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CHIEF JUSTICE’S MESSAGE

It gives me great pleasure to present for the very first time, a One Judiciary annual report boxed set, which showcases the work of the Supreme Court, the State Courts and the Family Justice Courts sharing a common mission to superintend the administration of justice and make justice accessible to all. Themed “Upholding Our Values”, the reports detail the work of the three Courts and their initiatives that are underpinned by the values of fairness, accessibility, independence, integrity and impartiality.

The Judiciary will have to respond to an increasingly challenging global and economic climate. We must enhance the quality of our work even as we look to reduce the cost of litigating by simplifying processes where possible. On this front, we have introduced significant changes to our civil and criminal litigation processes. At the Family Justice Courts, a child maintenance matrix, based on actuarial data is also being devised to guide the resolution of cases involving children so that such disputes can be settled quickly and less acrimoniously.

On the international front, we are widening and strengthening our judicial networks. An International Advisory Council which I chair and comprising family judges from various jurisdictions provides the Family Justice Courts with many useful and diverse perspectives that will help us address present and future challenges.

I am also delighted by the success of the first judicial insolvency network conference involving judges from 10 jurisdictions which we hosted in October 2016. The conference resulted in the promulgation of guidelines for court-to-court communication and cooperation protocols. Following the meeting, Singapore and the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware formally implemented the guidelines, with other jurisdictions expected to similarly adopt the guidelines.

Technological advancements will require the legal sector to rethink entire areas of practice. While this will likely prove to be disruptive, we should embrace and welcome the change as technology can potentially improve processes, resulting in greater effectiveness at a lower cost for society. The Courts of the Future Taskforce will make recommendations to get our Courts “future-ready” while the Singapore Academy of Law has launched the Legal Technology Vision to help the legal sector adopt and implement technological changes.

The Supreme Court and State Courts, together with NTU SPIRIT Centre, have embarked on the development of an Intelligent Case Retrieval System. The aim is to have a more effective retrieval of key legal documents in decided cases for road traffic accidents and personal injury matters. Besides making it easier and quicker for legal research to be performed, it will add to the quality of decision making and judgment writing for judges. The technology developed through this platform may even perform other legal functions, such as Case Summarisation and Logic Reasoning. This will lead the way to a more sophisticated legal research, advisory and decision support system in the future.

On the international front, we are widening and strengthening our judicial networks. An International Advisory Council which I chair and comprising family judges from various jurisdictions provides the Family Justice Courts with many useful and diverse perspectives that will help us address present and future challenges.

I am also delighted by the success of the first judicial insolvency network conference involving judges from 10 jurisdictions which we hosted in October 2016. The conference resulted in the promulgation of guidelines for court-to-court communication and cooperation protocols. Following the meeting, Singapore and the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware formally implemented the guidelines, with other jurisdictions expected to similarly adopt the guidelines.

Technological advancements will require the legal sector to rethink entire areas of practice. While this will likely prove to be disruptive, we should embrace and welcome the change as technology can potentially improve processes, resulting in greater effectiveness at a lower cost for society. The Courts of the Future Taskforce will make recommendations to get our Courts “future-ready” while the Singapore Academy of Law has launched the Legal Technology Vision to help the legal sector adopt and implement technological changes.

The Supreme Court and State Courts, together with NTU SPIRIT Centre, have embarked on the development of an Intelligent Case Retrieval System. The aim is to have a more effective retrieval of key legal documents in decided cases for road traffic accidents and personal injury matters. Besides making it easier and quicker for legal research to be performed, it will add to the quality of decision making and judgment writing for judges. The technology developed through this platform may even perform other legal functions, such as Case Summarisation and Logic Reasoning. This will lead the way to a more sophisticated legal research, advisory and decision support system in the future.

The Judiciary is on the cusp of change and these are exciting times. As we implement changes, we must continue to put the interest of Singaporeans first and ensure that justice is within their reach. I am confident that my colleagues on the Supreme Court Bench as well as the judicial officers and administrators from the State Courts and Family Justice Courts will continue to work hard in ensuring effective access to justice for all. I am deeply grateful for their dedication and commitment to this extremely meaningful cause.

