

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.V. WINSLOW

Mr. Justice A.V. Winslow, easily one of Singapore's most respected and able judges, retired on April 5, 1977 because of ill-health. By this time, he had served nearly fifteen years as a Puisne judge of the Supreme Court though his legal career may be said to have spanned over thirty-five years. We, in the Faculty of Law, University of Singapore, would like to wish him a happy retirement and to dedicate this issue of the Malaya Law Review to him and to express our gratitude for the immense help that he had personally rendered to the cause of legal education in Singapore generally and to the Faculty of Law in particular.

Born in 1916 in Perak, he received his early education mainly at Penang Free School. His scholastic record was excellent, culminating in his being awarded a Queen's Scholarship after coming first in the Queen's Scholarship Examinations (Straits Settlements and Federated Malay States). The Scholarship enabled him to proceed to Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, England, where he read Mathematics (Part I, Tripos) and, of course, Law. He obtained his B.A. in 1938 and his LL.B. a year later. Of his life in Cambridge, it would appear that he enjoyed it thoroughly, unencumbered by the pressure of academic work. He must have made quite a few friends with his "lively mind" and "winning ways" (Tun Suffian, Personal Notes on Mr. Justice Winslow, *post*, p. 4). After coming down from Cambridge, he took his Bar Finals in 1939 and was called to the English Bar (Middle Temple) in 1940. He then read in chambers before returning to Singapore to join the Straits Settlements Legal Service.

During the years 1940-1949, he served in the legal service in several capacities: as Assistant Official Assignee, Assistant Public Trustee, Assistant Custodian of Enemy Property, Assistant Official Receiver, Deputy Registrar, Sheriff, Crown Counsel, Deputy Public Prosecutor and also a 6-month stint as District Judge and Magistrate. In 1949 he was promoted to the Colonial Legal Service. In 1953-1957 he was Senior Crown Counsel. In 1957, he was appointed Solicitor-General (and, from time to time, Acting Attorney-General) until his appointment to the Bench in October 1962.

In all these years in the legal service, Mr. Justice Winslow was able to distinguish himself as a fair and conscientious legal officer. As David Marshall, a senior member of the Bar, recalls:

"Although it is rare today to establish relations of personal friendship between Prosecution and Defence Counsel, I remember with pleasure not only the courtesy but the friendliness of Mr. Justice Winslow as Deputy Public Prosecutor; his readiness to discuss frankly with counsel pending cases and his fairness and firmness at all times when presenting the Prosecution case in court. He was never hesitant in admitting weaknesses or errors despite the then invidious position of local civil servants under the supervision of expatriate senior officers."

There is no doubt that Mr. Justice Winslow was greatly appreciated by his colleagues on the Bench and by lawyers practising before him. Again, to quote David Marshall:

“As a judge, he has endeared himself not only for his undoubted legal ability but also for his charm, friendliness and wit. He had a delightful capacity for defusing tensions which made every case before him, whether won or lost, an enjoyable intellectual experience.”

This view should surprise no one, for he had in fair abundance the qualities which Lord Devlin called “virtues” of a judge — balance, patience, courtesy and detachment. In addition to these qualities may be included his ability to state, apply and analyse the law with commendable precision and, few would deny, with a strong sense of reaching the just decision. Quite often in his reported judgments (about 150) he showed also a crisp, flowing literary style of narrative of the facts of the cases before him which is reminiscent of the style of that acknowledged master in this respect, Lord Denning. Thus, in an action for moneys had and received by a winner in a sweepstakes lottery claiming for the balance of his winnings which was alleged to be unlawfully held in the hands of the defendant, the judge recounted part of the unfortunate circumstances thus:

“On 9th. March 1963, a perambulating gold-mine in the person of the plaintiff, a man of some 74 years of age, hove into view through the portals of No. 13, Neil Road with the winning ticket which he duly presented to one of the shop assistants. Needless to say, his arrival was greeted with tremendous enthusiasm on the part of the inmates thereof including the defendant to whom the plaintiff eventually entrusted the ticket for the purpose of collecting the prize on his behalf. The question I have to decide is whether the plaintiff promised \$2600 as a gift or a reward to the defendant or whether he told him, in effect to give him \$80,000 and keep the rest....” (*Mui Wing Shut v. Ngeow Soo Chong* [1964] M.L.J. 458 at p. 459)

