5,1976

IN THE PRIVY COUNCIL No. 10 of 1974

ON APPEAL

FROM THE HIGH COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINAGPORE

IN THE MATTER OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION ACT (Cap. 217)

and

IN THE MATTER OF ISAAC PAUL RATNAM an Advocate and Solicitor

B E T W E E N :

ISAAC PAUL RATNAM Appellant

-and-

THE LAW SOCIETY OF SINGAPORE

Respondent

SUPPLEMENTAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

CHARLES RUSSELL & CO.,
Hale Court,
Lincoln's Inn,
London, WC2A 3UL.

Solicitors for the Appellant.

JAQUES & CO.,
2 South Square,
Gray's Inn,
London, WCIR 5HR.

Solicitors for the Respondent.

INDEX TO

SUPPLEMENTAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

1. Page 13 of Cross-Examination of the Appellant in the proceedings before the Disciplinary Committee of Inquiry concerning Francis T. Seow on 7th December 1972.

Q. Miss Lim will say she then affixed a stamp "By Hand" and "Private and Confidential", and tried to find the file to affix the two copies for circulation. She could not find the file. She found the file only after lunch on your desk?
A. I agree the "chops" were put. The rest is not true.

Q. She will say that she then saw Miss Fong because she was worried that the letters were not circulated?
A. I definitely wrote them between 4.30 and 5.30 p.m.

Q. Seow will say from 11 o'clock onwards he was with the Monetary Authority of Singapore (M.A.S.) with a Mrs Elizabeth Sam and was not in the office when Mrs Gaffar and S.F. Rotnam were present on the 3rd August, 1972, when the letters were handed over.

(Cashin reads the last two lines of page 14 and top of page 15 of Exhibit "P2").

Is not that a lie?
A. I spoke to Seow before I wrote the letters either on the 2nd or on the morning of the 3rd.

Q. I suggest your last several answers are a pack of lies?
A. No.

Q. What time on the 2nd August did you see Seow?
A. I can't remember.

Q. Those two letters ..... (Cashin reads). Are they not the clearest incitement to commit a crime?
A. I did not realise it. This thought was not in my mind.

Q. Did you want to hide the files from the Police?
A. I did not want the files to be made available to the Police.

Q. I put it to you that you wanted to keep those files from the Police?
A. Yes. I did not want the Police to have them. Seow disagreed with me.

Q. What is the need of an exclamation mark? Does it not denote surprise?
A. Normally it would.

Q. Coupled with the question mark, what do you think that means?
A. It is a query.

Q. I suggest those two marks make it clear that Seow knew nothing and that nothing had been discussed with him?
A. It is possible he might not have remembered what I told him because he was very busy. He certainly knew about the letter.

Q. (Cashin puts the question again).
A. I did mention to him after I spoke to S.F. Rotnam.

Q. You want us to believe that after putting the exclamation and question marks he would tell you if you had taken clients' instructions, it would be alright?
A. He was the senior partner. He was head. He could have stopped it or asked me to retract it. He could have done it himself. He did not say a word about it until the Police arrested me.

Q. I put it to you he was angry and asked you what you meant by sending out such a letter?
A. That is a fabrication.