

3, 1982

IN THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL

No. 4 of 1980

O N A P P E A L

FROM THE COURT OF APPEAL IN SINGAPORE

B E T W E E N :

JOSHUA BENJAMIN JEYARETNAM

Appellant
(Defendant)

- and -

LEE KUAN YEW

Respondent
(Plaintiff)

SUPPLEMENTAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

WARD BOWIE,
Clement House,
99 Aldwych,
London, W.C.2.

Solicitors for Appellant

HERBERT SMITH & CO.,
Watling House,
35-37 Cannon Street,
London EC4M 5SD.

Solicitors for Respondent

O N A P P E A L
FROM THE COURT OF APPEAL IN SINGAPORE

B E T W E E N :

JOSHUA BENJAMIN JEYARETNAM

Appellant
(Defendant)

- and -

LEE KUAN YEW

Respondent
(Plaintiff)

SUPPLEMENTAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

INDEX OF REFERENCE

<u>No.</u>	<u>Description of Document</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Page</u>
<u>IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINGAPORE</u>			
1	Certificate of production of files	27th May 1981	1
2	Statement of Claim in Suit No. 219 of 1977	28th January 1977	2
3	Judgment in Suit No. 219 of 1977	24th March 1977	5
4	Statement of Claim in Suit No. 1023 of 1977	30th April 1977	5
5	Judgment in Suit No. 1023 of 1977	11th August 1977	8
6	Statement of Claim in Suit No. 1024 of 1977	17th May 1977	8
7	Judgment in Suit No. 1024 of 1977	5th September 1977	11
8	Statement of Claim in Suit No. 1025 of 1977	20th May 1977	11
9	Judgment in Suit No. 1025 of 1977.	5th September 1977	15

ON APPEAL
FROM THE COURT OF APPEAL IN SINGAPORE

B E T W E E N :

JOSHUA BENJAMIN JEYARETNAM

Appellant
(Defendant)

- and -

LEE KUAN YEW

Respondent
(Plaintiff)

SUPPLEMENTAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

No. 1

Certificate of production of files - 27th May 1981

IN THE HIGH COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

Suit No. 218 of 1977

Between

LEE KUAN YEW

... Plaintiff

and

JOSHUA BENJAMIN JEYARETNAM

... Defendant

In the High
Court

No. 1
Certificate of
production of
files
27th May 1981

I, R.E. MARTIN, Registrar of the Supreme Court of The Republic of Singapore do hereby certify that the Suit files Nos. 219 of 1977, 1023 of 1977, 1024 of 1977 and 1025 of 1977 were produced before The Honourable Mr Justice Chua on Monday, the 20th day of November, 1978 at 10.30 a.m. in connection with the trial of Lee Kuan Yew against Joshua Benjamin Jeyaretnam in Suit No. 218 of 1977 in this Honourable Court.

Dated this 27th day of May, 1981.

(Signed) R.E. MARTIN
Registrar
SUPREME COURT, SINGAPORE.

In the High
Court

No. 2

Statement of Claim - 28th January, 1981

No. 2
Statement of
Claim - 28th
January 1981

IN THE HIGH COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

Suit No. 219 of 1977

Between

LEE KUAN YEW

... Plaintiff

and

TENG AH BOO

... Defendant

STATEMENT OF CLAIM

10

1. The Plaintiff is the Prime Minister of Singapore, and Secretary-General of the People's Action Party which is, and was at all material times, in government of Singapore.