I hope this One Judiciary Annual Report will give you a glimpse into the work of the Courts in Singapore. Together, we seek to administer a world class judiciary and make justice accessible for all Singaporeans.

SUNDARESH MENON
Chief Justice
Supreme Court of Singapore
TOWARDS A WORLD CLASS LEGAL SECTOR

Improving Judicial and Litigation Processes

Criminal & Civil Litigation
Reforms in Civil litigation by the Civil Justice Commission will simplify and update the Rules of Court, eliminate time-and-costs-wasting procedural steps, promote technology, and allow greater judicial control of the litigation process when it completes its wide ranging review towards the end of 2017. The proposed establishment of the Criminal Procedure Rules will also benefit Criminal litigation with more deliberated and customised procedures. These reforms are part of our efforts to improve judicial and litigation processes, thereby enhancing access to justice for all Singaporeans.

Community Justice Centre
Supreme Court collaborated with the Community Justice Centre (CJC) to establish a satellite office at the Supreme Court to provide practical support and useful assistance to persons involved in bankruptcy proceedings. Besides offering advice and practical support on preparatory work for trials, volunteers are at hand to provide emotional support. The satellite CJC may consider expanding its scope beyond bankruptcy proceedings for the benefit of its users.

Evolving Paradigms in Medical Litigation
To assuage Singaporeans’ concerns over medical care, the Supreme Court is realigning our Medical litigation paradigm to ensure that medical practice is not distorted by the fear of litigation. We will promote alternative dispute resolution and move away from the adversarial mode of litigation to a more inquisitorial, judge-led process. To help our judges, we are working with the Singapore Medical Council to establish a panel of medical assessors to work alongside them on cases.
TOWARDS A WORLD CLASS LEGAL SECTOR

Cementing our Position as a Regional Hub for Legal Services

Singapore International Commercial Court

The Singapore International Commercial Court (SICC) saw six more transfer cases in 2016 and this is expected to expand as familiarity with its commendable work grows. The first judgment was delivered on 12 May 2016. By the end of 2016, eight cases were transferred from the Singapore High Court to the SICC and six written judgments/grounds of decision were delivered. The SICC also saw the filing of the first two notices of appeal to the Court of Appeal arising from one of the cases. The appeals will present potential users with further opportunities to observe and be better acquainted with the SICC dispute resolution framework.

Promoting Court-to-Court Arrangements: Cross-Border Insolvency

The Supreme Court brought together insolvency judges from 10 jurisdictions for a meeting to promote cross-border insolvency in October 2016. The meeting enabled the insolvency judges to draft guidelines to facilitate communication and cooperation between courts on cross-border insolvency matters which should lead to better financial returns for all parties involved. The United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware and the Supreme Court of Singapore formally implemented the guidelines on 1 February 2017, the first for cross-border insolvency matters on a global level. More jurisdictions are expected to follow suit in the near future.

Embracing Technology

Courts of the Future Taskforce

With advancement in technology, a Courts of the Future Taskforce was set up to undertake a strategic study to identify technological opportunities that will support the strategic direction of the Judiciary over the medium to long term. Focusing on enhancing access to justice, the Taskforce developed a Blueprint which consists of 15 key IT initiatives encompassing each broad phase of the court process such as developing self-help solutions and the use of artificial intelligence and data analytics. As we pursue our journey of court excellence, the Taskforce will continue to recommend initiatives and leverage technology to enhance our adjudication process.

Pursuing Excellence without Compromise

Professionalism of the Judiciary

The Singapore Judicial College (SJC) enjoyed notable success in its international and local programmes. On the local front, the SJC offered more than 40 programmes in 2016. This meant that each of our Judges and Judicial Officers would have attended an average of at least five judicial education programmes during the year. In the international arena, with the 13 courses conducted in 2016, more than 600 foreign participants from more than 60 jurisdictions would have become alumni of the SJC’s international wing since its inception. Besides judicial training, the SJC runs an active empirical judicial research programme. As at 2016, a total of seven research projects have been approved.
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INTERNATIONAL JUDGES

appointment of Judges of appeal

Justice Prakash served more than two decades in the High Court and many of her judgments, particularly on arbitration and commercial law, have been influential domestically and internationally.