When circumstances demanded it, Mr. Justice Winslow did not hesitate to enforce what he believed to be the proper values to observe. In *D.P.P. v. Abdul Rahman* [1963] M.L.J. 213 he had to consider whether a Muslim girl of the Hanafi sect has a lawful guardian after she has attained puberty. In a previous decision, *Ghouse bin Haji Kader Mustan v. Rex* [1946] M.L.J. 36, the High Court in Singapore had decided that after attaining puberty, the girl in question had no guardian and therefore could not be kidnapped from lawful guardianship contrary to the Penal Code. In *Abdul Rahman (supra.)* Mr. Justice Winslow refused to follow *Ghouse* and in the following passage, expressed his reasons for not doing so:

“It seems to me that in the light of the authorities, it would be dangerous to regard a Muslim girl of the Hanafi sect as being without any lawful guardian for the purposes of the Penal Code merely because she has attained puberty and is free, without the guardian’s consent, to make her own selection of her future husband. To hold otherwise would be to expose every Muslim girl professing the tenets of the Hanafi school, who has attained puberty, to the rapacity or cunning of every would-be Lothario, enticer or potential seducer who would only need to cite *Ghouse’s* case to escape conviction and punishment. He could say that the girl in question had no guardian at all as she was free, in the eyes of Muslim law to ignore her lawful guardian for all purposes as she had none. He could add insult to injury by further saying that, even if she had left her high and dry, without marriage, he would have done no serious legal wrong if any because she had no lawful guardian. Looked at in this way, the consequences of holding that such a girl is guardianless can be readily seen to be indeed alarming and such as the legislature could never have intended.”

Thus, the legalistic approach is eschewed in favour of a purposive approach. However, this is not to say that Mr. Justice Winslow did not pay due respect to the dictates of the doctrine of precedent. On the contrary, he would examine applicable decisions in some detail — to reconcile what might seem conflicting decisions and to declare, with reference to the underlying principles, what he thought the law was. A case illustrative of his meticulous approach to and regard for past precedents is *Eastern Enterprises Ltd. v. Ong Choo Kim* [1969] 1 M.L.J. 236. This concerned a claim for possession by the landlord against a sub-tenant on the basis of using the premises (or permitting such to be used) for immoral purposes. Such a user does not, however, constitute a crime. The issue before the judge was: what is the standard of proof on such an issue? There were no authorities cited on this point as most of the cases decide a more obvious point, *i.e.*, the standard of proof in a civil case of a *crime*. The judge examined a host of authorities dealing with the latter point. The Privy Council cases were themselves in conflict: one (the earliest) stated that the standard is that of the civil one, namely, on a balance of probabilities. However, two later Privy Council decisions (dealing with allegations of conspiracy and fraud) found the appropriate standard to be that of beyond reasonable doubt — the criminal standard. Faced with this conflict, Mr. Justice Winslow embarked on an examination of other Commonwealth decisions and concluded that the general trend of those decisions was to follow the earlier case, that is, that the correct standard was that of a balance of probabilities. But the allegation in the instant case “is of a sufficiently grave character to amount to an allegation of a criminal nature notwithstanding that the allegation has not been propounded in the specific terms of the offences....” The standard of proof suggested to him therefore was one which “need not be as high as that of proof beyond reasonable doubt as is required by a criminal court but the degree of probability required is one which must be commensurate with the occasion and proportionate to the gravity of the issue involved.” (p. 242) As is so often the case, the statement of the rule of law is easier than the application of it. Here, the facts were such that there was a suspicion that there was immoral user — but was this sufficient to discharge the plaintiff’s burden? Mr. Justice Winslow thought not — a conclusion which is obviously right on the facts. But it is not so much the result of his finding as the articulation of his reasons for so finding that marks him out as a judge willing to qualify the rigour of the law with a good measure of common sense and which so typifies that oft-misunderstood phrase of Oliver Wendell Holmes, “The life of the law has not been logic: it has been experience.” Mr. Justice Winslow said:

“To a certain extent it is expected that a court will approach cases of this kind as a reasonable and prudent man would approach it in the light of his own knowledge of human affairs and the realities of everyday life. A prudent man is not necessarily a prude. Nor is he a person, who, like an ostrich, buries his head in the sand in the face of something which is obvious. Faced with the evidence of the kind before me I must try and avoid either being a prude or veering to the other extreme and behaving like an ostrich which pretends not to see the obvious. On the one hand, one can only draw an inference of immoral user if one adopts the standard of a prude when faced with this kind of evidence. On the other hand, can one draw the inference that the premises were so obviously being used for immoral purposes that only an ostrich would hope they were not?

