

IN THE FAMILY JUSTICE COURTS OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

[2024] SGHCF 1

Originating Summons No 10 of 2023

Between

WTB

... Applicant

And

WTC

... Respondent

JUDGMENT

[Family Law — Matrimonial proceedings — Whether a second extension of time to file a notice of appeal should be allowed]

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.

WTB

v

WTC

[2024] SGHCF 1

General Division of the High Court (Family Division) — Originating
Summons No 10 of 2023

Choo Han Teck J

11 January 2024

16 January 2024

Judgment reserved.

Choo Han Teck J:

1 The parties obtained final judgment of their divorce on 31 May 2023. The present application arises from the District Judge's ("DJ") order in FC/D 5459/2021 concerning the ancillary matters, in particular the division of matrimonial assets and child maintenance. The Applicant Husband wanted to appeal against the DJ's orders that were handed down on 22 May 2023, but he failed to file the Notice of Appeal within the stipulated time, which was 14 days after 22 May 2023. The Applicant then applied for an extension of time in HCF/OSN 6/2023 on 22 June 2023. He said that he failed to file the Notice of Appeal in time because he was in the process of obtaining legal aid. At the hearing on 15 August 2023, I granted him leave to appeal within 14 days. However, he failed to comply again, and now seeks a second extension of time before me.

2 The Applicant Husband says that he did not know that he was supposed to file a Notice of Appeal and that he did not know how to file a Notice of Appeal within the stipulated time. I am unable to accept his reasons since no attempt was made. With the experience of his first application for an extension of time, he ought, at least, to seek help because he must know that a notice of appeal does not appear by itself. I agree with counsel for the Respondent Wife that there has been an unreasonable delay of 118 days from the last day the Applicant was supposed to file his Notice of Appeal.

3 I am also of the view that the Applicant's prospects of appeal are between slim and none. He intends to appeal against (1) the value of their matrimonial assets, in particular, his company New & Novel Engineering Pte Ltd, and (2) the amount of child maintenance the DJ ordered. The basis for his appeal rests on an accountant's report showing that the company is worth zero dollars. However, that accountant's report is not a valuation report explaining why the company has no funds — it is simply the annual report which compiled the company's financial statements for the year ended 31 December 2022. Those were self-serving statements that were not accepted by the court below. Thus, I dismiss his application and order costs of \$500 to be paid by him to the Respondent forthwith.

- Sgd -
Choo Han Teck
Judge of the High Court

The applicant in person;
Tan Yee Tat and Alvina Logan (Yeo & Associates LLC) for the
respondent.