

Guide to the Assessment of Costs **in the** **Singapore International Commercial Court**

This Guide to the Assessment of Costs in the Singapore International Commercial Court (“the Costs Guide”) is intended to assist court users in understanding the costs regime under the Singapore International Commercial Court Rules 2021 (“SICC Rules”), and serves to provide general information only. Reference should always be made to the relevant provisions in the SICC Rules, any applicable written law and practice directions, and any applicable guidance that may be found in prevailing case law. The Costs Guide does not, in any way, fetter the Court’s exercise of its discretion in awarding costs for each particular case. The Costs Guide is not intended to be, and should not be construed as, legal advice.

Guide to the Assessment of Costs in the Singapore International Commercial Court

A. Applicable provisions of the SICC Rules

1 The provisions relating to costs are set out in Order 22 of the Singapore International Commercial Court Rules 2021 (“**SICC Rules**”). Costs are in the discretion of the Court, and the Court has the power to determine all issues relating to the costs of or incidental to all proceedings, including by whom and to what extent the costs are to be paid, at any stage of the proceedings or after the conclusion of the proceedings (see Order 22 rule 2(1) of the SICC Rules).

2 Generally, and without affecting the scope of the Court’s discretion as to costs, a successful party is entitled to costs, and the quantum of any costs award will generally reflect the costs incurred by the party entitled to costs. This is subject to the principles of proportionality and reasonableness (see Order 22 rule 3(1) of the SICC Rules).¹ In considering proportionality and reasonableness, the Court may consider all relevant circumstances, including those set out in Order 22 rule 3(2) of the SICC Rules, as follows:

(2) In considering proportionality and reasonableness, the Court may have regard to all relevant circumstances, including —

- (a) the complexity of the case and the difficulty or novelty of the questions involved;
- (b) the skill, specialised knowledge and responsibility required of, and the time and labour expended by, the counsel;
- (c) the urgency and importance of the action to the parties;
- (d) the number of counsel involved in the case for each party;
- (e) the conduct of the parties, including in particular —
 - (i) conduct before, as well as during the application or proceeding;
 - (ii) whether it was reasonable for a party to raise, pursue or contest a particular allegation or issue;
 - (iii) the manner in which a party has pursued or contested a particular allegation or issue; and
 - (iv) whether the conduct of the parties, including conduct in respect of alternative dispute resolution, facilitated the smooth and efficient disposal of the case;
- (f) the amount or value of the claim;
- (g) the stage at which the proceedings were concluded;

¹ See also *The Republic of India v Deutsche Telekom AG* [2023] SGCA(I) 10 at [189].

- (h) the existence of any offer to settle, the date the offer was made, the terms of the offer and the extent to which the claimant's judgment is more favourable than the terms of the offer to settle;
- (i) the existence of an agreement as to the amount of, basis for, or mechanics for, the determination of a costs award; and
- (j) the estimates provided in a costs schedule.

3 A case commenced in the General Division of the High Court of Singapore (“**the General Division**”) may be transferred to the Singapore International Commercial Court (“**SICC**”) (see Order 2 rule 4 of the SICC Rules). In such cases, costs will likewise be assessed by the SICC, taking into account all of the circumstances of the case.

(a) In relation to pre-transfer costs, the SICC will take into consideration the fact that the General Division costs regime would have applied to those costs (see Order 22 rule 3(5) of the SICC Rules). Thus, in the absence of any court order to the contrary, and in the absence of any agreement to the contrary between the parties, the general position is that Order 21 of the Rules of Court 2021 and Appendix G of the Supreme Court Practice Directions 2021 (“**Appendix G**”) will continue to guide the assessment of pre-transfer costs.

(b) In relation to post-transfer costs, the general position is that the SICC costs regime will apply, unless there is a court order to the contrary or the parties agree otherwise, but the SICC is not precluded from taking into account the General Division costs regime (see Order 22 rule 3(5) of the SICC Rules). However, this general position may be departed from in appropriate cases.²

B. Applicable principles set out in case law

4 The provisions of the SICC Rules relating to costs are supplemented by case law. In *Kiri Industries Ltd v Senda International Capital Ltd and another* [2022] 3 SLR 174 (“**Kiri Industries (SICC)**”) at [77] and [79], the Court explained that the SICC costs regime is informed by the commercial consideration of ensuring that a successful litigant is not generally out of pocket for prosecuting their claim in a sensible manner. Thus, costs which are sensibly and reasonably incurred will generally be recoverable. Similarly, the Court in *B2C2 Ltd v*

² See *CBX and another v CBZ and others* [2022] 1 SLR 88 (“**CBX**”) at [28]; *Lao Holdings NV v Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic and another matter* [2022] SGHC(I) 6 (“**Lao Holdings**”) at [27].