Justice Tay served almost two decades in the High Court and has deep experience in criminal and public law. He commands respect in all matters of civil procedure and chairs the Civil Justice Commission to review the Rules of Court which governs civil procedure in the Courts.

As we move to realise the diverse initiatives of the Supreme Court Bench, it is imperative that the Judiciary is led by a strong and diverse bench that will spearhead efforts in various areas of legal development within our justice system.

Appointmen of Judges of Appeal

Justice Judith Prakash and Justice Tay Yong Kwang were appointed Judges of Appeal with effect from 1 August 2016.
Appointment of Judges

Judicial Commissioners See Kee Oon and Chua Lee Ming were elevated to Judges of the High Court with effect from 31 January 2017.

Justice See has more than 20 years of judicial experience and continues to manage the State Courts as its Presiding Judge.

Justice Chua has varied and considerable legal experience, having served in the Supreme Court Registry and the Attorney-General’s Chambers. He was also a partner of law firm, Lee & Lee, before joining GIC Pte Ltd in 1998 where he rose to the position of General Counsel before joining the Bench.

Appointment of Judicial Commissioners

Mr Pang Khang Chau and Ms Audrey Lim were appointed Judicial Commissioners on 1 August 2016 for a period of three years.

Judicial Commissioner Pang joined the Legal Service in 1995. He was a State Counsel at the Attorney-General’s Chambers and also served in the International Affairs Division, advising and representing the Government on international law matters.

Judicial Commissioner Lim joined the Legal Service in 1994. She was appointed Deputy Registrar at the Supreme Court in 2009. As Deputy Chief Legislative Counsel in the Attorney-General’s Chambers, she had handled court-related and Government legislations.
ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE
AS OF 31 JANUARY 2017

Supreme Court Registry

The Supreme Court Registry is currently headed by the Registrar of the Supreme Court. The Registrar oversees the Registry’s judicial functions in the Supreme Court and ensures the timely and efficient disposal of cases.

REGISTRAR

Mr Vincent Hoong

The Registrar is assisted by the Deputy Registrar, Senior Assistant Registrars and the Assistant Registrars who perform judicial functions.

DEPUTY REGISTRAR

Ms Teh Hwee Hwee
Divisional Registrar, Court of Appeal
Divisional Registrar, Singapore International Commercial Court

SENIOR ASSISTANT REGISTRARS

Ms Connie Ng Teng Teng
Divisional Registrar, High Court
Mr Christopher Tan
Mr Edwin Sari Ong Kyar

ASSISTANT REGISTRARS

Ms Chong Chin Chin
Ms Cheng Pei Feng
Mr James Elisa
Lee Han Loong
Mr Paul Quan
Kaili Shih
Ms Janice Wong Shi Hui

Ms Jean Chan Lay Koon
Mr Ramu Miyapan
Mr Paul Chan Wei Sern
Ms Una Khong
Ms Karen Tan Teck Ping

Mr Jay Lee Yuxuan
Mr Teo Guan Kee
Ms Lim Sai Nei
Mr Colin Seow Fu Hong
Ms Li Yuen Ting

Ms Wong Baochen
Ms Jacqueline Lee
Siew Hui
Mr Bryan Fang Hao Wen
Mr Ramasamy s/o
Nachiappan
Mr Shaun Pereira

Mr Scott Tan Chun Wen
Mr Paul Tan Wei Chean
Ms Norine Tan Yan Ling
ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE
AS OF 31 JANUARY 2017

Judiciary Administration and Operations

The Chief Executive oversees the efficient running of the court operations and the provision of effective services to court users. The Chief Executive is supported by a team of Directors with specialised functions and roles.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE

Ms Juthika Ramanathan

Infrastructure and Court Services Directorate
Strategises the use of resources and services that best support the hearing process which includes the Infrastructure Section, Court Reporting Services Section and Interpreters Section.

Corporate Services Directorate
Oversees the Human Resource and Administration Section, Security Section, Procurement Section, as well as the library.

Finance Directorate
Promotes proper stewardship of the Supreme Court’s resources.

Office of Public Affairs
Oversees the planning and execution of public engagement and communication efforts so as to position the Supreme Court as a forward-thinking and outward-looking organisation with effective public service delivery.

