refreshed their knowledge of the work processes of the various directorates by taking part in quizzes.

It was also the first time that three of the Supreme Court’s Hobby Clubs put up programmes on the central stage. The Food Club sent everybody drooling as they demonstrated how to make mouth-watering “fusion spring rolls”. The Art and Craft Club taught the staff the technique of making earrings as unique gifts with a personalised touch, and the Community Services Club enacted a humorous skit, imparting valuable tips on interacting with the elderly.

Encapsulating the continual learning and innovative spirit of the Supreme Court, Learning Day proved to be an educational, enjoyable and memorable event for all participants.
Staff Awards
A number of Supreme Court staff members were proud recipients of various prestigious awards in 2012.

2012 PS21 Star Service Awards
For their commitment to excellence in Public Service, these two officers were presented with the PS21 Star Service Award in May 2012:

Mr Ho Nyuk Chang, Chief Bailiff/Senior Case Manager
Ms Rageswari d/o Suppiah, Indian Interpreter

2012 Excellent Service Award (Silver)
Mr Ho Nyuk Chang was also presented the 2012 Excellent Service Award (Silver).

2012 National Day Awards
In recognition of their contributions and service, five members of the staff were presented the National Day Awards in August 2012:

The Public Administration Medal (Silver)
Ms Teh Hwee Hwee, Deputy Registrar

The Commendation Medal
Mr Lim Cher Yeow, Head (Chinese Interpreters)

The Efficiency Medal
Ms Haryati Bte Sungit, Private Secretary to the Registrar

The Long Service Medal
Mr Chong Hoong Sang, Director (Corporate Planning)
Ms Haryati Bte Jumahat, Deputy Head (Originating Summons, Insolvency and Specialised Section)
Staff Welfare Activities
By Ms Selina Khor, Senior Assistant Director (Corporate Services Directorate)

A plethora of welfare activities was organised in 2012 to encourage the Supreme Court staff to bond and to promote camaraderie.

The first was a meal-and-outing activity in February. Organised separately by each directorate of the Supreme Court, it aimed to build rapport and maintain excellent relations between co-workers.

In full support of work-life balance, “Eat with Your Family Day” was held on 25 May 2012 as an endorsement of family bonding. On that day, all staff were allowed to leave 30 minutes earlier to encourage them to enjoy a meal with their loved ones.

Corporate cards for places of interest like the Jurong Bird Park, Singapore Flyer and Science Centre were also acquired to enhance family cohesiveness for staff. With these cards, staff were able to bring their families out for a day of fun and excitement.

The Judiciary Recreation Club also organised the annual Dinner and Dance and held a Movies Night for staff of both the Supreme Court and the Subordinate Courts to unwind and relax.

To bring festive cheer to all staff, fruits and goodies were distributed during festivals such as Chinese New Year, Hari Raya Puasa, Deepavali and Christmas.

Observance ceremonies were also held in 2012 for National Day and the Public Service Week, for staff to reaffirm their loyalty to the nation and their commitment to the ideals of public service in Singapore.
## Corporate Calendar 2012

### JANUARY
- **6 JAN**
  Opening of the Legal Year / Opening of the Legal Year Dinner
- **10 JAN**
  Opening of the Legal Year Staff Lunch

### MARCH
- **3 MAR**
  2nd Joint Judicial Conference
- **23 MAR**
  Corporate Challenge

### APRIL
- **20 APR**
  Staff Workplan Seminar
- **27 APR**
  Tripartite Lunch 2012

### MAY
- **2 MAY**
  Second Annual ISO 9001:2008 Surveillance Audit
- **8 MAY**
  Learning Day
- **10 MAY**
  Learning Day
- **18 MAY**
  Dinner for the Judiciary and Forum of Senior Counsel
- **20 MAY**
  Staff Workplan Seminar
- **22 MAY**
  Public Service Week Observance Ceremony
- **25 MAY**
  Eat with Your Family Day
- **28 MAY**
  Mass Call

### JUNE
- **3 JUN**
  Corporate Challenge

### JULY
- **9 – 12 JUL**
  24th ISO 9001:2008 Internal Audit
- **21 JUL**
  Staff Workplan Seminar
- **22 JUL**
  Corporate Challenge

### AUGUST
- **3 AUG**
  National Day Observance Ceremony
- **24 AUG**
  Judiciary Recreation Club Dinner and Dance

### SEPTEMBER
- **19 SEP**
  24th ISO 9001:2008 Management Review Meeting
- **21 SEP**
  Legal Colloquium

### OCTOBER
- **4 – 5 OCT**
  Alternative Dispute Resolution Conference
- **29 OCT**
  Launch of *The Learning Court*
- **30 OCT**
  Legal Assistance Scheme for Capital Offences (LASCO) Dinner

### NOVEMBER
- **5 NOV**
  Launch of the book “The Law in His Hands: A Tribute to Chief Justice Chan Sek Keong” and Chief Justice (CJ) Chan’s Farewell
- **7 NOV**
  CJ Sundaresh Menon’s Swearing-In Ceremony at the Istana
- **9 NOV**
  CJ Menon’s Welcome Tea with Staff
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