Quoine Pte Ltd [2019] 5 SLR 28 (“**B2C2**”) observed at [12] and [14] that “[a] successful commercial litigant should not be out of pocket if it has prosecuted its claim or defence sensibly” and can “expect to receive reasonable compensation for the expenditure that they have properly incurred”. In *Lao Holdings NV v Government of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic and another matter* [2022] SGHC(I) 6 at [63], the Court agreed with the broad principles that were enunciated in *Kiri*. In *Senda International Capital Ltd v Kiri Industries Ltd* [2022] SGCA(I) 10 (“**Kiri Industries (CA)**”) at [32], the Court of Appeal reaffirmed that a successful party’s entitlement to costs under the SICC regime is to “whatever costs that had in fact been sensibly and reasonably incurred by the successful party”.

5 In SICC proceedings, “the question of amount of costs that a successful party should recover is at large and the judge is tasked to determine what is ‘reasonable’”.³ This determination involves, as a starting point, a subjective inquiry into just what costs were in fact incurred, whether these were reasonably incurred, and whether the overall quantum of costs is reasonable.⁴ In doing so, the Court may take into consideration many factors, including those set out in Order 22 rule 3(2) of the SICC Rules.⁵ These are “considerations which commercial people would understand as being factors which are intended to enable the court to draw a proper and clear line as to what expenditure is necessary to succeed in the litigation and what is in excess of that expenditure”.⁶ However, parties should be cautioned against the indiscriminate incurring of costs intended to oppress the opposing side. Such costs would not have been reasonably incurred and thus will not be awarded as reasonable costs.⁷

6 The approach to the assessment of reasonable costs was summarised by the Court of Appeal in *Kiri Industries (CA)* at [100] as follows:

(a) The starting point for the assessment is what costs were in fact incurred by the successful party, to the extent that such costs are “reasonable”. This is an open-ended inquiry to be undertaken with due regard to the specific facts of the case at hand.

(b) It is for the trial court that heard the matter to assess costs and it is also within the trial court’s discretion to determine the manner in which costs are to be assessed.

³ See *CBX* at [8]–[9]; *Lao Holdings* at [83]–[84].

⁴ See *Kiri Industries (CA)* at [52].

⁵ See *Kiri Industries (CA)* at [57].

⁶ See *B2C2* at [12].

⁷ See *Kiri Industries* at [79]–[80]; *B2C2* at [12]; *Kiri Industries (CA)* at [52].

(c) When costs come to be assessed by the trial court, the legal burden is on the successful party to establish that its claimed costs are indeed “reasonable costs”, and it must provide information to show how the claimed costs had been incurred and thereby allow the unsuccessful party and/or the court to assess whether they are reasonable.

(d) Upon the successful party providing a sufficient breakdown of its claimed costs, the evidential burden shifts to the unsuccessful party to adduce evidence in rebuttal.

7 In relation to transfer cases, a party’s objection to the transfer of a matter from the General Division to the SICC that is maintained specifically over the issues of costs will not generally be a relevant consideration affecting the assessment of reasonable costs.⁸ Some examples of the Court’s approach to the assessment of costs in transfer cases include the following:

(a) In *CPIT*, the Court assessed pre-transfer costs taking into account the fact that the General Division costs regime would have applied, such that appropriate weight was given to Appendix G. As regards post-transfer costs, although there was neither mention of Appendix G nor agreement or an order that Appendix G would continue to apply, Appendix G remained one of a number of factors to be considered in assessing reasonable costs.

(b) In *B2C2*, the Court assessed pre-transfer costs with reference to Appendix G. As regards post-transfer costs, in light of the court order at the transfer hearing that the SICC costs regime should apply post-transfer, and given the circumstances of the case, the Court did not place any material weight on Appendix G when assessing costs.

(c) In *Kiri Industries (SICC)*, the Court assessed pre-transfer costs by applying an uplift on the rates set out in Appendix G to reflect the complexity of the matter. In relation to post-transfer costs, the Court held that Appendix G carried no weight in the assessment of costs, due to the degree of complexity of the matter.

C. Costs awards made in previous SICC cases

8 A compilation of costs awards made in previous SICC cases may be found in the Annex of the Costs Guide. The compilation is divided into three categories:

⁸ *Kiri Industries (CA)* at [81].

- (a) Costs awards made in trials conducted in the SICC;
- (b) Costs awards made in SICC proceedings under the International Arbitration Act 1994;
- (c) Costs awards made in appeals to the Court of Appeal from decisions of the SICC.

9 This compilation is intended to provide SICC users with samples of costs awards that have been made by the SICC and the Court of Appeal in previous cases and is set out purely for reference by SICC users. It should be noted that costs awards are context specific and are ultimately at the Court's discretion. Reference should always be made to the relevant provisions in the SICC Rules, any applicable written law and practice directions, and any applicable guidance that may be found in prevailing case law.