A prudent man would not, however, and should not act by adopting either of these extremes on the available evidence. He would say to himself that there is a very strong suspicion that the premises were being used for immoral purposes and little more. That little more would not tend to satisfy him that the premises were probably so used, and certainly not to that higher degree of probability required.... I accordingly find that the plaintiffs have not discharged the burden of proving a case against the defendant in the first place." (p. 244)

Mr. Justice Winslow, then, through his judgments, has shown himself to have that rare ability to blend an eloquent literary style rich in imagery with legal exposition of even the most technical kind. The interested reader is referred to the list of Mr. Justice Winslow's reported cases appended to this Note.

Mr. Justice Winslow's contribution to the development of law and legal system in Singapore is not restricted to his services in the Legal Service and on the Bench. He was thoroughly involved in keeping up the standards of legal education in Singapore. He was, since the inception of the Faculty of Law in the University of Singapore, an External Examiner until he was forced by his illness to discontinue in 1976. Among the subjects he examined were: Administration of Criminal Justice, Public International Law, Administrative Law, Labour Law. He was also Chairman of the Board of Legal Education from the inception of the Board in 1967 until his retirement. He was a member of the organising committee for the Braddell Memorial Lectures and himself gave a lecture in 1972 on the topic "Some Reflections on Advocacy in A Fused Profession" in which he dealt with some subjects which, today, have become extremely topical: should Singapore retain a fused profession? Will standards improve with a divided profession? How should Singapore's own code of legal ethics be developed? Always concerned with the legal profession in general and the standard of advocacy in particular, Mr. Justice Winslow has expressed the hope that more able lawyers will be willing to take up advocacy instead of concentrating on out-of-court work.

"I should certainly like to see more advocates of calibre come forward to help us in the courts. The stronger and better the Bar becomes, so will its corporate and dedicated drive toward perfection in the profession, especially of advocacy, help one day to create and maintain an orderly society and a climate of which we and generations yet to come will always be proud. Conversely, if the Bar does not strive to maintain, consolidate and enhance its position as the profession that sets an example to other professions in the field of high integrity and high endeavour for the public good, the future is bound to be bleak and depressing, if not chaotic." (*Malaya Law Review Legal Essays* p. 312)

This hope and warning by the judge in his Braddell Memorial Lecture in 1972 is as relevant and topical today, if not more so, than when he first articulated it.

Perhaps, Mr. Justice Winslow, in his retirement, will be able to make known more of his views on the state of the law in Singapore, as he has so ably done in his impressive career. We wish him and his family well.

T.Y.C.

Personal Notes

I first met Victor Winslow in 1936, at Tilbury Dock, London when he came to meet his friend Ahmad Ibrahim, now Professor and Dean of the Law Faculty at the University of Malaya, with

whom I had sailed on the S.S. Naldera from Penang on my way from kampong to Cambridge.

Though we three other Queen's scholars on board (Noel L'Angellier, Ng Yok Hing and I) had not known him, we had no trouble taking advantage of his good nature: we tagged ourselves on to his coat-tail and he readily gave assistance with immigration and customs formalities, with our baggage, our transport from the dock and even to our lodgings in Hampstead.

This was before the days of the British Council so helpful to newly arrived foreign students. I had wondered when approaching England whether anybody would come to meet me to help me in the vast metropolis whose population then exceeded that of the whole of Malaya. Nobody from the Colonial Office or Malaya House came to meet us, and one can imagine therefore my gratitude for Victor's friendliness to a "*sengkek*" at home only in small-town Kuala Kangsar.

Victor took Ahmad to their lodging in Baron's Court, after making sure that the taxi would take us and our baggage to Hampstead, where we met other students from this part of the world, including S. Rajaratnam, now Singapore's Foreign Minister, and others, some of whom lost no time in unloading on us their second-hand law books at a price.