2. At an election rally of the Barisan Sosialis (a political party which contested the Parliamentary General Elections held in Singapore on the 23rd December, 1976) held at Car Park No. 1, Block 79, Toa Payoh Central, Singapore, on the 15th December, 1976, the Defendant falsely and maliciously spoke and published of the Plaintiff in the way of the Plaintiff's office as Prime Minister, the following words in the Hokkien dialect of the Chinese language to members of the general public who attended the said rally:

20

我們要知道住在大芭窰區的人全部是住在
他的政府組屋，李光耀他講他們政府是
沒有貪污的。現在我們是小弟要指出一點
李光耀的貪污是很大條的貪污是指那一
條呢？我們住政府組屋的或者是買政府組
屋的「屋宇」是誰做的？是李光耀的老婆 LEE
△ LEE 律師館做的這條是不是貪污？在民
主國家里面，大公無私政府我們所要做的
東西你是在做那個生意的總理，你的律師
館不能夠做我們百姓們所用的東西，要
給自己人做，全部彎進來，手臂全部彎進來，
別人全部不可以做，有很多人跟他反對以
來講你們是買屋換屋的，可以給別的律
師做，要是你們買新屋，全部就要給
LEE △ LEE 律師館做，我們知道報紙如
果開來看那里要抽籤放屋了，啊，李光耀
他們又要大爭達了，照這一條他說沒有
貪污我說他一定很大的貪污，他明
顯的貪污。

3. The literal translation of the words quoted in the preceding paragraph hereof is as follows:

"We ought to know that all those staying in Toa Payoh live in Government HDB flats. Lee Kuan Yew says his Government is not corrupted. Now I am going to point out that Lee Kuan Yew is corrupted, very corrupted. In what way? Who handles the conveyance for those who purchase Government HDB flats? Lee Kuan Yew's wife, the Lee & Lee Advocates & Solicitors. Is not this corruption? In a democratic country, there ought to be fair play without favouritism. You are the Prime Minister 10 dealing in that business. Your lawyer's firm is not supposed to do such a thing for people. Instead, you give it all to your own people and others cannot do it. Only after many people had raised objection, he then said purchase and transfer of flats could be done through other lawyers' firms. But purchase of new flats must be done through Lee & Lee Advocates & Solicitors. When reading newspapers, you will see that balloting for new houses will take place again. Wow, Lee Kuan Yew & Co. will be prosperous again! In this respect he says he is not corrupted. But I say he is definitely and obviously 20 corrupted".

4. By the said words, the Defendant meant and was understood to mean that the Plaintiff abused his aforesaid office for personal financial gain by causing and/or ensuring that the firm of Lee & Lee, Advocates & Solicitors, of which Firm the Plaintiff's wife is a senior partner, acted in the matter of purchases and transfers of Housing and Development Board flats, and hence that the Plaintiff lacks integrity, has been corrupt and dishonest in the discharge of his aforesaid office, and is unfit to hold the same.

5. The said words were calculated to disparage the Plaintiff in his aforesaid office. 30

6. In the premises, the Plaintiff has been injured in his character, credit and reputation as Prime Minister.

7. Unless restrained by this Honourable Court, the Defendant will further publish the said or similar slanders upon the Plaintiff.

AND the Plaintiff claims:

- (i) Damages for slander;
- (ii) An injunction restraining the Defendant, by his agents or servants or otherwise, from further publishing the said or any similar slanders upon the Plaintiff; 40
- (iii) Costs; and
- (iv) All further requisite relief.

Served the 28th day of January, 1977.

(Signed)

Solicitors for the Plaintiff.

No. 3

In the High
Court

Judgment in Suit No. 219 - 24th March 1977

IN THE HIGH COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

Suit No. 219 of 1977

Between

LEE KUAN YEW

... Plaintiff

and

TENG AH BOO

... Defendant

The 24th day of March, 1977

The Plaintiff having on the 25th day of February, 1977, obtained interlocutory Judgment herein against the Defendant for damages to be assessed and the amount found due to the Plaintiff having been certified at \$100,000.00 as appears by the Deputy Registrar's Certificate filed the 24th day of March, 1977, IT IS THIS DAY ADJUDGED that the Defendant do pay the Plaintiff \$100,000.00 and costs to be taxed.

Entered in Volume 171 page 93 at 11.30 a.m. of the 24th day of March, 1977.

(Signed)

ACTING DEPUTY REGISTRAR.