Annex: Costs awards made in previous SICC cases

Trials

S/N	Case Name	Nature of case	Number of witnesses	Length of hearing	Whether Senior Counsel (“SC”)/ Queen’s Counsel or King’s Counsel (“KC”) or Registered Foreign Lawyer (“RFL”) involved	Date of costs award	Costs award (excluding costs orders in respect of interlocutory applications)
1	SIC/S 3/2016 <i>SRS Commerce Ltd & Anor v Yuji I Mabeppu & Ors</i>	Equity and Trusts, Restitution, Tort	Factual: 0 Expert: 0	1 day	No.	30/11/2016	The court dismissed the action for want of prosecution. The court awarded the third defendant costs fixed at \$208,500 (including interlocutory applications and excluding disbursements) and awarded the first and fourth defendants costs fixed at \$296,500 (including interlocutory applications and excluding disbursements).
2	SIC/S 4/2016 <i>Arris Solutions, Inc. & 2 Ors v Asian Broadcasting Network (M) Sdn Bhd</i>	Contract, Insolvency	Factual: 0 Expert: 0	Half day	No.	09/01/2017	The court granted summary judgment to the second and third plaintiffs and dismissed the first plaintiff’s claims. The court awarded the plaintiffs costs fixed at \$20,000 excluding disbursements.
3	SIC/S 1/2016	Contract	Factual: 7 Expert: 0	4 days	Yes, RFL instructed by	04/04/2017	The court allowed the plaintiff’s claim and dismissed the defendant’s counterclaim.

Annex: Costs awards made in previous SICC cases

S/N	Case Name	Nature of case	Number of witnesses	Length of hearing	Whether Senior Counsel (“SC”)/ Queen’s Counsel or King’s Counsel (“KC”) or Registered Foreign Lawyer (“RFL”) involved	Date of costs award	Costs award (excluding costs orders in respect of interlocutory applications)
	<i>Teras Offshore Pte Ltd v Teras Cargo Transport (America) LLC</i>				the defendant.		The court awarded the plaintiff costs fixed at \$68,000 excluding disbursements.
4	SIC/S 2/2015 (HC/BC 23/2017) <i>Telemedia Pacific Group Limited & Anor v Yuata Asset Management International Limited & Anor</i>	Contract, Equity, Tort	Factual: 2 Expert: 3	7 days	No.	24/05/2017	The court allowed the plaintiffs’ claim in part and dismissed the defendants’ counterclaim. The court awarded the plaintiffs costs of \$370,000 excluding disbursements.
5	SIC/S 5/2016 <i>CPIT Investments Ltd v Qilin World Capital Ltd and another</i>	Credit and Security, Tort, Trusts	Factual: 5 Expert: 2	3 days	Yes, SC appointed by the defendant.	05/03/2018	The court allowed the plaintiff’s claim in part and dismissed the remaining claims and counterclaims. The court awarded the plaintiff costs fixed at \$384,000 excluding disbursements.

Annex: Costs awards made in previous SICC cases

S/N	Case Name	Nature of case	Number of witnesses	Length of hearing	Whether Senior Counsel (“SC”)/ Queen’s Counsel or King’s Counsel (“KC”) or Registered Foreign Lawyer (“RFL”) involved	Date of costs award	Costs award (excluding costs orders in respect of interlocutory applications)
							The second defendant’s appeal was allowed by the Court of Appeal, which awarded the second defendant costs of the first instance proceedings fixed at \$534,000 excluding disbursements.
6	SIC/S 2/2017 <i>Bachmeer Capital Limited v Ong Chih Ching</i>	Conflict of Laws, Contract, Tort	Factual: 10 Expert: 3	13 days	Yes, SC appointed by the first, second and fourth to sixth defendants.	24/05/2019	The court dismissed the plaintiff’s claim and the first and fourth defendants’ counterclaim. The court awarded the fifth and sixth defendants costs fixed at \$731,250 excluding disbursements and awarded the third defendant costs fixed at \$210,000 (all-in).
7	SIC/S 7/2017 <i>B2C2 Ltd v Quoine Pte Ltd</i>	Contract, Trusts	Factual: 3 Expert: 2	5 days	No.	12/09/2019	The court allowed the claim. The court awarded the plaintiff costs fixed at \$562,500 excluding disbursements.
8	SIC/S 9/2017	Trusts, Restitution,	Factual: 4 Expert: 0	5 days	No.	14/11/2019	The court allowed the claim in part.

Annex: Costs awards made in previous SICC cases

S/N	Case Name	Nature of case	Number of witnesses	Length of hearing	Whether Senior Counsel (“SC”)/ Queen’s Counsel or King’s Counsel (“KC”) or Registered Foreign Lawyer (“RFL”) involved	Date of costs award	Costs award (excluding costs orders in respect of interlocutory applications)
	<i>HE & SF Properties LP v Rising Dragon Singapore Pte Ltd and another</i>	Contract, Tort					The court awarded the plaintiff costs fixed at \$114,000 excluding disbursements.
9	SIC/S 2/2016 (HC/BC 130/2019) <i>BNP Paribas SA v Jacob Agam & Anor</i>	Contract, Credit and Security, Evidence	Factual: 5 Expert: 0	2 days	No.	10/12/2019	The court allowed the claim. The court awarded the plaintiff costs of \$350,000 excluding disbursements (on an indemnity basis).
10	SIC/S 3/2017 <i>Dystar Global Holdings (Singapore) Pte Ltd v Kiri Industries Ltd & 4 Ors</i>	Damages	Factual: 4 Expert: 2	4 days	Yes, SC appointed by the plaintiff.	03/03/2020	The court allowed the claim in part. The court awarded the plaintiff costs fixed at \$145,000 excluding disbursements.