Thereafter Victor continued to be helpful; he took me to enrol at his Inn, the Middle Temple, and, subsequently on reaching Cambridge, to open an account with his bank, Barclay's Bank, though I doubt if they profited much from looking after my allowance.

Victor's friendliness to us juniors was in startling contrast to the attitude of some of the seniors from Malaya. I remember inviting Sulaiman bin Datuk A. Rahman of Queens to tea in my room. When he came, he berated me and my fellow juniors for being so presumptuous as to invite him first without waiting to be invited by him three years my senior. (This did not however prevent him from enjoying the tea and cakes provided, and years later when I was D.P.P. in Johore and he in private practice, we became firm friends for he had a heart of gold).

Victor seemed to have plenty of leisure and was hospitable and we often visited him in his room at Sidney Sussex, where there was always an abundance of beer, which on grounds of economy he bought by the barrel, and music, for he was expert on the accordion, and of animated conversation and argument. By then he was in his second year, and had switched from mathematics to law. I marvelled at his casual attitude to study (I never once saw him near the law school nor in the library) and envied the ease with which he sailed through his examinations; but then he had a lively mind and a good memory.

On the train back from our bar dinners in London I envied the charm with which he would engage in conversation complete strangers who responded readily to his winning ways. When not prising the English from their shells, he would be entertaining his fellow bar students with gay music from his mouth organ.

The other three Queen's scholars of my year were gluttons for work and all consistently scored firsts. It was all I could do to run panting after them, so as not to be left too far behind. If it had not been for Victor's casual attitude to lectures and books, and indifference to academic distinction, I would have ended with the feeling that I was a failure and had no future. In my eyes he was very much the grown-up sophisticate, and his debonair example was a great comfort to me.

In 1938 Victor got his degree and I was not to see him again until 1949 when I was D.P.P. in Johore Bahru and he in Singapore. On many a Friday did we meet in his Katong quarters, the modesty of which was soon forgotten in the midst of enjoying his anecdotes and Ruby's curries. [Ed. note: Victor was married to Ruby Sayampanathan in April 1946.]

Was I grievously saddened to hear of Victor's illness and eventual retirement from the bench! I never had the privilege of appearing before nor of sitting with him, but for years I followed his judgments in the M.L.J., which are distinguished not only by the felicity with which he expresses himself but also by down-to-earth common sense (he was never guilty of excessive legal formalism) and through the learning would frequently peep his sense of humour. While treating seriously the disputes and quarrels that came up for adjudication in his court, he was clearly bemused by human weaknesses and foibles and I imagine that often he must have burst into chuckles the moment he found himself in the privacy of his chambers. Always discernible in his judgments was the logical mind of the mathematician. In his reasoning he always displayed a firm grasp of principles, on the study of which alone he had concentrated when an undergraduate, and a quick mercurial mind in seizing the points at issue. The fact that he was familiar with the higher reaches of mathematics was very much in evidence when we sat together on the Board of Examiners of the Law Faculty of the University of Singapore. Whenever marks had to be totalled, Victor would often come up with the answer faster than the efficient Mr. Young (Faculty's Administrative Assistant) working his magic machine. As an external examiner Victor was concerned with the maintenance of high standards so that incompetent lawyers are not let loose among the unsuspecting and paying public.

Victor is now no longer active in the law, and, because of his love for the company of his fellows, must miss the frequent contacts with colleagues and others that come with going to work daily. His numerous friends and admirers wish for him in retirement peace and contentment, which should not be difficult to achieve, with his free and easy relaxed ways.

Tun Mohamed Suffian
Lord President, Malaysia.

Lord President's Chambers,
Federal Court,
KUALA LUMPUR.

17th April, 1978.

A SELECTION OF MR. JUSTICE WINSLOW'S JUDGMENTS

Administrative and Constitutional Law

Chok Kok Thong v. The Minister For Home Affairs & Ors.
[1963] M.L.J. 232.

Amalgamated Union of Public Employees v. Permanent Secretary (Health) & Anor.
[1965] 2 M.L.J. 209.

Ling How Doong v. The Attorney-General, Singapore
[1968] 2 M.L.J. 253.