No. 4

Statement of Claim in Suit No. 1023 of 1977 -
30th April 1977

IN THE HIGH COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

Suit No. 1023 of 1977

Between

LEE KUAN YEW

... Plaintiff

and

CHAN YANG LING

... Defendant

STATEMENT OF CLAIM

1. The Plaintiff is the Prime Minister of Singapore and Secretary-General of the People's Action Party which is, and was at all material times, in government of Singapore.

2. At an election rally of the Singapore Justice Party (a political party which contested the Parliamentary General

No. 4

Statement of Claim
in Suit No. 1023
of 1977 - 30th
April 1977

Elections held in Singapore on the 23rd December, 1976) held at a car park in front of Block 209, Boon Lay Place on the 20th December, 1976, the Defendant falsely and maliciously spoke and published of and concerning the Plaintiff and of and concerning him in the office of Prime Minister of Singapore and in relation to his conduct therein, to members of the general public who attended the said rally, the following words:

"..... I said these words, if LEE KUAN YEW is a corrupt man, suppose LEE KUAN YEW is a corrupt man, who can do wonderful things on him? No one! Because why? He controls the CPIB. If LEE KUAN YEW is corruption, is corrupted, then can the CPIB take and arrest LEE KUAN YEW? Cannot. Because he controls the CPIB. Just now at the Arab Street there, I deliberately asked this question because we want the CPIB to be an independent board so that anyone from the Rank and File, top to the bottom, who commits corruption will be dealt accordingly to the law set up by the people. That is a wonderful thing! That, I don't know who has given such a special licence, a bank licence. Bank licence is very difficult to get and the special bank now in operation is called the Tat Lee Bank. And by checking through the record of Tat Lee Bank, to our surprise, that one of the directors of Tat Lee Bank is LEE KUAN YEW's brother! So, we are so shocked. Then we, I'm curious to find out, MSA can give special licence or the Ministry of Finance can give special licence for a Bank to operate in Singapore, like Tat Lee Bank. Moreover, Housing Board flat, whenever you want to transfer your houses buy houses and all these things, it goes to Lee & Lee Co. which LEE KUAN YEW's wife is a senior partner of Lee & Lee. That is why when we are in, forming into going into the Parliament, we will set up a Commission of Enquiries to find out all these things, I do not mean that LEE LUAN YEW is corrupt but we will have to find out who in the MSA or Finance Ministry give special permit licence for Tat Lee Bank to operate in Singapore and who, in the Ministry of Housing Board Development Bank, I'm sorry, Housing and Development Board give the special permission to Lee & Lee to conduct all businesses in the Housing Board. If not, some years, many years back it's a pity that I, but I'll like to express again that I had no special grudges on the police but I like the police very much. They are very helpful sometimes"

3. At an election rally of the Barisan Sosialis (another political party that contested the said Elections) held at Queen Street (near Middle Road), the Defendant falsely and maliciously spoke and published of the Plaintiff as aforesaid, the following words:

"..... and today, look at the Straits Times, page 19, 'flat buyers get legal permit', Straits Times today. All the while and in fact at the first meeting over here, I have explained, expressed that Housing Board transactions, all were given to one company, Lee & Lee. Because, we further exposed this, they had now decided to say, free legal service to all people. You know, one conveyance fee between a buyer and the Housing Board costs about \$300, \$300. But we ask, if the Housing Board to answer this question, if they said free legal service, are the Housing Board prepared to repay all those people who had been giving conveyance fees at the rate of \$300 over, those who have bought house previously, are

the Housing Board prepared to refund them all the money.
Tell them, are the Housing Board, is the Housing Board
prepared to refund the money back to all those people?....."

In the High
Court

No. 4
Statement of
Claim in Suit
No. 1023 of
1977 - 30th
April 1977
Continued

10 4. The words quoted in paragraph 2 hereof, in their natural and ordinary meaning meant and were understood to mean that the Plaintiff had procured preferential treatment for his brother and/or wife to his own and/or their personal financial advantage, had thereby abused and would continue to abuse the office of Prime Minister of Singapore, is wanting in honesty and integrity and is unfit to hold the said office.