Annex: Costs awards made in previous SICC cases

S/N	Case Name	Nature of case	Number of witnesses	Length of hearing	Whether Senior Counsel (“SC”)/ Queen’s Counsel or King’s Counsel (“KC”) or Registered Foreign Lawyer (“RFL”) involved	Date of costs award	Costs award (excluding costs orders in respect of interlocutory applications)
11	SIC/S 4/2018 <i>Sheila Kazzaz & Anor v Standard Chartered Bank & 3 Ors</i>	Banking, Contract, Credit and Security, Damages, Tort	Factual: 6 Expert: 2	10 days	Yes, RFL appointed by the plaintiffs.	31/08/2020	The court dismissed the plaintiff’s claim. The court awarded the defendants costs fixed at \$1,100,000 excluding disbursements.
12	SIC/S 7/2018, SIC/S 8/2018 & SIC/S 9/2018 <i>Hai Jiao 1306 Limited v Yaw Chee Siew</i>	Contract	Factual: 6 Expert: 2	13 days	Yes, SC appointed by the plaintiffs.	27/10/2020	The court allowed the claims in part. The court awarded the plaintiff costs fixed at \$1,550,000 excluding disbursements.
13	SIC/S 1/2019 <i>POSH Semco Pte Ltd v Makamin Petroleum Services Co & Anor</i>	Credit and Security, Civil Procedure, Commercial Transactions	Factual: 1 Expert: 1	2 days	Yes, SC appointed by the plaintiff.	18/12/2020	The court allowed the plaintiff’s claim. The court awarded the plaintiff costs fixed at US\$577,070.10 plus \$132,306.50 excluding disbursements.

Annex: Costs awards made in previous SICC cases

S/N	Case Name	Nature of case	Number of witnesses	Length of hearing	Whether Senior Counsel (“SC”)/ Queen’s Counsel or King’s Counsel (“KC”) or Registered Foreign Lawyer (“RFL”) involved	Date of costs award	Costs award (excluding costs orders in respect of interlocutory applications)
14	SIC/S 3/2018 <i>Baker, Michael A (executor of the estate of Chantal Burnison, deceased) v BCS Business Consulting Services Pte Ltd & 2 Ors</i>	Trusts, Contract	Factual: 3 Expert: 0	8 days	Yes, SC and RFLs appointed by both parties.	13/04/2021	The court allowed the claim. The court awarded the plaintiff costs fixed at \$530,000 excluding costs for US counsel and disbursements.
15	SIC/S 10/2018 <i>Beyonics Asia Pacific Limited & Ors v Goh Chan Peng & Anor</i>	Abuse of process, Companies, Employment Law	Factual: 8 Expert: 4	15 days	Yes, SC appointed by the defendants.	15/07/2021	The first instance court struck out the plaintiffs’ claim. On appeal, the Court of Appeal partially allowed the appeal, finding that the claims should not have been struck out for abuse of process. The defendants were ordered to pay the plaintiffs’ costs for the abuse of process issue and the Court of Appeal did not disturb the order made at first instance for the plaintiffs to pay two-thirds of the defendants’ costs for the substantive issue. The court awarded the plaintiffs costs fixed at \$122,040 , excluding disbursements, for the abuse of process issue

Annex: Costs awards made in previous SICC cases

S/N	Case Name	Nature of case	Number of witnesses	Length of hearing	Whether Senior Counsel (“SC”)/ Queen’s Counsel or King’s Counsel (“KC”) or Registered Foreign Lawyer (“RFL”) involved	Date of costs award	Costs award (excluding costs orders in respect of interlocutory applications)
							and awarded the defendants costs fixed at \$370,640 , excluding disbursements, for the substantive issue.
16	SIC/S 6/2020 <i>Judah Value Activist Fund v Open Faith Investment Limited</i>	Contract	Factual: 4 Expert: 2	6 days	No.	14/09/2021	The court dismissed the plaintiff’s claim. The court awarded the defendant costs fixed at \$87,000 excluding disbursements.
17	SIC/S 7/2020 <i>Dystar Global Holdings (Singapore) Pte Ltd v Kiri Industries Limited & Anor</i>	Res judicata, Abuse of process, Contract	Factual: 7 Expert: 0	5 days	Yes, SC appointed by the plaintiff.	24/09/2021	The court dismissed the defendant’s counterclaim. The court awarded the plaintiff costs fixed at \$1,062,000 excluding disbursements.
18	SIC/S 8/2020	Tort	Factual: 2 Expert: 0	8 days	No.	09/11/2021	The court allowed the plaintiff’s claim.