Legal Directorate
Oversees the processing and maintenance of all court documents and records, making them available to court users. Provides administrative support to the Registrar to ensure the efficient and expeditious disposition of all cases.

Internal Audit
Promotes a culture of risk awareness and to ensure adequacy of internal controls and compliance.

Strategic Planning and Policy Directorate
Sets long-term and sustainable goals. Conducts research to identify emerging trends regionally and internationally.

Computer and Information Services Directorate
To be at the forefront of new IT trends and developments, as well as to anticipate and render IT solutions for the organisation.

Chief Justice

Dean, Singapore Judicial College

Chief Executive
(Office of the Chief Justice)

Deputy Chief Executive

Registrar

Deputy Registrar

Senior Assistant Registrars and Assistant Registrars

Judges and Judicial Commissioners

Finance Directorate

Infrastructure and Court Services Directorate

Internal Audit

Computer & Information Services Directorate

Chief Information Officer (Not in picture)

Douglas Chi, Legal Counsel and Senior Director (Market Development, Singapore International Commercial Court) | Terence Ee, Chief Information Officer (Not in picture)
Constitution and Jurisdiction

The Judiciary is one of the three branches of government, with the other two being the Executive and Legislature.

The Judiciary, headed by the Chief Justice, is a system of courts that upholds the law and ensures justice is accessible to all. The Chief Justice is appointed by the President on the advice of the Prime Minister.

Structure of the Supreme Court

The Supreme Court is made up of the Court of Appeal and the High Court, and hears both civil and criminal matters. The Supreme Court Bench consists of the Chief Justice, Judges of Appeal, Judges, Senior Judges, International Judges and Judicial Commissioners. The Supreme Court Registry is headed by the Registrar who is assisted by the Deputy Registrar, Senior Assistant Registrars and Assistant Registrars. Justices’ Law Clerks, who work directly under the charge of the Chief Justice, assist the Judiciary by carrying out research on the law, particularly for appeals before the Court of Appeal.
OUR ROLE

Court of Appeal

The Court of Appeal generally hears appeals against the decisions of the High Court in both civil and criminal matters. It became Singapore’s final court of appeal on 8 April 1994, when appeals to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council were abolished.

The Chief Justice sits in the Court of Appeal together with the Judges of Appeal. A Judge, Senior Judge, International Judge and Judicial Commissioner may sit in the Court of Appeal on such occasion as the Chief Justice requires. An International Judge may sit in the Court of Appeal for an appeal against a judgment or order of the Singapore International Commercial Court on such occasion as the Chief Justice requires. The Court of Appeal is presided over by the Chief Justice, and in his absence, a Judge of the Supreme Court or a person appointed by the Chief Justice to preside where the Court of Appeal does not include any Judge of the Supreme Court.

The Court of Appeal is usually made up of three judges. However, certain appeals, including those against interlocutory orders, may be heard by only two judges.

If necessary, the Court of Appeal may comprise five or more uneven number of judges.

High Court

The High Court consists of the Chief Justice and the Judges of the High Court. A Judge of Appeal may sit in the High Court on such occasion as the Chief Justice requires. A Senior Judge or Judicial Commissioner may also sit in the High Court on such occasion as the Chief Justice requires. An International Judge may sit in the Singapore International Commercial Court (SICC) division of the High Court on such occasion as the Chief Justice requires.

Proceedings in the High Court are heard before a single judge, unless otherwise provided by any written law. The High Court may also appoint one or more persons with expertise in the subject matter of the proceedings to assist the court.

May sit in the Court of Appeal

Chief Justice

Judges of Appeal

Judge 1

Judge 2

Judge 3

May sit in the High Court

Chief Justice

Judges of the High Court

A Judge

A Senior Judge

An International Judge

A Judicial Commissioner

May sit in the SICC division

An International Judge
OUR ROLE

The High Court hears both criminal and civil cases as a court of first instance. The High Court also hears appeals from the decisions of District Courts and Magistrate’s Courts in civil and criminal cases, and decides points of law reserved in special cases submitted by a District Court or a Magistrate’s Court. In addition, the High Court has general supervisory and revisionary jurisdiction over all courts in any civil or criminal matter.