5. The words quoted in paragraph 3 hereof, in their natural and ordinary meaning meant and were understood to mean that the Plaintiff abused his aforesaid office for personal financial gain by causing and/or ensuring that the firm of Lee & Lee, Advocates and Solicitors, of which Firm the Plaintiff's wife and brother are senior partners, acted in the matter of purchases and transfers of Housing and Development Board flats, and hence that the Plaintiff lacks integrity, has been corrupt and dishonest in the discharge of his aforesaid office, and is unfit to hold the same.

20 6. The said words were calculated to disparage the Plaintiff in his aforesaid office.

7. In the premises, the Plaintiff has been injured in his character, credit and reputation as Prime Minister.

8. Unless restrained by this Honourable Court, the Defendant will further publish the said or similar slanders upon the Plaintiff.

And the Plaintiff claims:

- 30 (i) Damages for slander;
- (ii) An injunction restraining the Defendant, by his agents or servants or otherwise, from further publishing the said or any similar slanders upon the Plaintiff;
- (iii) Costs; and
- (iv) All further requisite relief.

Served the 30th day of April, 1977.

(Signed)

Solicitors for the Plaintiff.

In the High
Court

No. 5
Judgment in
Suit No. 1023
of 1977 -
11th August
1977

No. 5

Judgment in Suit No. 1023 of 1977 - 11th August 1977

IN THE HIGH COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

Suit No. 1023 of 1977

Between

LEE KUAN YEW

... Plaintiff

and

CHAN YANG LING

... Defendant

10

The 11th day of August, 1977

The Plaintiff having on the 24th day of June, 1977, obtained interlocutory Judgment herein against the Defendant for damages to be assessed and the amount found due to the Plaintiff having been certified at \$65,000.00 as appears by the Registrar's certificate filed the 11th day of August, 1977, IT IS THIS DAY ADJUDGED that the Defendant do pay the Plaintiff \$65,000.00 and costs to be taxed.

Entered in Volume 178 page 60 at 10.00 a.m. of the 11th day of August, 1977.

20

(Signed)

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR.

No. 6
Statement of
Claim in Suit
No. 1024 of
1977 - 17th
May 1977.

No. 6

Statement of Claim in Suit No. 1024 of 1977 -
17th May, 1977

IN THE HIGH COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

Suit No. 1024 of 1977

Between

LEE KUAN YEW

... Plaintiff

and

WONG KUI YU

... Defendant

30

STATEMENT OF CLAIM

1. The Plaintiff is the Prime Minister of Singapore and Secretary-General of the People's Action Party which is, and was at all material times, in government of Singapore.
2. At an election rally of the United Front (a political party which contested the Parliamentary General Elections held in

Singapore on the 23rd December, 1976) held at a car park between Blocks 70 and 72, Bukit Merah, Singapore, on the 22nd December, 1976, the Defendant falsely and maliciously spoke and published of and concerning the Plaintiff and of and concerning him in the office of Prime Minister of Singapore and in relation to his conduct therein, to members of the general public who attended the said rally, the following words in Mandarin:

In the High
Court

No. 6
Statement of
Claim in Suit
No. 1024 of
1977 - 17th
May 1977
Continued

3. The literal translation of the words quoted in the preceding paragraph hereof is as follows:

10 "There is another thing. When I spoke in the Brickworks
last evening, I said for the people to buy a Government
flat, we would have to pay 'lawyer fee' of five hundred
dollars, normally done by Lee and Lee Company. Whose
company is the Lee & Lee Company? It belongs to Mrs.
Lee Kuan Yew. You just imagine how many S.I.T. flats there
are in Singapore, how many people have bought S.I.T. flats
and how many \$500's Lee & Lee Company has earned. Well!
20 in Sin Chew Jit Poh it says a statement issued by the HDB
clarifies that buyers of new flats need not select
solicitors to complete their purchase procedures. As for
resale, one must engage one's own lawyer. Then it goes on
to say, one need not pay five hundred dollars. Fifteen
dollars will be sufficient. So each person can save more
than four hundred dollars. Am I right? However, I wish
to tell you all. If you have paid this amount, if you have
paid this \$500/-. (Hereafter he spoke in Hokkien). Uncles
and aunts, please go to Lee & Lee to claim back. If he
does not pay you the money, sue him. This money is yours and
not Lee & Lee's. You have paid him \$500/-. Now you ask him
30 for a refund. If he does not pay you the money, sue him".