Annex: Costs awards made in previous SICC cases

S/N	Case Name	Nature of case	Number of witnesses	Length of hearing	Whether Senior Counsel (“SC”)/ Queen’s Counsel or King’s Counsel (“KC”) or Registered Foreign Lawyer (“RFL”) involved	Date of costs award	Costs award (excluding costs orders in respect of interlocutory applications)
	<i>Providence Asset Management & Anor v Then Feng & Ors</i>						The court awarded the plaintiffs pre-transfer costs fixed at \$50,000 and post-transfer costs fixed at \$200,000 (both figures excluding disbursements).
19	SIC/S 2/2019 <i>Solomon Lew v Kaikhushru Shiavax Nargolwala & Ors</i>	Agency, Conflict of Laws, Contract, Trusts, Tort	Factual: 8 Expert: 2	11 days	Yes, SC appointed by the plaintiff.	25/11/2021	The court dismissed the plaintiff’s claim. The court awarded the first and second defendants costs at \$475,000 , awarded the third and fourth defendants costs fixed at \$400,000 , and awarded the fifth defendant costs fixed at \$175,000 (all figures excluding disbursements).
20	SIC/S 4/2017 <i>Kiri Industries Limited v Senda International Capital Limited & Anor</i>	Companies, Civil Procedure, Contract, Tort	Factual: 21 Expert: 5	26 days	Yes, SC appointed by first defendant.	08/12/2021	The court allowed the claim in part. The court awarded the plaintiff pre-transfer costs of \$114,636.90 and post-transfer costs of \$4,846,178.36 (both figures excluding disbursements).

Annex: Costs awards made in previous SICC cases

S/N	Case Name	Nature of case	Number of witnesses	Length of hearing	Whether Senior Counsel (“SC”)/ Queen’s Counsel or King’s Counsel (“KC”) or Registered Foreign Lawyer (“RFL”) involved	Date of costs award	Costs award (excluding costs orders in respect of interlocutory applications)
21	SIC/S 1/2021 <i>Credit Agricole Corporate & Investment Bank, Singapore Branch v PPT Energy Trading Co. Ltd</i> SIC/S 2/2021 <i>PPT Energy Trading Co. Ltd v Credit Agricole Corporate & Investment Bank, Singapore Branch</i>	Banking, Tort, Bills of Exchange and other Negotiable Instruments, Credit and Security	Factual:7 Expert: 2	8 days	Yes, SC appointed by the defendant in SIC/S 1/2021 and KC/RFL appointed by both parties.	30/03/2022	The court dismissed the claims of the plaintiff in SIC/S 1/2021 and awarded judgment in favour of the plaintiff in SIC/S 2/2021 (“PPT”). The court awarded PPT pre-transfer costs of \$15,000 and post-transfer costs of US\$780,000 and £170,000 (all figures excluding disbursements).
22	SIC/S 5/2019 <i>Carlsberg Breweries A/S v CSAPL (Singapore) Holdings Pte Ltd</i>	Contract	Factual: 6 Expert: 0	6 days	No.	09/06/2022	The court dismissed the claim but this decision was reversed on appeal, with costs of the trial to be fixed by the first instance court.

Annex: Costs awards made in previous SICC cases

S/N	Case Name	Nature of case	Number of witnesses	Length of hearing	Whether Senior Counsel (“SC”)/ Queen’s Counsel or King’s Counsel (“KC”) or Registered Foreign Lawyer (“RFL”) involved	Date of costs award	Costs award (excluding costs orders in respect of interlocutory applications)
							The court awarded the plaintiff pre-transfer costs of \$8,500 and post-transfer costs of \$900,000 (excluding disbursements).
23	SIC/S 3/2020 <i>Christian Alfred Larpin & Anor v Kaikhushru Shiavax Nargolwala & Anor</i>	Contract	Factual: 4 Expert: 0	6 days	No.	26/08/2022	The court dismissed the plaintiffs’ claim. The court awarded the defendants costs of \$374,500 excluding disbursements.
24	SIC/S 4/2020 <i>Tamar Perry & Anor v Bonnet Esculier Servane Michele Thais & Anor</i>	Conflict of Laws, Trusts	Factual: 4 Expert: 1	8 days	Yes, KC/RFL appointed by plaintiffs.	29/08/2022	The court dismissed the plaintiffs’ claim. The court awarded the defendants costs of \$800,000 (excluding disbursements).
25	SIC/S 1/2015	Contract	Factual: 13 Expert: 21	22 days	Yes, SC appointed by both parties.	19/12/2022	The court allowed the plaintiffs’ claim in part.

