

Goh Ah Teck v Yeo Bee Luan
[2001] SGHC 92

Case Number : DCA 710011/2000
Decision Date : 11 May 2001
Tribunal/Court : High Court
Coram : Choo Han Teck JC
Counsel Name(s) : Appellant in person; Tan Siew Kim (Harry Elias Partnership) for the respondent
Parties : Goh Ah Teck — Yeo Bee Luan

JUDGMENT:

Grounds of Decision

1. The appellant appeared in person in an appeal against the award of maintenance dated 7 March 2001. The District Judge awarded the respondent wife \$300 maintenance for herself and \$1,000 to each of the two children, a daughter aged 5 and a son aged 2.
2. The appellant is 35 years old and the respondent is 33. He works as a manager in one of the Lucent Technologies Group of Companies whose nett salary was ascertained by the District Judge to be between \$7,000 to \$8,000 a month inclusive of bonus payments. The respondents take-home pay as an administrative officer in the civil service was about \$2,500.
3. The appellant argued before me that the District Judge erred in over-estimating his income in finding that he had bonuses which he never received. Furthermore, he argued that the respondents own bonuses were not taken into account. Secondly, he argued that the District Judge was wrong in finding that the monthly expenses of the respondent to be \$5,672.
4. Thirdly, the appellant argued that by reason of the award, the respondent was in fact given a higher standard of living than she had before the breakdown of the marriage.
5. Reviewing the affidavits and the submissions of the appellant and Miss Tan (on behalf of the respondent) I am of the view that there may have been a slight over-estimate of the respondents monthly expenses because I am doubtful whether the maids expenses would be as much as \$1,058. There may also be some doubt counting in respect of the meals of the respondents household. Other than these, I find no reason to disturb the findings of the District Judge.
6. I am of the view that even after taking the over-estimation by the District Judge, on a global view, the overall award of \$2,300 is not excessive nor warrant any disturbance. However, for my part, I would have apportioned the amount of \$2,300 as follows:

\$500 for the daughter;

\$300 for the son; and

\$1,500 for the respondent.
7. For these reasons, the appeal was dismissed.

Choo Han Teck

Judicial Commissioner

Copyright © Government of Singapore.