4. The said words in their natural and ordinary meaning
meant and were understood to mean that the Plaintiff abused
his aforesaid office for personal financial gain by causing
and/or ensuring that the firm of Lee & Lee, Advocates &
Solicitors, of which Firm the Plaintiff's wife is a senior
partner, acted in the matter of purchases and transfers of
Housing and Development Board flats, and hence that the Plaintiff
lacks integrity, has been corrupt and dishonest in the discharge
of his aforesaid office, and is unfit to hold the same.

40 5. The said words were calculated to disparage the Plaintiff
in his aforesaid office.

6. In the premises, the Plaintiff has been injured in his
character, credit and reputation as Prime Minister.

7. Unless restrained by this Honourable Court, the Defendant
will further publish the said or similar slanders upon the
Plaintiff.

And the Plaintiff claims:

- 50 (i) Damages for slander;
- (ii) An injunction restraining the Defendant, by his
agents or servants or otherwise, from further
publishing the said or any similar slanders upon
the Plaintiff.

In the High
Court

No. 6

Statement of
Claim in Suit
No. 1024 of
1977 - 17th
May 1977
Continued

(iii) Costs; and

(iv) All further requisite relief.

Served the 17th day of May, 1977.

(Signed)

Solicitors for the Plaintiff.

還有一件事情。昨晚我在磚窯那邊講。我說我們人
民買一間政府的屋子。要律師費五百塊。通常都是
LEE & LEE COMPANY做的。LEE & LEE COMPANY做的。LEE & LEE
COMPANY是誰的COMPANY?是李光耀太太的。你想想
新加坡有多少信托局的屋子。多少人買信托局的屋。
LEE & LEE賺了多少次五百塊。好。今天是講出來了。
你看。在星洲報里面。它講建屋發展局文告澄清。
組屋購置人士不必請律師辦手續。轉售必順自行請
律師。那麼它下面講不必五百塊。十五塊就夠了。這
個每一個人省了四百多塊了。是不是?但是我告訴大
家。如果你還了這筆錢的。你還了這五百塊。如果
你還了五百塊。(HE THEN SPOKE IN HOKKIEN)請各位阿
伯阿媽都回去 LEE & LEE 拿。他不給你。控告他!
此錢是你們的。不是 LEE & LEE 的。你給他五百塊。
你現在向他討回來。他不還你。控告他!

No. 7

Judgment in Suit No. 1024 of 1977 - 5th September
1977

IN THE HIGH COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

Suit No. 1024 of 1977

Between

LEE KUAN YEW

... Plaintiff

and

WONG KUI YU

... Defendant

The 5th day of September, 1977.

The Plaintiff having on the 29th day of July, 1977, obtained interlocutory Judgment herein against the Defendant for damages to be assessed and the amount found due to the Plaintiff having been certified at \$65,000.00 as appears by the Registrar's Certificate filed the 5th day of September, 1977, IT IS THIS DAY ADJUDGED that the Defendant do pay the Plaintiff \$65,000.00 and costs to be taxed.

Entered in Volume 179 page 128 at 2.30 p.m. of the 5th day of September, 1977.

(Signed)

ACTING DEPUTY REGISTRAR

No. 8

Statement of Claim in Suit No. 1025 of 1977 -
20th May 1977

IN THE HIGH COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

Suit No. 1025 of 1977

Between

LEE KUAN YEW

... Plaintiff

and

HWANG BAN CHEONG alias
NG POH CHONG

... Defendant

STATEMENT OF CLAIM

1. The Plaintiff is the Prime Minister of Singapore and Secretary-General of the People's Action Party which is, and was at all material times, in government of Singapore.

