

IN THE HIGH COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

[1997] SGHC 159

Suit No 597 of 1995

Between

Advanced Microcomputers Pte
Ltd

... Plaintiff

And

Regional (Far East) Electronics
Pte Ltd

... Defendant

GROUND OF DECISION

This judgment is subject to final editorial corrections 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.

Advanced Microcomputers Pte Ltd v Regional (Far East) Electronics Pte Ltd

[1997] SGHC 159

Suit No 597 of 1995
Choo Han Teck JC
07 June 1997

1

Judgment:

2 GROUNDS OF DECISION

3 1. This was an action by the Plaintiff company for the repayment of a
sum of \$250,000

being the balance of a loan to the Defendant company. The Plaintiffs were at all material

times a company carrying on the business of selling computer products and components. The

Defendants were at the material time carrying on a similar business, but was also an

The first cheque (\$120,000) was issued from the Plaintiffs' account with the Overseas

Union Bank Ltd and the second cheque (\$380,000) was from Ng Kim Siah's personal

account also with the same bank. Ng's evidence was that the Plaintiff company did not

have sufficient funds at the time and he therefore, drew out a personal cheque, but the

intention of the parties was that it was to be a loan between the two companies.

Accordingly, the Plaintiffs' accounting records reflected the sum of \$380,000 as an

advance from Ng to the company.

6 4. In exchange, two post-dated cheques of \$200,000 and \$300,000 from the Defendant

company were given to the Plaintiffs. The first cheque was eventually presented for

payment and was honoured. At the request of Koh Keng Hin the Plaintiffs returned the

second cheque to Koh in exchange for six post-dated cheques of \$50,000 each.
Evidence was

not led in this point but it is obvious that this exchange was to enable the
Defendants to

repay the balance by instalment. The first cheque cleared but the rest were not.
Koh was

called as a witness and testified on behalf of the Plaintiffs. He said that the
remaining

cheques could not clear because his wife Heng Kwee Choo had subsequently
obtained a court

order requiring two signatories to the Defendants' cheques. The six cheques
given to

the Plaintiffs were signed by him solely before that order was obtained.

7 5. The Defendants claimed that the loan was a personal loan by Ng Kim
Siah to his good

friend Koh Keng Hin or, alternatively, to Koh's new company called Regional

Electronics Pte Ltd. As a further alternative, it was alleged that the loan was an
illegal

loan because it contravened the Moneylenders Act, Cap 188. I shall deal first with the

argument that the loan was given by the Plaintiffs to Koh's new company. Regional

Electronics (the new company) was a company incorporated by Koh without his wife as a

shareholder or director. The name of this company is very similar to that of the

Defendants except that the words "(Far East)" were not part of the name. The

basis for the allegation that the loan was for this company and not the Defendants was

that one of the Plaintiffs' payment vouchers described the payee as "Regional

Electronics Pte Ltd" but had the letters "F.E." (obviously to mean

"Far East") inserted as an addendum between the words "Regional" and

"Electronics". This allegation is of no merit whatsoever as Heng Kwee Choo

herself admitted in her affidavit that confusion often arose because the Defendant company

had been mistaken for Koh's new company before. What is more important is that the

cheques were addressed to the Defendants as payee and they were paid into the

Defendants' account accordingly.

8 6. The second argument by the Defendants was that the loan was made to Koh personally.

There was no evidence to support this allegation. Ng Kim Siah and Koh Keng Hin both

testified that the loan was made between the two companies. They were hardly

cross-examined on this allegation, and no evidence was led or adduced to show what

happened to the money after it was paid into the Defendants' account. The evidence of

Koh and his assistant Soh Beng Guan was that the Defendants needed money at that time to

reduce their indebtedness to SGS-Thomson. Soh stated under cross-examination that after

the loan was given the Plaintiffs continued business with the Defendants and

made some

purchases. He said that at that time the Plaintiffs were not a big customer, but they felt

that it could develop into one. That might not have come to pass, but I am satisfied that

that was the hope of the parties at that time. I find that there was no evidence

sufficient to contradict this. Soh was *au fait* with the circumstances of the

Defendant company at the material time and he was a witness whose evidence I accept as

being truthful. Furthermore, it seems most unlikely that Koh would have asked Soh to

accompany him if he had only wanted to borrow the money personally. It would require some

speculation to the effect that Koh was acting with guile and cunning to deceive Ng Kim

Siah (using Soh as a prop) to lend him the money. Soh also stated under cross-examination

that Ng did not impose any conditions to the loan which Koh promised to repay

within two
or three months.