Chief Building Surveyor v. Makhanlall & Company Ltd.
[1969] 2 M.L.J. 118.
[F.C. (Tan Ah Tab, Winslow, Choor Singh JJ.)]

In Re An Application By N.H.E. Nassim
[1976] 1 M.L.J. 97.

Banking Law

Overseas Union Bank Ltd. v. Chua Teng Hwee trading as Rexson & Co.
[1964] M.L.J. 165.

K.G. Chemie-Export W. Ruter G.B.b.H. & Co. v. Eastern Enterprises (Pte.) Ltd.
[1973] 2 M.L.J. 91.

Bills of Sale, Hire Purchase, Moneylending, Bailment

Ratan Singh v. Tan Teng Luan & Anor.
[1963] M.L.J. 116.

Flinter v. Idris
[1965] 2 M.L.J. 78.

Tan Tien Choy v. Kiaw Aik Hang Co. Ltd.
[1966] 1 M.L.J. 102.

[F.C. (Barakbah C.J. (Malaya), Wylie C.J. (Borneo) and Winslow J.)]

United Investment & Finance Ltd. v. Abdul Rahman & Anor.
[1966] 2 M.L.J. 9.

C.C. Loke v. S.H. Benson (Singapore) Ltd.
[1967] 1 M.L.J. 26.

United Investment and Finance Ltd. v. Walker & Anor.
[1967] 1 M.L.J. 30.

Yik Wah Trading (Pte.) Ltd. v. Tan King Kak & Anor.
[1972] 1 M.L.J. 94.

People's Credit (Pte.) Ltd. v. Ee Kee Chai
[1974] 1 M.L.J. 6.

Company Law

Raffles Hotel Ltd. v. L. Rayner; Same v. Malayan Banking Ltd.
[1965] 1 M.L.J. 60.

Raffles Hotel Ltd. v. Malayan Banking Ltd. (No. 2)
[1965] 1 M.L.J. 262.

Goh Siew Wan v. Columbia Films of Malaysia Ltd.
[1966] 1 M.L.J. 39.

Contract Law

Tong Aik (Far East) Ltd. v. Eastern Minerals & Trading (1959) Ltd.
[1963] M.L.J. 322.

Mui Wing Shui v. Ngeow Joo Chong
[1964] M.L.J. 458.

Koh Peng Moh v. Yahiya
[1965] 1 M.L.J. 230.

Muthusamy v. Subramanian
[1965] 2 M.L.J. 273.

Malayan Miners Co. (M) Ltd. v. Lian Hock & Co.
[1966] 2 M.L.J. 273.

Rodrigues v. Robert Wee & Co.
[1968] 2 M.L.J. 95.

Seng Hin v. Arathoon Sons Ltd.
[1968] 2 M.L.J. 123.
[F.C. (Wee Chong Jin C.J., Tan Ah Tah, Winslow JJ.)]

Yap Eng Thong & Anor. v. Faber Union Ltd.
[1973] 1 M.L.J. 191.

Wong Yan Mok v. Indo-Malaya Trading Co.
[1975] 1 M.L.J. 147.

Raymond Banham & Anor. v. Consolidated Hotels Limited
[1976] 1 M.L.J. 5.

Criminal Law & Procedure

Abu Bakar v. Regina
[1963] M.L.J. 288.

Deputy Public Prosecutor v. Abdul Rahman
[1963] M.L.J. 213.

Harjit Singh v. Regina
[1963] M.L.J. 287.

Ong Chan Tow v. Regina
[1963] M.L.J. 160.

Lim Hung Tong v. Public Prosecutor
[1964] M.L.J. 336.

Re Maria Menado
[1964] M.L.J. 266.

Gian Singh & Co. Ltd. v. Super Services
[1965] 1 M.L.J. 256.

Kuo Chen Suan v. William K. Kwik & Anor.
[1965] 2 M.L.J. 179.

Lam Soon Cannery Co. v. H.W. Hooper & Co.
[1965] 1 M.L.J. 135.

Lemanit v. Public Prosecutor
[1965] 2 M.L.J. 26.
[F.C. (Wee Chong Jin C.J., Tan Ah Tah & Winslow JJ.)]

Oversea Chinese Transport Co. Ltd. v. Public Prosecutor
[1965] 1 M.L.J. 260.

