

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

**MALAYSIA**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SABAH & SARAWAK**  
**AT KUCHING**  
**DIVORCE PETITION NO. KCH-33JP-234/7-2017**

IN THE MATTER of Dissolution of Marriage  
by mutual consent

AND

IN THE MATTER of Rule 8 of the  
Divorce and Matrimonial Proceedings  
Rules 1980

AND

IN THE MATTER of Section 52 of the  
Law Reform (Marriage & Divorce) Act  
1976

BETWEEN

**LEE CHUI SI [f] ... WIFE PETITIONER**  
**(WN.KP. 790714-13-5126)**  
Lot 8322, 1343A, Lorong Bayor Bukit 8,  
Jalan Bayor Bukit, Tabuan Jaya Phase 4,  
93350 Kuching, Sarawak

AND

**TEH YAW POH ... HUSBAND RESPONDENT**  
**(WN.KP. 730326-14-5141)**  
1739, Sublot 8, Lot 997,  
Lorong 4A Taman Sri Moyan,  
Jalan Matang – Batu Kawa,  
93250 Kuching, Sarawak

**JUDGMENT**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

1. The Wife Petitioner and the Husband Respondent were lawfully married on 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2005 and there are three children of the marriage, that is, Peggy Teh (f) aged 10, Teh Jian Fei aged 8 and Teh Jian Yi aged 7 [collectively referred to as “the Children”].
  
2. The parties to this divorce petition had, originally on 25<sup>th</sup> July 2017, filed a joint petition for dissolution of marriage by mutual consent. However, on 25<sup>th</sup> July 2017 i.e. the hearing date of the joint petition, the Husband Respondent changed his mind and indicated that he intended to contest for the custody of the two boys, Teh Jian Fei and Teh Jian Yi.
  
3. Vide Consent order dated 11<sup>th</sup> January 2018, the parties had agreed to the following terms:
  - (a) *That the said marriage be dissolved;*
  
  - (b) *That no maintenance is to be paid to the Wife Petitioner by the Husband Petitioner;*
  
  - (c) *The Petitioners further jointly agree that neither the Husband Petitioner nor the Wife Petitioner shall have any claim against any property or assets of the other save and except for the matrimonial house of 1739, Sublot 8, Lot 977, Lorong 4A, Taman Sri Moyan, Jalan Matang – Batu Kawa, 93250 Kuching, Sarawak (hereinafter “the said property”). Both the Petitioners agreed that the said property is to be sold at the prevailing market rate and either party has liberty to do so and the other shall agrees and undertakes to execute any instruments and documentations to effect the said transfer and/or disposal of the*

1                    *said matrimonial property within seven (7) days from the receipt*  
2                    *of Notice from the other party and the proceeds of the said*  
3                    *and/or disposal of the said property shall be divided equally*  
4                    *between the Wife Petitioner and the Husband Petitioner after the*  
5                    *legal deductions and expenses incurred for the sale of the said*  
6                    *property;*

7                    (d) *That the Wife Petitioner and Husband Petitioner shall bear the*  
8                    *costs of this Joint Petition equally;*

9                    (e) *That there be liberty for parties to apply for variation of the*  
10                    *Court Order in the event of change of circumstances; and*

11                    (f) *That the matter is adjourned to 8<sup>th</sup> January, 2018 – 11<sup>th</sup> January,*  
12                    *2018 for the trial and determination of the maintenance,*  
13                    *custody, access of the children and other ancillary reliefs by the*  
14                    *parties hereto.*

15                    4.    **Statement of Issues To Be Tried marked SIT Enclosure 58 stated**  
16                    **as follows:**

17                    1.    *Whether there is any ground justifying a change of custody of*  
18                    *Peggy Teh (f), Teh Jian Fei and Teh Jian Yi [hereinafter “the*  
19                    *said children”] from the Wife Petitioner to the Husband*  
20                    *Respondent with reasonable access to be given to the Wife*  
21                    *Petitioner?*

22                    2.    *Whether the Husband Respondent is a person unfit to have*  
23                    *custody of the said children?*

24                    3.    *Whether there is a change of circumstances justifying the*  
25                    *variations and/or amendment of the current provision for the*  
26                    *children’s maintenance to be varied from the sum of RM1,200.00*  
27                    *to RM2,500.00 per month?*