9 7. Ng was cross-examined on the occasion when the Plaintiffs gave the
Defendants a

\$100,000 standby letter of credit. Koh was not cross-examined on this point. Ng
explained

that SGS-Thomson had asked the Defendants to secure more credit facilities
and as the

Plaintiffs had not fully utilised their own facilities, it persuaded its bank to allow
the

Defendants to use that facility with the Plaintiffs acting as guarantor for the

Defendants. Ng stated that the Defendants were to bear all the bank charges and
bank

interests should it use this facility. This point was not pursued any further.

10 8. It was submitted by counsel for the Defendants that there was no
evidence to show

that the sum of \$380,000 was not a personal loan from Ng Kim Siah and not the
Plaintiffs

"other than the oral evidence of the Plaintiffs' directors and the internal documentation". With respect, counsel failed to appreciate the evidential burden of

proof that lay with the Defendants when it alleged that the loan was not made to the

Defendants but to Koh personally. The mere assertion that the loan was made on the basis

of a "personal relationship" and "mutual trust between Koh Keng Hin and Ng

Kim Siah" is sufficient to discharge this burden. I find that the loan was one that

was made by the Plaintiff company to the Defendant company.

11 9. The main defence of the Defendants was that the loan was an illegal moneylending

transaction. The loan itself was not disputed by the Plaintiffs or Koh, but they denied

that any interest was paid for these loans. The Defendants relied on a cheque of \$9,000

and two cheques of \$5,000 each paid from the Defendants' bank account by

Koh to the

Plaintiffs in August, September and October 1994 as proof of payment of
interest. The

evidence of Ng and Koh was that these cheques were given to the Plaintiffs by
Koh in

exchange for cash as Koh found it more convenient than going to the bank.
Koh's

evidence on this point was somewhat incoherent and he appeared a little
embarrassed when

giving evidence on this point. Although I find him to be a generally truthful
witness, his

evidence on this point was not entirely satisfactory. If interest was charged, the

Moneylenders Act creates a presumption of moneylending. However, the mere
charging of

interest does not render the loan transaction illegal. What is prohibited under the
Act is

the carrying on of a business of moneylending. In determining whether a person
was

Advanced Microcomputers Pte Ltd v Regional (Far East) Electronics Pte Ltd [1997] SGHC 159

carrying on such a business, the court will take into account whether interest was

charged. If no interest was charged then it can hardly be called a business since no

profits would have been made.

12 10. If interest was charged, the court may then consider the amount of interest

charged. The higher the rate the more a court may incline towards finding that the lender

was an unlicensed moneylender carrying on such a business. In this case, the undisputed

evidence was that there was no deduction of interest "upfront". This does not exclude an agreement between the parties that interest was chargeable, but it is relevant

in determining whether this was a typical moneylender's way of doing business. It is

also relevant, in this particular case in that it does explain the embarrassment of Koh

when he gave evidence on this point. He said that it was his own decision to
give the

three cheques to the Plaintiffs in exchange for cash because he "felt bad that the

Defendants were unable to repay the principal sum". The loan was made in May
but the

three cheques were given only for August, September and October. This was
consistent with

Koh's evidence that at the time the loan was advanced there was no agreement
to pay

any interest. I can only come to the conclusion that because the Defendants were
unable to

pay the principal sum, Koh felt obliged to defray the cost to the Plaintiffs in
giving the

loan. There was no evidence of any other interest payments other than these
three cheques.

Furthermore, the rate of interest cannot be said to be manifestly exorbitant. Even
the

Defendants' counsel conceded that in this case it was no more than 24% per
annum.