Annex: Costs awards made in previous SICC cases

S/N	Case Name	Nature of case	Number of witnesses	Length of hearing	Whether Senior Counsel (“SC”)/ Queen’s Counsel or King’s Counsel (“KC”) or Registered Foreign Lawyer (“RFL”) involved	Date of costs award	Costs award (excluding costs orders in respect of interlocutory applications)
	<i>BCBC Singapore Pte Ltd & Anor v PT Bayan Resources TBK & Anor</i>						The court awarded the defendants pre-transfer costs of \$90,000 and post-transfer costs of \$2,671,787 , plus disbursements.
26	SIC/S 9/2021 <i>Roll SG Pte Ltd v Cong Ty Co Phan Van Tai Lien Hiep Huy Hoang</i>	Contract	Factual: 3 Expert: 0	1 day	No.	25/04/2023	The court allowed the plaintiff’s claims. The court awarded the plaintiff costs fixed at S\$725,715.21 (inclusive of disbursements) and US\$34,140.02 (for legal fees due to the plaintiff’s Vietnamese counsel).
27	SIC/S 4/2021 <i>Bidzina Ivanishvili & 4 Ors v Credit Suisse Trust Limited</i>	Trusts	Factual: 8 Expert: 6	17 days	Yes, SC appointed by both parties.	19/09/2023	The court allowed the plaintiffs’ claim in part. The court awarded the plaintiffs costs of \$567,471.45 as agreed costs between the parties as well as costs fixed at \$6,731,421.98 (all figures inclusive of disbursements).
28	SIC/S 5/2020 <i>The Micro Tellers Network Limited & 3 Ors</i>	Contract, Equity, Tort	Factual: 9 Expert: 0	7 days	No.	31/10/2023	The court allowed the plaintiffs’ claim in part. The court ordered (a) the fourth defendant to pay to the first plaintiff costs fixed at \$128,000 ; (b) the second to third plaintiff to pay to the fourth defendant costs of

Annex: Costs awards made in previous SICC cases

S/N	Case Name	Nature of case	Number of witnesses	Length of hearing	Whether Senior Counsel (“SC”)/ Queen’s Counsel or King’s Counsel (“KC”) or Registered Foreign Lawyer (“RFL”) involved	Date of costs award	Costs award (excluding costs orders in respect of interlocutory applications)
	<i>v Cheng Yi Han (Zhong Yihan) & 4 Ors</i>						\$62,000 ; and (c) the first to fourth plaintiffs to pay to the fifth defendant costs of \$197,589.60 (all figures inclusive of disbursements).

Annex: Costs awards made in previous SICC cases

First instance proceedings under the International Arbitration Act 1994

S/N	Case Name	Length of hearing	Whether SC/KC or RFL involved	Date of costs award	Outcome and costs award (excluding costs orders in respect of interlocutory applications)
1	SIC/OS 1/2019 <i>BXS v BVT</i>	Half day	No.	11/09/2019	The court struck out the plaintiff's application. The court awarded the defendant costs fixed at \$40,000 (all-in, including two interlocutory applications).
2	SIC/OS 3/2019 <i>BXY & 2 Ors v BXX & 2 Ors</i>	Half day	Yes, SC appointed by the defendants.	12/09/2019	The court dismissed the plaintiffs' application. The court awarded the defendants costs fixed at \$14,000 excluding disbursements.
3	SIC/OS 9/2019 <i>BYL & Anor v BYN</i>	Half day	Yes, SC appointed by both parties.	11/05/2020	The court dismissed the plaintiff's application. The court awarded the defendant costs fixed at \$47,600 excluding disbursements.
4	SIC/OS 7/2019 <i>CES v International Air Transport Association</i>	Half day	No.	16/06/2020	The court dismissed the plaintiff's application. The court awarded the defendant costs fixed at \$25,000 excluding disbursements.
5	SIC/OS 1/2020 <i>CBX & Anor v CBZ & 2 Ors</i>	Half day	Yes, SC appointed by both parties.	08/10/2020	The court dismissed the plaintiff's application. The court awarded the defendants costs fixed at \$150,000 (all-in).
6	SIC/OS 4/2020 <i>Gokul v Patnaik v Nine Rivers Capital Ltd</i>	1 day	No.	02/03/2021	The court dismissed the plaintiff's application. The court awarded the defendant costs fixed at \$65,000 excluding disbursements (including a striking out application, which was not heard).
7	SIC/OS 5/2021 <i>CJM and 6 Ors v CJT</i>	Half day	Yes, SC appointed by both parties.	27/08/2021	The court dismissed the plaintiff's application. The court awarded the defendant pre-transfer costs of \$25,000 and post-transfer costs of \$45,000 (both figures excluding disbursements).