With a few limited exceptions, the High Court has the jurisdiction to hear and try any action where the defendant is served with a writ or other originating process in Singapore, or outside Singapore in the circumstances authorised by Rules of Court; or where the defendant submits to the jurisdiction of the High Court.

Generally, except in probate matters, a civil case must be commenced in the High Court if the value of the claim exceeds $250,000. In addition, ancillary matters in family proceedings involving assets of $1,500,000 or more are also heard in the High Court.

The following matters are also exclusively heard by the High Court:

The High Court has jurisdiction to try all offences committed in Singapore and in certain circumstances, may also try offences committed outside Singapore. In criminal cases, the High Court generally tries cases where the offences are punishable by death or imprisonment for a term which exceeds 10 years.

Cases commenced in the High Court:

- **CIVIL CASES** $\geq 250,000
- **ANCILLARY MATTERS** $\geq 1.5$ million

Applications for the admission of advocates and solicitors
Bankruptcy proceedings
Company winding-up proceedings
Admiralty matters
EVENT HIGHLIGHTS

OPENING OF THE LEGAL YEAR

Opening of the Legal Year Ceremony
11 January 2016
Supreme Court

An annual signature event to mark the start of the legal year. Together with The Honourable the Chief Justice, nearly 800 guests attended the event including Former Chief Justices of Singapore, political leaders, ASEAN Chief Justices and other distinguished personalities in the legal fraternity to renew their support to uphold the rule of law and the administration of justice.

Opening of the Legal Year Dinner
11 January 2016
The Istana

Following the Opening of the Legal Year ceremony on 11th January 2016, the Judiciary and the legal fraternity hosted a dinner at the Istana. The event was graced by His Excellency, the President of Singapore, Mr Tony Tan and Mrs Tan.
EVENT HIGHLIGHTS

THOUGHT-LEADERSHIP

Singapore International Commercial Court Conference
12-13 January 2016
Supreme Court

An annual gathering of the Judiciary, chaired by The Honourable the Chief Justice. The two-day Conference was attended by over 40 participants from the Supreme Court Bench, Senior Judges and International Judges.

Judicial Insolvency Network Conference
10-11 October 2016
Supreme Court

A conference for Members of the Judiciary Insolvency Network (JIN) to discuss cooperation in cross-border insolvency matters. The two-day conference was held in Singapore for the first time, with insolvency judges from 10 jurisdictions including Australia (Federal Court and New South Wales), the British Virgin Islands, Canada (Ontario), the Cayman Islands, England & Wales, Hong Kong SAR (as an observer), Singapore and the United States of America (Delaware and Southern District of New York). JIN provides a platform for sustained and continuous engagement among judges from various insolvency courts.

Magna Carta & Us
19-23 November 2015
Supreme Court

The Supreme Court, in partnership with the British High Commission Singapore, hosted the display of the Hereford Cathedral’s 1217 version of Magna Carta to celebrate its 800th anniversary and 50 years of our independence (SG50). The accompanying “Magna Carta & Us” exhibition gave close to 2,800 visitors a glimpse of Magna Carta and its history, as well as the historical footprints linking our Constitution and rule of law to the charter.

EVENT HIGHLIGHTS

MASS CALL

Admission of Advocates & Solicitors
26-27 August 2016
Supreme Court

An annual event to admit newly appointed advocates and solicitors to the Singapore Bar, held over three sessions on 26 August and 27 August 2016 at the Supreme Court Auditorium.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Lunch hosted for the Guest-Of-Honour, Singapore Academy of Law Annual Lecture
31 August 2016
Supreme Court

Hosted by The Honourable the Chief Justice Sundaresh Menon on the occasion of the visit by The Right Honourable The Lord Thomas of Cwmgiedd, Lord Chief Justice of England and Wales, to Singapore to deliver the Singapore Academy of Law Annual Lecture 2016.