2. At an election rally of the United Front (a political party which contested the Parliamentary General Elections held in Singapore

In the High
Court

No. 7

Judgment in Suit
No. 1024 of 1977 -
5th September
1977

No. 8

Statement of
Claim in Suit
No. 1025 of
1977 - 20th
May 1977

In the High
Court

No. 8
Statement of
Claim in Suit
No. 1025
of 1977 - 20th
May 1977

on the 23rd December, 1976) held at a car park between Blocks 70 and 72, Bukit Merah, Singapore, on the 22nd December, 1976, the Defendant falsely and maliciously spoke and published of and concerning the Plaintiff and of and concerning him in the office of Prime Minister of Singapore and in relation to his conduct therein, to members of the general public who attended the said rally, the following words, in Mandarin, and in the Hokkien dialect of the Chinese language:

親愛的同胞們，至於反對黨在國會是不是佔一個很重要的角色呢？我看你們今天早上有看到報紙，這
個報紙，南洋商報、星洲日報、STRAITS TIMES，每個
報紙都有登，你們的屋子，我們買的屋子，要經過
律師，那個律師費三百多塊錢你們要交，那麼我
們問行動黨為什麼這些組屋的屋主不能夠找
他們自己^的律師，而一定要 LEE & LEE 的律師樓來辦
理呢？為什麼？是不是有政治貪污？所以他為了
我們反對黨天天晚上在那邊攻擊他，沒有辦法，他
今天登出報紙來了，你們親愛的各民族同胞們
應該感謝反對黨，假如不是反對黨天天晚上在攻
擊的話，你們不會得到免費的律師，有沒有看到
這一欄？「買主無須聘律師處理，建屋局提供免
費服務」看到了，是不是，這個，所以反對黨在國
會里面的角色是非常重要的，全世界的國家
都會有反對黨，就是我們這個獨裁的國家沒
有反對黨，所以我們知道，全新加坡的人民
知道，國會必須要有反對黨。

刚才我已用華語講過了。反對黨是很有用的。有人住這屋的人，七十二號屋的同胞兄弟，你們會知道，你們買這間屋是\$6200/LAWYER FEE不曉得是三百塊還是兩百多塊。律師的費。這個律師呢，他一定要叫LEE & LEE的律師才可以做。別的律師不可以做。新加坡有很多律師。他說他們不夠資格。不可以做。唯LEE & LEE的律師館才可以做。

LEE & LEE的律師館是誰的？你知道嗎？知道不知道？LEE & LEE知道不知道？不知道哦？李光耀道？LEE & LEE的妻子的啊。所以常常李光耀說他們以前。他說行動黨是真正清潔的。白衣白褲很清潔。沒有貪污的。為什麼這次他不敢講他是真正廉潔的。真正清潔。連過去的外交部長去提名時他不敢穿白衣白褲。不敢穿什麼知道嗎？拉惹勒南。穿白衣黑褲啊。變色了。PAP。他說他們沒有貪污有貪污。沒有貪污。問你們會知道。你們自己會知道。你們的眼睛會看到。對嗎？我不必講。再講下去。我是多重複我的話了。對嗎？你們自己會知道。有沒有貪污。我們人民自己會知道。不必我講。

3. The literal translation of the words quoted in the preceding paragraph hereof is as follows:

1. "..... Dear compatriots, does the opposition play a very important role in Parliament? I suppose you have read today's newspaper. All the newspapers - Nanyang Siang Pau, Sin Chew Jit Poh, Straits Times - have published it. For the purchase of your flats, the flats we buy, you have to go through a lawyer and pay more than three hundred dollars' lawyer fee. So, we ask the PAP why these flat owners can't engage their own lawyers but must go through Lee & Lee. Why? Is there any political corruption involved? It is because we, opposition parties, have been attacking him night after night, that he cannot but issue that thing in the newspaper. Dear compatriots of all races, you should thank the opposition parties. Had they not attacked him night after night, you would not have got any free legal service. Have you seen this column: "Buyers of HDB flats need not engage solicitors; the Housing Board provides free legal service"? You have seen it, haven't you? Therefore, the role played by the opposition in Parliament is very important. There are opposition parties in countries all over the world but not in this dictatorial country of ours. We know, and all the people of Singapore know, that there must be an opposition in Parliament."