1           5.     Statement of Agreed Facts marked SAF Enclosure 57 was filed on  
2                   7<sup>th</sup> December 2017 and it stated as follows:

3           1.     The Wife Petitioner is a Sarawak born and the Husband  
4                   Respondent is originated from West Malaysia; paternal  
5                   grandparents are all living in West Malaysia;

6           2.     The Wife Petitioner and the Husband Respondent was  
7                   married on 23.4.2005 and divorced on 9.8.2017;

8           3.     They have three (3) children out of their 12 years marriage,  
9                   PEGGY TEH,, TEH JIAN FEI & TEH JIAN YI are all  
10                  minor of the ages of 10 years old, 8 years old and 7 years  
11                  old respectively;

12          4.     Save that the Husband Respondent had initially agreed that  
13                  the care control and custody to be given to the Wife  
14                  Petitioner with reasonable access to be given to Husband  
15                  Respondent as per the Joint Petition for Dissolution of  
16                  Marriage by Mutual Consent dated 25.7.2017 (hereinafter  
17                  “Joint Petition”), he had changed his mind during the  
18                  hearing on the 9.8.2017 that he intends to fight over the  
19                  custody of his two younger children . However, upon  
20                  receipt of the answer of Petition, it is apparent in Paragraph  
21                  2 of the Answer to Petition that the Husband Respondent is  
22                  now intending to fight over the custody of all three (3)  
23                  children;

24          5.     There is no maintenance to be paid for the Wife Petitioner;

1           6.     Initial arrangement as to the exercise of access by the  
2           Husband Respondent is as per the Petition, that the Wife  
3           Petitioner has custody over the kids with the Husband  
4           Respondent having reasonable access subject to the  
5           willingness of the children. On 13.10.2017, this Honourable  
6           Court has made an interim order that the Husband  
7           Respondent is entitled to exercise his reasonable access to  
8           the children once per week.

9           7.     Current maintenance is RM1,200.00 paid directly to the  
10          Wife Petitioner's account for the children;

11          8.     The Husband Respondent shall continue to pay for the  
12          education including tuition expenses and insurance for the  
13          benefit for the minor children without any demand by the  
14          Wife Petitioner; and

15          9.     Both parties have agreed that the matrimonial house is to be  
16          sold at the prevailing market rate.

17          6.     However, on the day of trial (8<sup>th</sup> January 2018) the counsel for the  
18          Husband Respondent informed the Court that he disagreed with  
19          paragraph 8 therein, that is, the Husband Respondent shall  
20          continue to pay for the education including tuition expenses and  
21          insurance for the benefit for the minor children without any  
22          demand by the Wife Petitioner.

23

1           **Interim Order**

2           7.     On 21<sup>st</sup> December 2017, pursuant to the Notice of Application  
3           Enclosure 15, the Court made an interim order on access to the  
4           Children in the following terms:

5           a.     Respondent shall not be given access to Peggy Teh and Teh  
6           Jiah Fei.

7           b.     Respondent be given access to Teh Jian Yi on alternate  
8           weekends from 6.30 p.m. on Friday to 6.30 p.m. on Sunday.

9           **Issue No. 1 – Whether there is any ground justifying a change**  
10          **of custody of the Children from the Wife Petitioner to the**  
11          **Husband Respondent with reasonable access to be given to the**  
12          **Wife Petitioner?**

13          **And**

14          **Issue No. 2 – Whether the Husband Respondent is a person**  
15          **unfit to have custody of the said Children?**

16          8.     I shall consider the two issues together as they are interlinked.

17          9.     The claim for the custody of the Children signify a change of heart  
18          of the Husband Respondent in view that, the parties had,  
19          originally in the joint divorce petition, agreed that care, control  
20          and custody of the Children be given to the Wife Petitioner with  
21          reasonable access to the Husband Respondent. In his cross  
22          examination, Husband Respondent said that the refusal of the  
23          Wife Petitioner to let him bring the Children to celebrate CNY

1 with his parents in West Malaysia caused him to contest for their  
2 custody.

3 10. It has been expressly provided for in section 88 of the Law  
4 Reform (Marriage and Divorce) Act 1976 [“LRA”] that the  
5 welfare of the children is the first and paramount concern in  
6 determining the custody of children.