Senior Counsel Forum Dinner
30 September 2016
Amarone Restaurant, Capitol Towers

The Supreme Court Bench hosted a dinner for the Forum of Senior Counsel, that was attended by about 50 guests. The guests were given the opportunity to mingle and strengthen ties with the Bench and the Bar over dinner.
STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Judiciary Volunteer Appreciation Dinner
1 November 2016
Grand Copthorne Waterfront

The inaugural Tri-Court Volunteers Appreciation Dinner was held on 1 November 2016 to appreciate and recognise the contributions of volunteers in pro bono work.

The LASCO (Legal Assistance Scheme for Capital Offences) award, conferred by the Supreme Court, was presented to Mr Eugene Thuraisingam for his contributions to LASCO and service rendered to the State and the community.

NUS Judiciary Lunch
2 November 2016
Supreme Court

A total of 43 academic staff from NUS Law Faculty, including Professor Simon Chesterman, Dean, NUS Faculty of Law, attended the Judiciary Lunch at the Supreme Court Viewing Gallery on 2 November 2016. The event was an effort to engage members of the legal academia on prevailing legal issues and the administration of justice.

Tripartite Luncheon with Supreme Court, AGC & Law Society
3 November 2016
The Padang Café, National Gallery Singapore

The Criminal Bar hosted the Tripartite Lunch on 3 November 2016 at the Padang Café, National Gallery. The lunch was attended by The Honourable the Chief Justice Sundaresh Menon, Attorney-General VK Rajah SC, Judges from the Supreme Court and the State Courts, prosecutors from the Attorney-General’s Chambers and members of the criminal bar. The Tripartite Lunch is a unique hallmark of the strength of engagement between the stakeholders in the criminal justice system in Singapore. The host for the Tripartite Lunch is rotated between the Judiciary, Attorney-General’s Chambers and the Bar.
EVENT HIGHLIGHTS

STRENGTHENING TIES

Visits by International Delegates

1. Chief Justice of Eastern Caribbean Supreme Court
   26 February 2016
2. Jiangsu Provincial High People’s Court
   13 June 2016
3. Mr Kenji Shinoda, Ambassador of Japan to Singapore
   4 July 2016
4. Lord Neuberger of Abbotsbury, President of the Supreme Court of UK
   31 August 2016
5. Chief Justice of Union of Myanmar
   1 September 2016
6. Mr Michael Lauber, Attorney-General of Switzerland
   5 October 2016

Supreme Court hosted several visits from delegates of various foreign courts and government agencies in the year of 2016. Amongst them, we have had the honour of receiving Dame Janice M. Pereira – Chief Justice of the Eastern Caribbean Supreme Court, Lord Neuberger of Abbotsbury – President of the Supreme Court of UK, Mr Kenji Shinoda – Ambassador of Japan to Singapore, Chief Justice of the Union of Myanmar U Htin Htun Oo, Mr Michael Lauber – Attorney-General of Switzerland and judicial officers from the Jiangsu Provincial High People’s Court. During the visits, there were lively exchanges of perspectives and updates on the global legal landscape, and it also gave us the opportunity to reconnect with counterparts from other judiciaries around the world.

Media Training Workshop

25-26 October, 2016
Supreme Court

The Media Training Workshop on Court Processes and Reporting was held on 25 – 26 October 2016 and attended by 33 journalists from both SPH and Mediacorp. In addition to giving an overview on the Singapore judiciary and court processes, last year’s programme outline included a new segment on case studies of past reporting errors and a simulation exercise where the participants were asked to script a news report based on a real-life judgment. The workshop was conducted by Ms Lau Joon-Nie, an experienced broadcast journalist and lecturer on journalism and news reporting with a strong legal background.
SERVING THE COMMUNITY

Judiciary Cares
1 November 2016
Society for the Aged Sick & Singapore Zoological Gardens

The second Judiciary Cares event brought together a group of 150 judges and staff from the Supreme Court, State Courts and Family Justice Courts. Led by The Honourable the Chief Justice, we visited the Society for the Aged Sick (SAS), a voluntary welfare organisation that runs a 404-bedded home for the aged, sick and destitute. A total of more than $30,000 was successfully raised for SAS. Judges and staff presented each resident with a goody bag and some residents were accompanied by the volunteers to an excursion to the zoo in the afternoon.