Annex: Costs awards made in previous SICC cases

S/N	Case Name	Length of hearing	Whether SC/KC or RFL involved	Date of costs award	Outcome and costs award (excluding costs orders in respect of interlocutory applications)
8	SIC/OS 7/2021 <i>CLQ v CLR</i>	Half day	Yes, SC appointed by both parties.	24/12/2021	The court dismissed the plaintiff's application. The court awarded the defendant costs fixed at \$70,000 excluding disbursements.
9	SIC/OS 10/2021 <i>Twarit Consultancy Services Pte Ltd and another v GPE (India) Ltd and others</i>	Half day	No.	04/02/2022	The court dismissed the plaintiff's application. The court awarded the defendant costs fixed at \$39,000 inclusive of disbursements.
10	SIC/OS 5/2020 <i>Lao Holdings NV v The Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic</i> SIC/OS 6/2020 <i>Sanum Investments Limited v The Government of the Lao's People Democratic Republic</i>	1.5 days	Yes, SC appointed by the defendant.	13/04/2022	The court dismissed the plaintiffs' applications. The court awarded the defendant costs fixed at \$222,000 inclusive of disbursements. This comprised \$42,000 for pre-transfer costs and \$180,000 for post-transfer costs.
11	SIC/OS 11/2021 <i>Asiana Airlines Inc v Gate Gourmet Korea Co Ltd</i>	3 days	Yes, SC appointed by the plaintiff.	27/05/2022	The court dismissed the plaintiff's application. The court awarded the defendant pre-transfer costs of \$40,000 and post-transfer costs of \$80,000 (excluding disbursements).
12	SIC/OS 1/2021 <i>CHY & Anor v CIA</i>	1 day	No.	22/06/2022	The court dismissed the plaintiff's application and allowed the defendant's application to strike out the plaintiffs' expert evidence.

Annex: Costs awards made in previous SICC cases

S/N	Case Name	Length of hearing	Whether SC/KC or RFL involved	Date of costs award	Outcome and costs award (excluding costs orders in respect of interlocutory applications)
					The court awarded the defendant costs of \$92,866.80 (excluding disbursements).
13	SIC/OS 6/2022 & SIC/OS 7/2022 <i>The Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic & 2 Ors v Sanum Investments Limited & Anor</i>	1 day	No.	14/07/2022	The court dismissed the applications of Lao Holdings NV and Sanum Investments Ltd ("the Investors") against the Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, San Marco Capital Partners LLC and Kelly Gass ("the GOL Parties") to set aside an arbitral award and to resist enforcement of the award. The court awarded the GOL Parties pre-transfer costs of \$30,000 and post-transfer costs of \$115,000 (excluding disbursements).
14	SIC/OS 8/2022 (HC/SUM 155/2022, HC/SUM 720/2022, SIC/SUM 24/2022 and SIC/SUM 45/2022) <i>Deutsche Telekom AG v The Republic of India</i>	2 days	Yes, SC appointed by both parties.	17/04/2023	The court dismissed the defendant's applications. The court awarded the plaintiff costs fixed at \$380,800 (comprising \$50,000 as pre-transfer costs and \$330,000 as post-transfer costs), which included the costs of certain interlocutory applications, plus disbursements.
15	SIC/OA 1/2022 <i>CUW and 2 Ors v CUZ</i>	1 day	No.	05/06/2023	The court dismissed the claimants' application. The court awarded the respondent costs fixed at \$56,000 , plus disbursements.
16	SIC/OS 2/2022, SIC/OS 3/2022, SIC/OS 4/2022 & SIC/OS 5/2022 <i>CNA v CNB & Anor & other matters</i>	3 days	Yes, SC and KC appointed by the plaintiffs and RFL appointed by all parties.	02/08/2023	The court dismissed the plaintiffs' applications. The court awarded the defendants two separate sets of costs payable by the plaintiffs for the following amounts: (a) pre-transfer costs of S\$25,000 for fees owing to the defendants' Singaporean counsel and KRW2,677.606 for fees owing to the defendants' Korean counsel; (b) post-transfer costs of S\$322,666.05 for fees owing to the defendants' Singaporean counsel and KRW13,211,852.50 for fees owing to the defendants' Korean counsel; and (c) disbursements.

Annex: Costs awards made in previous SICC cases

S/N	Case Name	Length of hearing	Whether SC/KC or RFL involved	Date of costs award	Outcome and costs award (excluding costs orders in respect of interlocutory applications)
17	SIUC/OA 6/2023 <i>DBO & 3 Ors v DBP & 4 Ors</i>	1 day	No.	07/09/2023	The court dismissed the claimants' application. The court awarded the first to fourth respondents costs fixed at \$113,000 , plus disbursements.
18	SIC/OA 3/2022 <i>CYW v CYX</i>	1 day	No.	31/10/2023	The court dismissed the claimant's application. The court awarded the respondent costs fixed at \$174,734.41 (comprising pre-transfer costs of \$10,000 and post-transfer costs of \$159,195.80), inclusive of disbursements.
19	SIC/OS 1/2023 <i>CZT v CZU</i>	1 day	Yes, SC appointed by the defendant.	26/12/2023	The court dismissed the plaintiff's application. The court awarded the defendant costs fixed at \$145,000 , plus disbursements.