Koh Seng Wah v. Public Prosecutor
[1966] 1 M.L.J. 12.

Lim Ting Hong v. Public Prosecutor
[1966] 2 M.L.J. 119.

Sunny Ang v. Public Prosecutor
[1966] 2 M.L.J. 195.
[F.C. (Tan Ah Tah, Chua & Winslow JJ.)]

Ismail & Anor. v. Public Prosecutor
[1967] 1 M.L.J. 241.
[F.C. (Wee Chong Jin C.J., Tan Ah Tah & Winslow JJ.)]

Lee Chiang Seng & 9 Ors. v. Public Prosecutor
[1967] 2 M.L.J. 32.

Norata Singh v. Serdara Singh
[1967] 1 M.L.J. 265.
[F.C. (Tan Ah Tah, Buttrose, Winslow JJ.)]

Chung Khiaw Bank Ltd. v. Bajaj Textiles Ltd. & Anor.
[1968] 1 M.L.J. 299.

*Chung Khiaw Bank Ltd. v. Toy Soo Tong:
United Overseas Bank Ltd. — Applicants*
[1968] 1 M.L.J. 291.

Gan Poh Chye v. Public Prosecutor
[1968] 1 M.L.J. 288.

In Re An Advocate & Solicitor
[1968] 1 M.L.J. 302.

Majid v. Muthuswamy
[1968] 2 M.L.J. 89.
[F.C. (Wee Chong Jin C.J., Tan Ah Tah, Winslow JJ.)]

Pang Kim Guan v. Lee Cheng Liam
[1968] 2 M.L.J. 133.
[F.C. (Tan Ah Tah, Chua & Winslow JJ.)]

Saw Chiang Guan & Ors. v. Public Prosecutor
[1968] 2 M.L.J. 125.

William Wong v. Tan Yong Chim
[1968] 2 M.L.J. 111.
[F.C. (Tan Ah Tah, Chua & Winslow JJ.)]

Ee Yee Hua v. Public Prosecutor
[1969] 2 M.L.J. 123.

Kok Swee Teng & Anor. v. Perola Navigation & Trading Co. Ltd.
[1969] 1 M.L.J. 95.
[F.C. (Tan Ah Tah, Chua & Winslow JJ.)]

Krishnan v. Abdul Razak & Anor.
[1969] 1 M.L.J. 43.

Ong Kiang Kek v. Public Prosecutor
[1970] 2 M.L.J. 283.
[C.C.A. (Wee Chong Jin C.J., Tan Ah Tah & Winslow JJ.)]

Public Prosecutor v. Richard Kwan
[1970] 2 M.L.J. 286.
[C.C.A. (Wee Chong Jin C.J., Tan Ah Tah & Winslow JJ.)]

Sebastian v. Public Prosecutor
[1970] 2 M.L.J. 76.

Sofjan & Anor. v. Public Prosecutor
[1970] 2 M.L.J. 272.

The "Simba"; Owners of "Simba" v. Zim Israel Navigation
[1970] 1 M.L.J. 121.

Ralph v. Public Prosecutor
[1972] 1 M.L.J. 242.

Koninklijke Bunge N.V. v. Sinitrada Co. Ltd.
[1973] 1 M.L.J. 194.

P.G. Ralph v. Public Prosecutor
[1973] 1 M.L.J. 81.

Law of Equity, Land & Succession

Saraspathy & Anor. v. Kanagasundram
[1962] M.L.J. 422.

Peter Wong v. Cunnan Kaloo Nair
[1963] M.L.J. 163.

Re Chionh Ke Hu Decd.
[1964] M.L.J. 270.

Tan Geok Loo v. Koh Beng Quee & Ors.
[1966] 1 M.L.J. 134.
[F.C. (Tan Ah Tah Ag. C.J., Buttrose & Winslow. JJ.)]

United Overseas Bank Ltd. v. Singapore Engineers Ltd.
[1966] 2 M.L.J. 267.

Liew Ah Hock v. Malayan Railway
[1967] 1 M.L.J. 53.

Kassim Bin Arippin v. Mohamed Bin Ramlan
[1971] 1 M.L.J. 87.

