

IN THE HIGH COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

[2019] SGHC 110

Suit No 815 of 2018
(Summonses Nos 5242, 5698, 5703 and 5705 of 2018)

Between

1. CRRC (Hong Kong) Co Limited
2. CRRC HongKong Capital Management Co Limited

... Plaintiffs

And

Chen Weiping

... Defendant

And

Chew Hwa Kwang Patrick

... Third Party

Between

Chen Weiping

... Plaintiff in Counterclaim

And

1. CRRC (Hong Kong) Co Limited
2. CRRC HongKong Capital Management Co Limited
3. Chew Hwa Kwang Patrick
4. Guo BingQiang

... Defendants in Counterclaim

GROUNDS OF DECISION

[Civil Procedure] — [Summary judgment]
[Civil Procedure] — [Striking out]

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.

CRRC (Hong Kong) Co Ltd and another
v
Chen Weiping (Chew Hwa Kwang Patrick, third party)

[2019] SGHC 110

High Court — Suit No 815 of 2018 (Summonses Nos 5242, 5698, 5703 and 5705 of 2018)

Woo Bih Li J

11 February 2019

29 April 2019

Woo Bih Li J:

Introduction

1 This action was the second action filed by the plaintiffs (“Plaintiffs”) against the defendant, Chen Weiping (“Chen”), as guarantor of the obligations of Midas Holdings Limited (“Midas”). It was similar to the first action in Suit No 420 of 2018 filed by the Plaintiffs against Chen. The first action was in respect of “the Series 003 Notes” issued by Midas. The second action was in respect of “the Series 004 Notes” issued by Midas.

2 The background to the second action was the same as that to the first action.

3 On 7 November 2018, the Plaintiffs filed Summons No 5242 of 2018 for summary judgment against Chen.

4 On 4 December 2018, the Plaintiffs and Guo Bingqiang filed Summons No 5698 of 2018 to strike out the counterclaim by Chen against them.

5 Likewise, on 4 December 2018, Patrick Chew filed Summons No 5705 of 2018 to strike out Chen's counterclaim against him and Summons No 5703 of 2018 to set aside Chen's Third Party Notice against him. The Third Party Statement of Claim had apparently not been filed yet.

Decisions

6 As the arguments in respect of the four applications were the same as those in respect of similar applications made in the first action, the outcome was the same. I granted the substantive reliefs sought by the applicants in the four applications in the second action.

7 I am releasing my grounds of decision for the applications in the first action on the same day as these grounds for the second action. The grounds for the first action will also apply to the applications in the second action.

Woo Bih Li
Judge

Ajinderpal Singh, Lee Wei Alexander, Ng Guo Xi and Zoe Pittas
(Dentons Rodyk & Davidson LLP) for the plaintiffs and
first, second and fourth defendants in counterclaim;
Wong Hin Pkin Wendall, Chen Jie'An Jared, Ang Xin Yi Felicia and
Loo Quan Rung Alexis (Drew & Napier LLC) for the defendant and
plaintiff in counterclaim;
Aaron Lee Teck Chye and Chong Xue Er, Cheryl (Allen & Gledhill
LLP) for the third party and third defendant in counterclaim.