10

20

2. "..... I have just spoken in Mandarin. The opposition is useful. Occupants of the flats here, compatriots and brothers staying in Block 72, I suppose you know that you have paid \$6,200.00 for your flat. The lawyer fee is either three hundred over or two hundred over dollars. Now, this lawyer - he is none other than Lee & Lee Company. Do you know to whom Lee & Lee belongs? Do you know or not? Lee & Lee. Do you know or not? It's Lee Kuan Yew. His wife's. Before, Lee Kuan Yew used to say the PAP is really clean. White shirts and white pants are very clean indeed. No corruption. Why doesn't he dare to say he is really clean this time? Even the ex-Foreign Minister dare not put on white shirt and white pants when he went for nominations. What did he put on? Rajaratnam was in white shirt but black pants. The colour has changed. The PAP claims that they are not corrupt. Corrupt or not? Ask yourselves. You will know. You can see for yourselves. Right? I don't have to say. If I carry on speaking, I will just be repeating what I have said. Right? You will know whether there is any corruption. Our people will know I don't have to say."

30

40

4. The said words in their natural and ordinary meaning meant and were understood to mean that the Plaintiff abused his aforesaid office for personal financial gain by causing and/or ensuring that the firm of Lee & Lee, Advocates & Solicitors, of which Firm the Plaintiff's wife is a senior partner, acted in the matter of purchases and transfers of Housing and Development Board flats, and hence that the Plaintiff lacks integrity, has been corrupt and dishonest in the discharge of his aforesaid office, and is unfit to hold the same.

50

5. The said words were calculated to disparage the Plaintiff in his aforesaid office.

In the High
Court

6. In the premises, the Plaintiff has been injured in his character, credit and reputation as Prime Minister.

No. 8
Statement of
Claim in Suit
No. 1025
of 1977 - 20th
May 1977

7. Unless restrained by this Honourable Court, the Defendant will further publish the said or similar slanders upon the Plaintiff.

And the Plaintiff claims:

- (i) Damages for slander;
- (ii) An injunction restraining the Defendant, by his agents or servants or otherwise, from further publishing the said or any similar slanders upon the Plaintiff;
- (iii) Costs; and
- (iv) All further requisite relief.

Served the 20th day of May, 1977.

(Signed)

Solicitors for the Plaintiff.

No. 9

Judgment in Suit No. 1025 of 1977 - 5th September
1977

No. 9
Judgment in Suit
No. 1025 of 1977
- 5th September
1977

IN THE HIGH COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

Suit No. 1025 of 1977

Between

LEE KUAN YEW

... Plaintiff

and

HWANG BAN CHEONG alias
NG POH CHONG

... Defendant

The 5th day of September 1977

The Plaintiff having on the 29th day of July, 1977, obtained interlocutory Judgment herein against the Defendant for damages to be assessed and the amount found due to the Plaintiff having been certified at \$65,000.00 as appears by the Registrar's Certificate filed the 5th day of September, 1977, IT IS THIS DAY ADJUDGED that the Defendant do pay the Plaintiff \$65,000.00 and

In the High
Court

costs to be taxed.

No. 9
Judgment in Suit
No. 1025 of 1977
- 5th September
1977

Entered in Volume 179 page 129 at 2.30 p.m. of the 5th day
of September, 1977.

(Signed)

ACTING DEPUTY REGISTRAR.

O N A P P E A L

FROM THE COURT OF APPEAL IN SINGAPORE

B E T W E E N :

JOSHUA BENJAMIN JEYARETNAM

Appellant
(Defendant)

- and -

LEE KUAN YEW

Respondent
(Plaintiff)

SUPPLEMENTAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

WARD BOWIE,
Clement House,
99 Aldwych,
London, W.C.2.

Solicitors for Appellant

HERBERT SMITH & CO.,
Watling House,
35-37 Cannon Street,
London EC4M 5SD.

Solicitors for Respondent