Poh Kim Kang & Ors. v. Ishak Bin Lambik & Anor.
[1971] 2 M.L.J. 251.

Yeo Long Seng v. Luckily Park (Pte.) Ltd.
[1971] 1 M.L.J. 20.

Re Will of P.M. Framroz Decd.;
S.F. Framroz & Anor. v. The Chartered Bank (M) Trustee Ltd. & Anor.
[1972] 1 M.L.J. 43.

Re Valibhoy Charitable Trust
[1975] 1 M.L.J. 187.

Family Law

Wee Hock Guan v. Chia Chit Neo & Anor.
[1964] M.L.J. 217.

Doshi v. Doshi
[1965] 2 M.L.J. 267.

Low Gek Kim v. Seow Lek Kee
[1965] 1 M.L.J. 55.

Moses v. Moses
[1968] 1 M.L.J. 96.

Seah Cheng Hock v. Lau Biau Chin
[1969] 2 M.L.J. 239.

Evelyn Tan v. Tan Lim Tai
[1973] 2 M.L.J. 92.

Tey Leng Yeow v. Tan Poh Hing & Anor.
[1973] 2 M.L.J. 53.

Helen Ho Quee Neo v. Lim Pui Heng
[1974] 2 M.L.J. 51.

Re S.S.
[1975] 1 M.L.J. 56.

Tan Kok Teck v. Lim Sian Ngo
[1975] 1 M.L.J. 13.

Law of Landlord & Tenant, Patents Law

British and Malayan Trustees Ltd. v. Abdul Jabbar & Anor. and Kader Maideen & Anor.
[1966] 2 M.L.J. 110.

Re Tan Tye, Decd.;
Tan Lian Chve v. British And Malayan Trustees Ltd.
[1966] 2 M.L.J. 107.

Victoria Hotel v. Ho See Teck
[1966] 1 M.L.J. 29.

S.E.A.C. Co. v. Ang Ah Bak
[1967] 1 M.L.J. 171.
[F.C. (Tan Ah Tah, Chua & Winslow JJ.)]

Teo Chwee Geok v. Ng Hui Lip & Company
[1967] 1 M.L.J. 245.

Sime Darby Singapore Ltd. & Anor. v. Beecham Group Ltd.
[1968] 2 M.L.J. 161.
[F.C. (Wee Chong Jin C.J., Tan Ah Tah, Winslow JJ.)]

Singapore Hotel v. Airport Hire Cars
[1968] 2 M.L.J. 200.

Success Enterprises Ltd. v. Eng Ah Boon
[1968] 1 M.L.J. 75.

Tay Sai Hiang v. Tan Ee Keok
[1968] 1 M.L.J. 234.
[F.C. (Wee Chong Jin C.J., Tan Ah Tah, Winslow JJ.)]

Eastern Enterprises Ltd. v. Ong Choo Kim
[1969] 1 M.L.J. 236.

Yap Lian v. Kris Investment Co. Ltd.
[1969] 1 M.L.J. 96.
[F.C. (Wee Chong Jin C.J., Chua & Winslow JJ.)]

Ang Bock Seng v. Murugian Valamball
[1970] 1 M.L.J. 130.

Hoo Yan Meng v. Esah
[1970] 1 M.L.J. 126.

Koh Lan Eng & Anor. v. Tee Choon Yong
[1970] 1 M.L.J. 153.

Nam Wah v. Tan Moh Hung
[1971] 1 M.L.J. 133.

South Union Co. Ltd. v. Seng Hin Ltd.
[1973] 1 M.L.J. 39.

People's Park Development (Pte.) Ltd. v. Lian Ya (Pte.) Ltd.
[1974] 2 M.L.J. 140.

Somasundaram & Anor. v. Tong Nam Contractors (Pte.) Ltd
[1976] 1 M.L.J. 95.

Revenue Law

Seow Peng Kuan v. Regina
[1963] M.L.J. 279.

*Ang Hock Leong & Ors. v. Trustees of Sandilands Buttery Local Staff
Provident Fund & Ors.*
[1965] 2 M.L.J. 259.

Chief Assessor, Property Tax v. Town And City Properties Ltd.
[1967] 1 M.L.J. 189.

Attorney-General v. Sim Lim Investments Ltd.
[1968] 1 M.L.J. 116.