Hence, even though I find that there were three payments of interest, these payments were

not characteristic of that charged by a person carrying on a business of unlicensed

moneylending.

13 11. It is also significant that the only security taken by the Plaintiffs for the loan

were two cash cheques for the exact amount of the loan. This is consistent with the

Plaintiffs' evidence (and that of Koh) that it was a loan to cement their business relationship and not in the course of a moneylending business.

14 12. There was also no dispute that the Plaintiffs did not harass the Defendants or Koh

for payment. However, Koh's wife Heng Kwee Choo testified that on 29 November 1994 Ng

Kim Siah telephoned her and told her that her husband owed him \$250,000 with interest at

\$5,000 a month. She made a police report and in that report she stated that Ng said that

he would be "nasty" if he was not paid. She made the report on the advice of her

solicitors. Ng denied that he had threatened her. This point was hardly pursued by counsel

for the Defendants. I take into account Ng's denial, and the fact that apart from

this one instance, made long after the debt was due, there was no other

"harassment". There was no evidence or submission as to what was meant or

understood by the word "nasty".

15 13. Although Koh was estranged from his wife, he would still stand to gain if the loan

was found to be an illegal transaction. I am left to conjecture that he denied that the

transaction was a moneylending transaction purely to spite his wife. Considering the

evidence as a whole, I am unable to come to that conclusion.

conclusion that it

was not a genuine sale at an objectively ascertained value. If, as it was, that at the

time of the sale of the flat the Defendants were still owing \$250,000 to the Plaintiffs

then the Plaintiffs would have lost out because Koh had departed with a valuable security

for less, unless, which was not proved, the sale price was so much below the market value

as to make it worth the while for Ng or his wife to acquire the flat at that price and at

that time. Otherwise, as it appeared, Ng's wife would have purchased Koh's property at an insignificant discount when half the principal loan had not been repaid.

All these facts indicate the improbability of the Defendants' allegation of the Plaintiffs carrying on an unlicensed moneylending business. Heng Jee Lim's evidence

which was hardly shaken under cross-examination was as follows:

17 "Mr Koh had, on or about December 1994, approached both Mr Ng and myself to

inquire if we were interested in purchasing the property known as 105 Highland Road,

Highland Condominium, Singapore 549179, ("the property"). Mr Koh then quoted us

a purchase price of \$800,000.

18 I was I fact interested in purchasing a piece of property situated in that locale but I

found the price quoted by him to be too high. I therefore made a counter-offer to purchase

the property at \$700,000 but my counter-offer was rejected by Mr Koh.

19 Thereafter, no more was said about the property until sometime on or about March 1995,

when Mr Koh approached me with another offer to purchase the property. This time he

offered to sell the property to me for \$780,000. I proposed that a valuation be done but

he said that he already had a valuation done and he produced a valuation report prepared

by Cheong Koon Seng (CKS) Auctioneers & Valuers Pte Ltd (CKS) dated 19th November 1994

which valued the property at \$780,000.

20 We then both agreed that the purchase price be fixed at \$780,000 in reliance on the CKS valuation."

21 15. It was not disputed that the valuation report was obtained by Koh and not by Ng or

his wife. It was also accepted that at that time Koh was in financial difficulties and

eventually became a bankrupt. In those circumstances, and in the absence of any real

challenge to the evidence of Heng Jee Lim, whose evidence I accept, it was not improbable

that Koh was prepared to sell his property at valuation even if that price might be a

little lower than if he had been more patient or determined to sell at a higher price.

the business

22 16. For the reasons above, I find that the Plaintiffs were not carrying on
the

of moneylending, and, accordingly, I allowed its claim.

23 Choo Han Teck

24 Judicial Commissioner

25 Singapore, 7 June 1997.

Choo Han Teck JC

Leow Chiap Seng and Tan E-Fang [Sim Hill Tan & Wong] for the
plaintiffs
Cheong Aik Chye and Tan Tuan Wee [Judy Loke & Cheong] for the
defendants