7 11. What is involved in the consideration of “first and paramount” has  
8 been defined by the Federal Court in Mahabir Prasad v Mahabir  
9 Prasad [1982] 1 MLJ 189. Essentially it “*connotes a process*  
10 *whereby, when all the relevant facts, relationship, claims and*  
11 *wishes of the parents, risks, choices and other circumstances are*  
12 *taken into consideration and weighed*” to determine what is  
13 utmost in the interest of the children’s welfare.

14 12. I totally agree with learned counsel for the Husband Respondent’s  
15 submission where he referred to the view expressed by Lord  
16 Denning in W v W and C [1968] 2 All ER 408 that young boys  
17 lean more to their father and they need male guidance and  
18 companionship.

19 13. The question to be asked is whether the Husband Respondent has  
20 shown that he is able to provide the guidance and companionship  
21 that his two sons need. I regret to say that such evidence is  
22 woefully lacking.

23 14. It is to be noted that in his evidence in chief, the Husband  
24 Respondent did not offer any evidence as to why the custody of

1 the Children should be given to him. The evidence elicited  
2 through cross-examination of the Husband Respondent is that if  
3 he were given the custody of the Children, he would quit his job  
4 and move back to West Malaysia so that he could spend more  
5 time with them; his parents would be able to look after the  
6 Children when he goes to work; he would work in his father's  
7 business when he goes back to West Malaysia. He also alleged  
8 that the care of the Children are left mainly with their maternal  
9 grandmother and she did not look after the Children well and that  
10 the Children always got blamed for anything that happened.

11 15. By admission, the Husband Respondent agreed that the children of  
12 his brother are also looked after by the Children's maternal  
13 grandmother. The fact that the Husband Respondent's brother  
14 would leave his children in the care of the Children's maternal  
15 grandmother and that his brother did not come forth to testify to  
16 otherwise, it can be reasonably inferred that the Children's  
17 maternal grandparents is a responsible and reliable caretaker.  
18 Based on the testimony of the Children's grandmother, PW2, it  
19 amply showed the Children only go to their maternal  
20 grandparents' house in between school and tuition and tuition and  
21 home and the approximate time is two hours per day. During this  
22 time she would instill discipline into the children by asking them  
23 to take their meals and bath and wash their hands. I do not see any  
24 unreasonableness in what the maternal grandmother do with  
25 Children.



1           16.    The Husband Respondent only made bare assertion that he would  
2                   quit his job; his parents would help to look after the Children if  
3                   custody were given to him and that he would take up job with his  
4                   father to provide for them. However, there is no evidence from his  
5                   parents [father aged 70's and the mother in her 60's] that they are  
6                   willing and able to help to look after the Children. There is also no  
7                   evidence as to what kind of job he would be taking up with his  
8                   father and what kind of income he would be earning to support the  
9                   Children. In fact, the Husband Respondent could not answer the  
10                  question as to how he was going to financially support the  
11                  Children. Custody of the Children, if given to the Husband  
12                  Respondent, would mean uprooting them from the familiar  
13                  environment they were born and grew up in. According to the  
14                  Wife Petitioner's unchallenged testimony, the Husband  
15                  Respondent's family is complex and complicated with most of the  
16                  family members divorced and their children being left in the care  
17                  of their parents. The Husband Respondent has not offered any  
18                  evidence as to how he would help the Children to settle into a new  
19                  family with such complex situation and new school in West  
20                  Malaysia.

21           17.    On the other hand, the Wife Petitioner has shown that she was the  
22                   one who looked after the Children and spent the most time with  
23                   them due to the mobile nature of the Husband Respondent's job.  
24                   She is close to them and has provided motherly love and care and  
25                   the Children are close to her. She is also financially independent  
26                   and her mother is always there to lend a helping hand.

- 1       18.    In the absence of evidence from the Husband Respondent to show  
2           that the Wife Petitioner is an unfit mother to have custody of the  
3           Children, I am of the view that it is in the utmost interest of the  
4           Children not to disrupt the present arrangement. For them to move  
5           to West Malaysia and live with their grandparents would certainly  
6           not advance their welfare, especially in a complex and  
7           complicated family setting where most of the family members are  
8           divorced and their children left in the care of their grandparents.
- 9       19.    Having interviewed the Children on 8<sup>th</sup> November 2017 I had the  
10          strong impression that Peggy Teh and Teh Jian Fei are adamant  
11          not to see the Husband Respondent, at least not at the present  
12          moment, let alone living with the Husband Respondent. Peggy  
13          Teh still remembered the Husband Respondent rejecting her as his  
14          daughter and the trauma of being beaten with belt by the Husband  
15          Respondent. Teh Jian Fei is terrified of the Husband Respondent's  
16          violent temper having being belted by him for failing to account  
17          for 20 cents shortfall and being slapped for making noise. I can  
18          only say that the road to mend the relationship between the  
19          Husband Respondent and Peggy Teh and Teh Jian Fei is long and  
20          challenging.
- 21       20.    Indeed, evidence has been led that Peggy Teh was very  
22          traumatized after being whipped by the Husband Respondent that  
23          she had to attend counselling at Empower Counselling  
24          Consultancy Services, as evidenced by the Counselling report  
25          Exhibit P8 BDD(a).