EVENT HIGHLIGHTS

PERFORMANCE & STATISTICS
PERFORMANCE & STATISTICS

Waiting Periods

The Supreme Court sets targets for waiting periods in various court processes as part of its commitment to provide quality public service and we endeavour to achieve at least 90% compliance with all targets set.

In 2015 and 2016, the set targets were achieved save for those relating to appellate criminal jurisdiction, for which the targets are under review to ensure that they are relevant and reflective of the current caseload.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Proceedings</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Original Civil Jurisdiction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trials in Suits</td>
<td>8 weeks from the date of setting down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originating Summonses (OSes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Inter partes</td>
<td>6 weeks from the date of filing of the OS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Ex parte</td>
<td>3 weeks from the date of filing of the OS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankruptcy OS</td>
<td>6 weeks from the date of filing of the OS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Winding-Up OS</td>
<td>4 weeks from the date of filing of the OS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summonses (SUM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Applications for summary judgment pursuant to Order 14 of the Rules of Court</td>
<td>5 weeks from the date of filing of the SUM (statutory minimum period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) All other summonses</td>
<td>3 weeks from the date of filing of the SUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankruptcy SUM (Applications for discharge)</td>
<td>4 weeks from the date of filing of the SUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Original Criminal Jurisdiction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trials of Criminal Cases</td>
<td>6 weeks from the date of the final Criminal Case Disclosure Conference or Pre-trial Conference before trial (whichever is later)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appellate Civil Jurisdiction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals to the Court of Appeal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Before 2 Judges</td>
<td>Ready to be heard in 15 weeks from the date of Notification to collect the Records of Proceedings (ROP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Before 3 or more Judges</td>
<td>Ready to be heard in 19 weeks from the date of Notification to collect the ROP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar’s Appeals to the High Court Judge in Chambers</td>
<td>3 weeks from the date of filing for other appeals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 weeks from the date of filing for appeals involving assessment of damages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals to the High Court from the State Courts</td>
<td>4 weeks from the date of receipt of the ROP from the State Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appellate Criminal Jurisdiction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals to the Court of Appeal</td>
<td>8 weeks after the week of receipt of the last confirmation of the ROP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals to the High Court from the State Courts</td>
<td>8 weeks from the date of receipt of the ROP from the State Courts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERFORMANCE & STATISTICS

Workload Statistics

The Supreme Court received a total of 14,293 and 14,538 new civil and criminal matters in 2015 and 2016 respectively. A total of 13,772 and 14,059 matters were disposed of in the same corresponding period. The clearance rate for all civil and criminal matters for 2015 and 2016 were 96% and 97% respectively.

The following shows the breakdown of the filing and disposal and clearance rates of the civil and criminal proceedings for 2015 and 2016.

Civil Jurisdiction

Civil Interlocutory Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of cases filed</th>
<th>No. of cases disposed of</th>
<th>Clearance rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>6,411</td>
<td>6,020</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6,845</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Civil Originating Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of cases filed</th>
<th>No. of cases disposed of</th>
<th>Clearance rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>6,508</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criminal Jurisdiction

Criminal Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of cases filed</th>
<th>No. of cases disposed of</th>
<th>Clearance rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criminal Motions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of cases filed</th>
<th>No. of cases disposed of</th>
<th>Clearance rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>108%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Magistrate's Appeals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of cases filed</th>
<th>No. of cases disposed of</th>
<th>Clearance rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criminal Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of cases filed</th>
<th>No. of cases disposed of</th>
<th>Clearance rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criminal Appeals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of cases filed</th>
<th>No. of cases disposed of</th>
<th>Clearance rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appeals before the High Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of cases filed</th>
<th>No. of cases disposed of</th>
<th>Clearance rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>108%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applications before the High Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of cases filed</th>
<th>No. of cases disposed of</th>
<th>Clearance rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appeals before the Court of Appeal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of cases filed</th>
<th>No. of cases disposed of</th>
<th>Clearance rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applications before the Court of Appeal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of cases filed</th>
<th>No. of cases disposed of</th>
<th>Clearance rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of cases filed</th>
<th>No. of cases disposed of</th>
<th>Clearance rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>14,293</td>
<td>13,722</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>14,538</td>
<td>14,059</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on the information compiled as at 18 January 2017 for the period 2015 and 2016.