

MCST allegation against Victor Lee

In MCST's letter of 15 Sept to SPs, it said it had issued a letter demanding that a



Gardens@Bullion: Ruellia Simplex

15 floor SP "Cease and Desist" his

allegations against the MCST. I

subsequently received a letter from

MCST lawyers. I also understand this

subject was discussed at the FAQ

session held on 25 Sept, with

participation by MCST lawyers.

I was unable to attend the FAQ because

of a personal issue but as this matter has

been discussed in the presence of a

considerable number of SPs, I now find

it necessary to let SPs know my position. Accordingly, I am showing below a copy of my reply to the MCST's cease and desist letter.

25 Sept 2021

Messrs Low Yeap Toh & Goon LLP

20 Maxwell Road

#12-01 Maxwell House,

Singapore 069113

Your Ref: TCP.AD.1757.11.19 (RUK)

Dear Sir:

Website containing contents allegedly injurious to the
standing and reputation of MCST 1849

I refer to your letter dated 20 Sept with the above reference.

1. It is admitted that I am the author of the websites stated in your letter.
2. In your letter, besides stating that the website contents "injures the standing and reputation of your client", you have provided no details and have thus not complied with the Pre action Protocol for Defamation Actions issued by the State Courts. I request that you comply with the Protocol in full, in particular, but not limited to:
 - A. the exact words complained of.
 - B. sufficient details of the factual inaccuracies or unsupportable comments within the words complained of to enable me to appreciate why the words are inaccurate or unsupportable.
 - C. any fact or matter which makes your client identifiable from the words complained of;
 - D. details of any special fact relevant to the interpretation of the words complained of and the meanings which your client attributes to the words complained of;
 - E. if damages occurred, details of the damage.

Please take note that if you should fail to comply with the Protocol in full, I shall seek the protection of the Courts, based on the full extent allowed by law.

3. In your letter under reference, you required me to reply within 7 days. Under the Protocol, except where there is *exceptional* urgency, I should be given at least 14 days to respond, and you have failed to explain the reasons for the urgency, as required under the Protocol.
4. Your client has also failed to set out their preferred alternative dispute resolution mechanism required under the Protocols. Since your client has failed to do so, let me state that, as mentioned in my website at several locations, parties should negotiate with each other to arrive at a settlement instead of getting involved in litigation. If your client accepts this alternative, I request that you make arrangements, and arrange for the meeting to be chaired by an independent person. Alternatively, I propose that you make use of the services of the Singapore Mediation Center, an organization you should be very familiar with, as one of your partners is an SMC Accredited Mediator.
5. In the meantime, please take note that all my rights are reserved, including my rights to update Subsidiary Proprietors of MCST 1849 of this action.

Yours faithfully,



Victor Lee Siong Kee

170 Lenton Loop #15-03

Singapore 789099