- 1           21. After viewing the photographs Exhibits 2-4 BDD(b), which  
2           showed how the Husband Respondent dragged Teh Jian Yi, I am  
3           convinced that the Children's account of their father's violent  
4           temper and their fear of him is not made up by the Wife Petitioner  
5           nor instilled in them by the Wife Petitioner. I believed that the  
6           Husband Respondent has uncontrolled bad temper and I can  
7           perceived that even when he testified at the trial. This is also  
8           corroborated by the testimony of the Wife Petitioner's parents,  
9           PW2 and PW3.
- 10          22. Since the Children grew up together, it will certainly cause  
11          emotional trauma to separate them via split custody. When I  
12          interviewed them I noticed that although the two boys are not very  
13          obedient to Peggy Teh's instruction and though they argued with  
14          each other, they also joked and generally mingled well together.
- 15          23. It is the Wife Petitioner's testimony that the Husband Respondent  
16          had bad influence on Teh Jian Fei who imitated his father's  
17          behavior by throwing things when he is angry. However, he is  
18          frightened, quiet and timid when his father is around so as to  
19          avoid beating by his father.
- 20          24. The Wife Petitioner testified in paragraphs 20 and 21 of her  
21          witness statement marked WSPW1 that after reasonable access of  
22          Teh Jian Fei and Teh Jian Yi was given for them to stay overnight  
23          with the Husband Respondent, they started to misbehave towards  
24          her and the elders in the family like her parents, sibling and  
25          relatives. They are angry and hostile towards her and Peggy Teh.

1 Their school results dropped drastically as the Husband  
2 Respondent permitted them to stay up late at night playing video  
3 games during the weekends.

4 25. For all the reasons aforesaid, my answer to both Issues No. 1 and  
5 2 are in the negative.

6 **Access to Children by the Husband Respondent**

7 26. In Leong Sam Moy v Low Chee Tiam [1997] 2 CLJ Supp 212, it  
8 was held that access is the basic right of the child rather than the  
9 parent.

10 27. Thus, in determining the access to the Husband Respondent, the  
11 Court should have regard to the view of the Children who, in my  
12 view, are of sufficient understanding and maturity to articulate  
13 their feelings on whether they are willing to meet the Husband  
14 Respondent and if they are unwilling, whether it is withheld  
15 unreasonably.

16 28. I have ascertained during the interview that Peggy Teh and Teh  
17 Jian Fei are adamant not to see the Husband Respondent, at least  
18 not at the present moment. The reasons for their resistance had  
19 been alluded to in paragraphs 19 - 21 above.

20 29. Having said that, I believe a window of opportunity should be left  
21 open for the Husband Respondent to make amend with Peggy Teh  
22 and Teh Jian Fei. As such, access to the Husband Respondent can  
23 be given by way of communicating with Peggy Teh and Teh Jian  
24 Fei via mobile phones (WhatsApp, phone calls, SMS or WeChat).

1 Without this opportunity to communicate with the said two  
2 Children, there is no way for the Husband Respondent to make  
3 amend with them. I hope that there is room for healing to take  
4 place and when that happened, it will unquestionably benefit the  
5 said two Children as well as the Husband Respondent.

6 30. For this reason, my view is that, in lieu of physical access, the  
7 Husband Respondent should be able to communicate with the said  
8 two Children via SMS, phone calls, WhatsApp, WeChat etc. In  
9 view of the present strained relationship between Peggy Teh and  
10 Teh Jian Fei with the Husband Respondent, the communication  
11 between them should be limited in the early stage and I will limit  
12 it to one phone call of not exceeding ten minutes and two text  
13 messages a week. Of course, if the said two children respond and  
14 feel comfortable to communicate with the Husband Respondent,  
15 the number of phone calls and texting can be more than what the  
16 court had limited.

