POLICE REPORT (NP299)

Report No. L/20211208/2013

Police Station Of Origin
Woodlands West N.P.C.
1 Woodlands Street 12 SINGAPORE 738622
Tel No: 1800-363 9999

Date/Time Report Made	Vide Report No.	Station Diary No.
08/12/2021 02:46		31

Name Of Informant	Address
WONG CHUN KHUEN	APT BLK 171 WOODLANDS STREET 11 #03-37 SINGAPORE 730171
ID Type / ID No. NRIC NO / S1247108D	Contact No. Home/Office Mobile 90473465
Nationality SINGAPORE CITIZEN	Email Address wong.chunk@gmail.com

Occupation	Sex	Age	Date of Birth	Race
SELF-EMPLOYED	Male	64	30/06/1957	Chinese

Institution/School Name	Language

Date/Time Of Incident	Location Of Incident
26/03/2018 00:00	Johor State, Setia Tropika HQ MALAYSIA

Brief details.

It must also be pointed out that in Muhammad Hanis' response the following: that Muhammad Hanis did not averred in this Afidavit Jawapan Responden - Muhamad Hanis Bin Kasni in paragraph 9 a similar stand as paragraph 13 of his Afidavit Jawapan Defendan - Muhamad Hanis Bin Kasni (Saman Pemula No: WA-24-5-01/2020, KL High Court).
From the above-mentioned two affidavits by Muhammad Hanis and one affidavit by myself and taken together with her Lordship's findings of fact in paragraph 29 of Attachment 1, as stated, quote: "it is of the

Signature Of Officer Recording The Report: L / Sgt 1 LIM WEI YU LOUIS	Signature Of Informant:
Signature Of Interpreter: Not applicable	Date/Time: 08/12/2021 02:46
Officer In-Charge Of Case: L / Woodlands Police Divisional Investigation Branch / Insp (2) PUA PENG SIANG Contact No.: 64660000	Classification Of Case:

Authentication Stamp

considered view that the Plaintiff's deposition that he was not produced before any Magistrate on 12.3.2018 is substantiated by the fact that there are two remand orders which have not been explained off by the Defendant" unquote; that what I averred in my Affidavit-in-Support - Wong Chun Khuen is supported by her Lordship's Judgement. So Muhammad Hanis had potentially lied on oath in his affidavits seemingly based on her Lordship's finding.

This requires an investigation to determine whether Muhammad Hanis had deliberately lied on oath before the Court.

In the same paragraph 29, her Lordship also stated the fact that there are now two remand orders. That must means that one is the true remand order court document and the other one is a fake "manufactured" court document. This fake "manufactured" court document must need to be investigated on the origin, find out the perpetuators behind it so as to maintain the integrity of the Judiciary.

As the Plaintiff myself, I was shocked that I could be a victim of fake document in this High Court. My counsel had gone to great length to list out and show all the many differences between both remand orders to prove that what Muhammad Hanis had exhibited in "MHK-1" of Attachment 2 - Afidavit Jawapan Defendan - Muhamad Hanis Bin Kasni (Saman Pemula No: WA-24-5-01/2020, KL High Court) was a fake "manufactured" document.

All the differences that were pointed out, starting from paragraph 21 to paragraph 25 of Attachment 5 - Plaintiff's Written Submission (KL High Court, Originating Summon No. WA-24-5-01/2020, Case No. 62PT-900-03-2018), is to prove that it was a fake "manufactured" court document. This has been pointed out by her Lordship in paragraph 27 and line 5 the following: "The Defendant does not take any challenge to Exhibit "W-2" which is the signed copy of the remand order now produced by the Plaintiff (myself) which they (the Defendant) produced in the other proceeding and as such the Defendant's attempt to show a re-typed and unsigned copy of the remand order as in Exhibit "MHK-1" to counter the Plaintiff's

Signature Of Officer Recording The Report: L / Sgt 1 LIM WEI YU LOUIS		Signature Of Informant:
Signature Of Interpreter: Not applicable		Date/Time: 08/12/2021 02:46
Officer In-Charge Of Case: L / Woodlands Police Divisional Investigation Branch / Insp (2) PUA PENG SIANG Contact No.: 64660000		Classification Of Case:

Authentication Stamp

non-production claim is therefore futile." What it means was that it was futile to manufacture a fake document to replace the original order. He should produced a clearer copy of Exhibit "W-2" and use that clearer copy to challenge my non-production claim. Attachment 5 - Plaintiff's Written Submission (KL High Court, Originating Summon No. WA-24-5-01/2020, Case No. 62PT-900-03-2018).
The reason for making this police report is for the Royal Malaysia Police to investigate on these two issues. To reiterate, the first issue is lying on oath in Affidavit to the High Court and the second issue is to investigate the origin and perpetuators of the fake "manufactured" remand order. I would then be able to follow up to seek Counsel's advice. I was instructed by one ACP Gurcharan Singh from High Commission of Malaysia to lodge this report in Singapore Police Station. I would like to add on my passport no. K1114442D.

Signature Of Officer Recording The Report: L / Sgt 1 LIM WEI YU LOUIS	Signature Of Informant:
Signature Of Interpreter: Not applicable	Date/Time: 08/12/2021 02:46
Officer In-Charge Of Case: L / Woodlands Police Divisional Investigation Branch / Insp (2) PUA PENG SIANG Contact No.: 64660000	Classification Of Case:

Authentication Stamp