

IN THE STATE COURTS OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

District Arrest Case 903786-2022
District Arrest Case 903800-2022

Public Prosecutor

Against

Goh Meng Kwee (Wu Minggui) & Ng Yeow Seng

BRIEF ORAL DECISION

[Criminal Law] — [Offences] – [Prevention of Corruption Act]

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.

Public Prosecutor

v

Goh Meng Kwee (Wu Minggui) & Ng Yeow Seng

District Arrest Case 903786-2022

District Arrest Case 903800-2022

District Judge Eugene Teo Weng Kuan

2-4 October 2023

16, 18-19 January 2024

22-25, 30 April 2024

14-18 October 2024

20 June 2025

29 August 2025

District Judge Eugene Teo Weng Kuan

1 I thank the parties for your submissions. This is my brief oral decision where I address only the main points.

2 The charge against each accused revolves around the payment of \$20,000 from Ng to Goh and whether it is tainted by corruption. Only the two of them were privy to what that payment was for. It was thus reasonable to expect that they would be able to coherently account for it if the payment was indeed innocent.

3 When so called to account by the CPIB, they each gave different explanations instead – the proof that the payment was innocent was thus missing. More critically, those explanations were incriminating of themselves and each other instead. The incriminating explanations in their statements to CPIB showed that the payment of \$20,000 from Ng to Goh was made for a corrupt purpose: i.e. as an inducement for Goh, as an agent in Wildlife Reserves Singapore Pte Ltd (“WRS”), to advance the business interests of Ng’s company, Ascension Engineering Services Pte Ltd with WRS. It is beyond dispute that there is no need to go further and prove that Goh could or did in fact show favour to Ng’s company: section 9, Prevention of Corruption Act 1960.

4 At trial, Goh and Ng have offered testimony in two main categories: (1) to resile from their admissions in their statements and (2) about the circumstances between them which indicates that there was an innocent purpose for the payment. Having reviewed the coherence of those explanations in the first category, against the statement contents as recorded from each of them (with the various amendments each made), together with the circumstances & sequence in which each statement was recorded, plus the testimony from the recording officers, I do not find their explanations in category 1 to be coherent and credible against that backdrop. Having reviewed the explanations in the second category, I find them to suffer from a lack of internal and external coherence. As a result, no reasonable doubt was raised.

5 An objective review of the evidence concludes that the statements are credible and show that the payment was made with a corrupt purpose. The circumstances surrounding the payment also support this finding. I therefore find that the prosecution has proven its case on the charges against each accused beyond a reasonable doubt, and hereby find each of them guilty of their respective charges and convict them on it.

PP v Goh Meng Kwee (Wu Minggui) & Ng Yeow Seng

6 I will hear parties on sentencing.



Eugene Teo Weng Kuan

District Judge

Deputy Public Prosecutors Alan Loh, Yap Jia Jun, Leong Kit Yu
(Attorney-General's Chambers) for the Public Prosecutor;
Mr Prakash Otharam (Ashvin Law Corporation) for Goh Meng Kwee
(Wu Minggui).
Mr Kang Kok Boon Favian (Jiang Guowen) (Centurion Law LLC)
for Ng Yeow Seng