17 31. In order that the communication described above can promote the  
18 healing of relationship and foster relationship between the  
19 Husband Respondent and the said two children, the Husband  
20 Respondent should not use any words or images in these  
21 communication to cause emotional trauma to the said two  
22 Children.

23 32. In my interview with the Children, Teh Jian Yi sometimes said  
24 that he does not mind to be with the Husband Respondent and  
25 sometimes he said he is scared if he does not want to see the

1 Husband Respondent. Peggy Teh and Teh Jian Fei would say that  
2 Teh Jian Yi does not mind to visit the Husband Respondent at  
3 weekends because the Husband Respondent allowed him to play  
4 video games without restriction. He hardly talked to the two boys  
5 during the access time. He would sleep early and let them play  
6 video games till late hours.

- 7 33. Since Teh Jian Yi is willing to see the Husband Respondent,  
8 limited access should, therefore, be given to him. It is hoped that  
9 the Husband Respondent would use the limited time they had  
10 together to bond with his son and not spoil him by letting him play  
11 video games without restriction.

12 **Whether there is a change of circumstances justifying the**  
13 **variation and/or amendment of the current provision for the**  
14 **Children's maintenance to be varied from the sum of**  
15 **RM1,200.00 to RM2,500.00 per month?**

- 16 34. The Wife Petitioner applied to vary the prayer in the Joint Petition  
17 with regard to the provision for monthly maintenance order for the  
18 Children from RM1,200.00 to RM2,500.00.

- 19 35. The Wife Petitioner's reasons for praying for the increase in  
20 maintenance is that it is the Husband Respondent's primary  
21 obligation to maintain the Children within his capabilities and the  
22 prior agreed sum of RM1,200.00 is insufficient. She testified that  
23 she earned RM3,500.00 per month and she spent money on the  
24 Children's clothing, medical bills, books and stationeries. She  
25 needs more maintenance now due to inflation, the increasing costs

1 of living expenses and the Children need computer for their  
2 studies.

3 36. The Wife Petitioner testified in cross-examination that if the  
4 Husband Respondent refused to pay RM2,500.00, she would then  
5 be entitled to refuse Husband Respondent access to the Children;  
6 if he paid the sum of RM 2,500.00, he can have access if the  
7 Children are willing to see him.

8 37. Section 92 of LRA provides:

9 *Except where an agreement or order of court otherwise*  
10 *provides, it shall be the duty of a parent to maintain or*  
11 *contribute to the maintenance of his or her children, whether*  
12 *they are in his or her custody or the custody of any other*  
13 *person, either by providing them with such accommodation,*  
14 *clothing, food and education as may be reasonable having*  
15 *regard to his or her means and station in life or by paying the*  
16 *cost thereof*

17 38. Section 93 of LRA states:

18 (1) *The court may at any time order a man to pay*  
19 *maintenance for the benefit of his child-*

20 (a) *if he has refused or neglected reasonably to provide*  
21 *for the child;*

22 (b) *if he has deserted his wife and the child is in her*  
23 *charge;*

24 (c) *during the pendency of any matrimonial proceedings;*  
25 *or*

1                                   (d) when making or subsequent to the making of an order  
2                                   placing the child in the custody of any other person.

3                                   (2) The court shall have the corresponding power to order a  
4                                   woman to pay or contribute towards the maintenance of  
5                                   her child where it is satisfied that having regard to her  
6                                   means it is reasonable so to order.

7           39. In Chin Seng Woah v Lim Shook Lin [1997] 1 CLJ 375, Mahadev  
8           Shankar JCA held:

9                                   *"The parental duties in this context are spelt out by s. 92 and it*  
10                                  *extends to accommodation, clothing, food and education as*  
11                                  *may be reasonable having regard to his or her means and*  
12                                  *station in life or by paying the cost thereof.*

13           40. In Sivajothi a/p Suppiah v Kunathasan a/l Chellia [2000] 3 CLJ  
14           175, it was held:

