

IN THE HIGH COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

[2016] SGHC 239

Originating Summons No 816 of 2015

Between

- 1. LEE WEI LING**
- 2. LEE HSIEN YANG**

And

ATTORNEY-GENERAL

SUPPLEMENTAL JUDGMENT

[Contract] — [Contractual terms]
[Copyright] — [Ownership]

This judgment is subject to final editorial corrections to be approved by the court and/or redaction pursuant to the publisher's duty in compliance with the law, for publication in LawNet and/or the Singapore Law Reports.

**Lee Wei Ling and another
v
Attorney-General**

[2016] SGHC 239

High Court — Originating Summons No 816 of 2015
Tay Yong Kwang JA
21 October 2016

21 October 2016

Tay Yong Kwang JA:

54 The parties were scheduled to attend before me on 21 October 2016 because the Plaintiffs had filed an application in Summons No 4885/2016, seeking leave to appeal to the Court of Appeal against the orders made in Summons No 5810/2015 (see [6] above). However, on 19 October 2016, the Plaintiffs' solicitors wrote to inform the Court that they wished to withdraw Summons No 4885/2016 with no order as to costs and that the Attorney General had no objections to this request. Both parties also agreed to dispense with attendance in Court, subject to the directions of the Court. As both parties had filed their written submissions on costs of the proceedings by then, I asked the parties to attend as scheduled so that I could deal with the outstanding issues relating to costs.

55 On 21 October 2016, before me, the parties confirmed the above stated position. I therefore ordered that, by consent, the Plaintiffs' application in SUM 4885/2016 be withdrawn with no order as to costs.

56 In respect of the costs of Summons No 5810/2015 and of the Originating Summons, I note from the written submissions that the Plaintiffs' position is that each party should bear its own costs. The Government's position is that, while it is entitled to costs since costs generally follow the event, it is not pressing for costs and would leave this issue to the Court.

57 As I have mentioned several times during the pre-hearing stages of this Originating Summons, I believe that both Plaintiffs are conducting these proceedings honourably and honestly in their duties as the executors of the LKY estate. Equally, I have emphasized that I believe that the Government is also contesting the Originating Summons honourably and honestly. Both parties hold genuine views as to how the Interview Agreement ought to be interpreted and have put them forward to the Court for determination.

58 Ordinarily, the Government is entitled to costs of Summons No 5810/2015 and of the Originating Summons as the Court ruled in its favour in both matters. However, as the Government is not pressing for costs and in view of what I have said above at [57], I agree that each party should bear its own costs for these two matters.

Tay Yong Kwang
Judge of Appeal

Lee Eng Beng, SC and Chew Xiang (Rajah & Tann LLP) for the
plaintiffs;
Kwek Mean Luck, 2SG, Koo Zhi Xuan, Germaine Boey (Attorney-
General's Chambers) for the defendant.
