

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

**PRESS RELEASE
16 MAY 2012, 7 PM**

**AG v Vellama d/o Marie Muthu
CA 35 of 2012/F**

The Attorney-General (“AG”) withdrew his appeal against Justice Pillai’s order to grant leave to the Respondent to apply for judicial review. The AG’s decision arose out of the fact that the entire substratum for this litigation has gone, and it would be an abuse of the process of the court for the matter to continue.

2 When the AG’s position was confirmed in court this morning, Mr Ravi surprisingly said he wanted an order for costs in favour of his client. The Respondent’s attempt to seek an order for costs is surprising because it is contrary to what Mr Ravi had communicated to the Court and the AGC earlier. First, as noted above, the AG has withdrawn his appeal because there is nothing left to litigate, a point Mr Ravi appeared to accept in his letter to us sent last Friday and copied to the media. In such circumstances, it would be an abuse of process to continue the proceedings. Second, this is contrary to the Respondent’s counsel’s representation in paragraph 19 of the Plaintiff’s Skeletal Arguments dated 5 April 2012 handed over to the Court when parties were in court to deal with the AG’s application for an expedited appeal. In that paragraph 19 of the Plaintiff’s Skeletal Arguments, Mr Ravi wrote “As Vellama’s solicitor is acting pro-bono, no costs will be claimed in the event that the appeal is dismissed.”

3 As the Respondent apparently intends to continue the proceedings, the Court of Appeal has reserved the question of costs until the Court below decides on any further steps that may be taken by either party.

* * *

Media Contact:

Li Jin Haw (Ms)
Assistant Director, Corporate Communications Unit
Attorney-General’s Chambers, Singapore
Email: li_jin_haw@agc.gov.sg Tel: 6332 4693