15                                  *Maintenance does not only mean the food she puts in her*  
16                                  *mouth it means the clothes on her back, the house in which*  
17                                  *she lives, and the money which she has to have in her pocket,*  
18                                  *all of which vary according to the means of the man who*  
19                                  *leaves a wife behind him... As applied to children, we think an*  
20                                  *equally wide meaning should be given to the word... It is*  
21                                  *settled law that it is the duty of the father to maintain the*  
22                                  *standard of living the children had enjoyed in the past, i.e.,*  
23                                  *during the existence of the marriage.*

24           41. I am mindful that under the provision in LRA, the Husband  
25           Respondent is primarily responsible to maintain the Children.  
26           However, the duty to maintain the Children irrespective of who  
27           has the custody, shall be the duty of a parent to maintain his or her



1 children in providing for them in the manner as described in  
2 section 92. This, to my understanding, means that both parents  
3 regardless who has the custody of the children have the  
4 responsibility to maintain the children. Thus, the Wife Petitioner  
5 also has a duty to maintain the Children albeit it is secondary.

6 42. It is in evidence that the Husband Respondent's net income as a  
7 construction supervisor is RM5,000.00 per month and yearly  
8 commission of RM10,000.00 for 2016 and 2017. The Husband  
9 Respondent had failed to pay the Children's maintenance for  
10 January 2018 which is to be paid on or before 5<sup>th</sup> of every calendar  
11 month. He had also intentionally stopped paying the Children's  
12 education insurance policy in order to compel the Wife Petitioner  
13 to continue paying for it to avoid the said policies being  
14 terminated by the insurance companies.

15 43. It is undeniable that the cost of living is escalating. However, I  
16 find that there is a dearth of evidence before me to show that there  
17 has been a change in circumstances for the amount of monthly  
18 maintenance of RM1,200.00 to be varied to RM2,500.00. The  
19 Wife Petitioner could have but did not furnish to the Court the  
20 breakdown of the monthly expenses of the Children to show that  
21 they have been affected by the inflation.

22 44. On the other hand, there is evidence that the Wife Petitioner is  
23 also gainfully employed and as such, I am of the view that the  
24 Wife Petitioner should also contribute 1/3 to the Children's  
25 education expenses.

1 45. In Mohan Raj St Patmanathan v Prema Rani A/P Kandiah  
2 Ponnampalam & Anor [2005] 4 MLJ 444, the Court adopted 25%  
3 from the net income in determining the final figure of  
4 maintenance.

5 **Conclusion**

6 46. I make the following Orders:

7 a. The custody, care and control of the Children be given to the  
8 Wife Petitioner with no physical access to Peggy Teh and  
9 Teh Jian Fei unless they are willing to meet the Husband  
10 Respondent.

11 b. In lieu of physical access, the Husband Respondent shall  
12 have access to Peggy Teh and Teh Jian Fei via mobile phone  
13 [WhatsApp, phone calls, SMS or WeChat]; the telephone  
14 calls shall not exceed once a week and not exceeding ten  
15 minutes per call and text messages not exceeding two per  
16 week, the restriction does not apply if the said two Children  
17 are willing and receptive to the calls/text messages.

18 c. The Husband Respondent shall have access to Teh Jian Yi  
19 on alternate weekends from 6.30 p.m. on Friday to Sunday  
20 6.30 p.m.

21 d. Order in terms of prayer 9 of the Joint Petition.

22 e. The Husband Respondent shall pay for 2/3 of the education  
23 expenses including tuition expenses and insurance for the  
24 benefit for the Children without demand by the Wife

1                     Petitioner. The remaining 1/3 is to be paid by the Wife  
2                     Petitioner.

3                     f.     The Husband Respondent shall, forthwith, return the identity  
4                     cards of Teh Jian Fei and Teh Jian Yi.

5                     g.     Costs of RM10,000.00 to the Wife Petitioner.

6  
7

8                                     (DATUK YEW JEN KIE)  
9                                     Judge

10

11                     Date of Delivery of Judgment: 28.2.2018

12

13                     Date of Hearing:                     8.1.2018  
14   9.1.2018

15

16                     For the Wife Petitioner:         Mr. Chan Khoon Moh together with  
17   Ms Dorothy Ling En Ci  
18   Messrs Chan Khoon Moh Advocates  
19   Kuching

20

21                     For the Husband Petitioner:         Mr. Cecil Lau  
22   Messrs Jaini Robert & Lau Advocates  
23   Kuching

24

25

26

27

28

29                     *Notice:         This copy of the Court's Reasons for Judgment is subject to editorial*  
30                                     *revision.*