Please delete where applicable –

1. These Grounds of Decision DOES NOT need redaction.
2. Redaction HAS NOT been done.

DEPUTY REGISTRAR
EVANS NG
07 April 2026

IN THE STATE COURTS OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

[2026] SGMC 47

Magistrate's Court Originating Claim No 3307 of 2025
Assessment of Damages No 1076 of 2025

Between

Liang Chi Air-Condition Pte Ltd

… *Claimant*

And

ATP Engineering Pte Ltd

… *Defendant*

GROUNDS OF DECISION

[Damages] — [Assessment]
[Damages] — [Practice and procedure]
[Damages] — [Special damages]

This judgment/GD 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.

Liang Chi Air-Condition Pte Ltd
v
ATP Engineering Pte Ltd

[2026] SGMC 47

Magistrate's Court Originating Claim No 3307 of 2025
Assessment of Damages No 1076 of 2025
Deputy Registrar Evans Ng
1 April 2026

7 April 2026

Deputy Registrar Evans Ng:

1 The defendant's driver damaged the claimant's vehicle in a road traffic accident. The claimant entered interlocutory judgment against the defendant. At the assessment of damages hearing, I granted the claims for consequential losses, including the cost of renting a substitute vehicle during repairs.

2 This is a simple matter, and I would not have written a judgment but for the need to remind lawyers of some requirements that they tend to overlook when preparing these commonplace cases for hearing.

3 When a litigant seeks damages that are made up of the costs of *renting a substitute vehicle* or for *loss of use* of his vehicle, he must expressly state all

relevant facts regarding his damaged vehicle in the text of his affidavit of evidence-in-chief. These facts include:

(a) the make and model of the vehicle, *eg* whether it is a Toyota Corolla Altis, Nissan Sunny or Yamaha MT-03;

(b) the type of vehicle, *eg* whether it is a lorry, 8-seater mini-van or double-decker bus;

(c) the vehicle's engine capacity;

(d) the vehicle's age or registration date;

(e) the ordinary use(s) of the vehicle; *eg* whether it was used once a week for grocery runs or five days a week to deliver goods; and

(f) either the actual rental cost incurred (*ie* the daily rate of rental x the number of rental days), or the proposed sum for loss of use (*ie* the proposed daily rate x the number of days).

These are factors which the court would consider when deciding whether the daily rate of rental incurred, or alleged value of the loss of use suffered by the claimant was reasonable. All too often, however, and indeed in this case, the sole particular that is disclosed in the claimant's affidavit of evidence-in-chief is the vehicle's registration number, *eg* ABC 1234 Z.

4 Lawyers must be mindful that when they act for a claimant, their client bears the burden of adducing evidence to prove the measure of damages sought, even in the absence of the opposing party. They should not assume that the court will pose clarificatory questions to the witnesses, from which the relevant evidence could emerge when they are answered. If a claimant's lawyer does not

Version No 1: 07 Apr 2026 (14:44 hrs)

draft all the material facts into the claimant's affidavit of evidence-in-chief, it only puts his client at risk of receiving nominal damages.

Evans Ng
Deputy Registrar

Lim Chui Ling Catherine (Catherine Lim LLC) for the claimant;
The defendant in person and absent.

Version No 1: 07 Apr 2026 (14:44 hrs)