H.C. & Anor. v. Comptroller of Income Tax
[1970] 2 M.L.J. 259.

C.E.C. v. Comptroller of Income Tax
[1971] 2 M.L.J. 43.

H.L.B. v. Comptroller of Income Tax
[1974] 2 M.L.J. 49.

Shipping Law

Colgate-Palmolive (Asia) Ltd. v. Swedish East Asia Co. Ltd.
[1967] 1 M.L.J. 115.
[F.C. (Wee Chong Jin C.J., Tan Ah Tah & Winslow JJ.)]

Vaynar Suppiah & Sons v. K.M.A. Abdul Kahim & Anor.;
Owners of "Lexa Maersk" & Ors. v. K.M.A. Abdul Rahim & Anor.
[1974] 2 M.L.J. 183.

Law of Tort

John Chong v. Heron, Gethin-Jones & Liow
[1963] M.L.J. 113.

Shaik Aly Sahib & Ors. v. M.I. & M. Corporation & Anor.
[1963] M.L.J. 232.

Abdullah v. Gladwin
[1964] M.L.J. 35.

Chan Fook Wah v. Board of Architects
[1965] 2 M.L.J. 7.

Yap Bor Lim v. Chia Thye Poh & Anor.
[1965] 2 M.L.J. 123.

Kosnan v. Phua Huat Choy
[1966] 2 M.L.J. 233.

Kwek How Bok v. Lee Sin Kweng
[1966] 1 M.L.J. 185.

Kuok Keet Ling v. National Iron & Steel Mills Ltd.
[1967] 2 M.L.J. 48.

Tan Gim Seng v. Gurdeu Singh Gill
[1967] 2 M.L.J. 154.

Tan Lian Chye v. Malayan Railway Administration
[1967] 2 M.L.J. 276.

Tay Boo Jiang v. Chan Yip Tong
[1967] 1 M.L.J. 84.

Saw Tong Seng v. Ong Kim Hoon
[1968] 1 M.L.J. 203.

Wee Soon Hian v. Lai Ching Mow
[1968] 2 M.L.J. 82.

Lim Ah Chi v. Tan Ah Mui & Anor.
[1969] 1 M.L.J. 215.
[F.C. (Wee Chong Jin C.J., Tan Ah Tah, Winslow JJ.)]

Mohamed Repin v. Lim Yu Kee
[1969] 1 M.L.J. 64.
[F.C. (Wee Chong Jin C.J., Tan Ah Tah, Winslow JJ.)]

Ong Sim Moy & Ors. v. Ong Sim Hoe
[1969] 1 M.L.J. 82.

The Attorney-General, Singapore v. Hoo Tee Ming
[1969] 1 M.L.J. 203.
[F.C. (Wee Chong Jin C.J., Chua & Winslow JJ.)]

Ngui Kee Siong v. Guan Soo Swee & Anor.
[1970] 2 M.L.J. 48,

John Tan Chor-Yong v. Lee Chay Tian
[1971] 1 M.L.J. 240.

Dobb & Co. Ltd. v. Hecla
[1973] 2 M.L.J. 128.

Yaw Kee v. Tan Chee Yim & Anor.
[1975] 2 M.L.J. 51.

Nicholas Arthur Nock v. Mohamed Ali Bin Suleman & Anor.
[1976] 1 M.L.J. 100.

Miscellaneous Cases

A. Mohamed Shariff & Co. Ltd. v. Mohamed Hussain
[1963] M.L.J. 340.

Maruthappan v. Claude Da Silva
[1965] 1 M.L.J. 94.
[Thomson, L.P., Chua & Winslow JJ.]

Public Prosecutor v. Li Chuan Pin
[1965] 1 M.L.J. 133.

Re Syed Eidrus Alsagoff;
Syed Mohamed Alsagoff v. Poh Kim San & Ors.
[1966] 1 M.L.J. 75.

Ng Kay Thiam & Anor. v. Redhill Paper Converters Ltd.
[1971] 2 M.L.J. 256.

Goh Geok Buay & Ors. v. H.J. Edwards & Anor.
[1974] 1 M.L.J. 43.

Tan Kiong Hwa v. Andrew S.H. Chang
[1974] 2 M.L.J. 188.