

The Singapore Free Press and Mercantile Advertiser (1884-1942), 9
November 1931, Page 7

MALACCA COURT NEWS

Article also available on microfilm reel NL1754 [Lee Kong Chian Reference Library - On shelf]

★ Add to Citation 📄 Save to myLibrary

Go to « First ‹ Previous | Next › Last » Article

MALACCA COURT NEWS

A Wife's Claim for Property Release

(From Our Own Correspondent)

Malacca, Nov. 6.

Indot binte Haji Rajah, who described herself as the wife of Said living at Kampong Pulau of Kuala Sungei Bahru, claimed for the release of property which had been seized by Chop Hoi Chong.

Mr. E. E. C. Thuraisingam appeared for the claimant whilst Mr. L. R. Chandran conducted the case for Chop Hoi Chong, the judgment creditor. The claimant submitted to Court that the debt was her husband's and she was in no way connected with it. She said that the house and furniture belonged to her and came from her parents. She also stated that her husband was dependant on her and was a very poor man.

His Honour in giving his verdict remarked that the evidence was very clear and furnished sufficient proof that the house and furniture belonged to the complainant and not to her husband. At the request of counsel for the complainant His Honour ordered that her claim be allowed and the seizure released.

THE WRONG MAN SUED

Gan Hua Boon, who styled himself as Managing Partner of Messrs. Chuan and Co. claimed a sum of \$112.82 from Gan Hong Hoe.

Mr. E. E. C. Thuraisingam appeared for the defendant whilst Mr. L. R. Chandran was for the plaintiff.

It was alleged that Gan Hua Boon had sup-

Page Thumbnail



plied certain goods to Chop Eng Hock Chuan, which firm, he said, was owned by the defendant. Gan Hong Hoe, the defendant, said in his evidence that he had nothing to do with Chop Eng Hock Chuan. He admitted that the said chop was run by three others who were only tenants on his estate at Kemendore. He denied having had anything to do with the plaintiff in the transaction of any business. Several witnesses supported the defendant's evidence and Gan Kiat Hoe's evidence clearly testified to the fact that he, Gan Kiat Hoe, was the debtor to this amount and not the defendant.

He said also in his evidence that he had made arrangements with Defendant to supply goods to his coolies. It was true that Gan Hong Hoe paid him after deducting from the coolies' wages.

His Honour remarked that Gan Hong Hoe gave very good evidence and he had reason to believe that the plaintiff had no evidence whatever to prove his case against the defendant. He dismissed the case and at the instance of the counsel for the defence ordered the plaintiff to pay all costs.

Url: <http://newspapers.nl.sg/Digitise>

Table of Contents of this Issue

To obtain an un-watermarked copy of this article, please visit our FAQ page for more information.