Annex: Costs awards made in previous SICC cases

Appeals from decisions of the SICC

S/N	Case Name	Nature of case	Length of hearing	Whether SC/KC or RFL involved	Date of costs award	Outcome and costs award (excluding costs orders in respect of interlocutory applications)
1	CA/CA 71/2017 <i>Jacob Agam & Anor v BNP Paribas SA</i>	Contract, Banking	Half day	No.	12/05/2017	The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. The Court of Appeal awarded the respondent costs fixed at \$24,000 (including for the leave to appeal application), excluding disbursements.
2	CA/CA 126/2017 & CA/CA 145/2017 <i>Qilin World Capital Limited v CPIT Investments Limited</i>	Credit and Security, Contract	Half day	Yes, SC appointed by the appellant in CA 126 and respondent in CA 145.	11/07/2018	The Court of Appeal allowed the appeal in CA 126 and dismissed the appeal in CA 145. The Court of Appeal awarded the appellant in CA 126/respondent in CA 145 costs fixed at \$170,000 for both appeals, excluding disbursements.
3	CA/CA 189/2016 & CA/CA 1/2017 <i>Yuanta Asset Management International Limited & Anor v Telemia Pacific Group Limited & Anor</i>	Contract, Equity, Tort, Trusts	1 day	Yes, SC appointed by the appellants in CA 189 and respondents in CA 1.	02/01/2019	The Court of Appeal allowed the appeal in CA 189 in part and dismissed the appeal in CA 1 and an interlocutory application. The Court of Appeal awarded the appellants in CA 189/respondents in CA 1 costs fixed at \$35,000 (all-in).
4	CA/CA 224/2017 (HC/BC 129/2019) <i>Jacob Agam & Anor v BNP Paribas SA</i>	Civil Procedure	Half day	No.	10/12/2019	The Court of Appeal granted a declaration that the appeal was deemed to have been withdrawn and ordered costs to be taxed or agreed. The court awarded costs of \$35,000 excluding disbursements (on an indemnity basis).

Annex: Costs awards made in previous SICC cases

S/N	Case Name	Nature of case	Length of hearing	Whether SC/KC or RFL involved	Date of costs award	Outcome and costs award (excluding costs orders in respect of interlocutory applications)
5	CA/CA 131/2019 <i>Bachmeer Capital Limited v Ong Chih Ching & 5 Ors</i>	Contract, Conflict of Laws, Tort	Half day	Yes, SC appointed by the first, second, fourth, fifth and sixth respondents.	18/02/2020	The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. The Court of Appeal awarded the first, second, fourth, fifth and sixth respondents costs fixed at \$75,000 (all-in), and awarded the third respondent costs fixed at \$25,000 (all-in).
6	CA/CA 201/2019 <i>Yaw Chee Siew v Hai Jiao 1306 Limited & 2 Ors</i>	Civil procedure	No hearing	Yes, SC appointed by the respondents.	21/02/2020	The Court of Appeal allowed the application to strike out the appeal. The Court of Appeal awarded the respondent costs fixed at \$3,000 (all-in).
7	CA/CA 81/2019 <i>Quoine Pte Ltd v B2C2 Ltd</i>	Contract, Restitution, Trusts	1 day	Yes, SC appointed by the appellant.	18/03/2020	The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. The Court of Appeal awarded the respondent costs fixed at \$100,000 (all-in).
8	CA/CA 203/2019 <i>Sheila Kazzaz & Anor v Standard Chartered Bank</i>	Banking, Tort, Civil Procedure	Half day	No.	11/06/2020	The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. The Court of Appeal awarded the respondent costs fixed at \$80,000 inclusive of disbursements.
9	CA/CA 16/2020 & CA/CA 48/2020 <i>Kiri Industries Limited & Anor v Dystar Global Holdings (Singapore) Pte Ltd</i>	Damages	Half day	Yes, SC appointed by the respondent.	16/11/2020	The Court of Appeal allowed the appeals in part. The Court of Appeal awarded the appellants in CA 16 costs fixed at \$35,000 (inclusive of disbursements). The Court of Appeal ordered that, in relation to the costs of the appeal in CA 48, each party was to bear its/his own costs.

Annex: Costs awards made in previous SICC cases

S/N	Case Name	Nature of case	Length of hearing	Whether SC/KC or RFL involved	Date of costs award	Outcome and costs award (excluding costs orders in respect of interlocutory applications)
10	CA/CA 180/2019 <i>Offshoreworks Global (L) Ltd v Posh Semco Pte Ltd</i>	Credit and Security, Civil Procedure	Half day	Yes, SC appointed by the respondent.	23/11/2020	The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. The Court of Appeal awarded the respondent costs on an indemnity basis fixed at \$105,000 excluding disbursements.
11	CA/CA 76/2020 <i>BCS Business Consulting Services Pte Ltd & 2 Ors v Michael A Baker (executor of the estate of Chantal Burnison, deceased)</i>	Trusts	Half day	Yes, SC appointed by both parties.	19/01/2021	The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. The Court of Appeal awarded the respondent costs of \$60,000 excluding disbursements.
12	CA/CA 131/2020 <i>Yaw Chee Siew v Hai Jiao 1306 Limited & 2 Ors</i>	Contract	Half day	Yes, SC appointed by the respondents.	04/02/2021	The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. The Court of Appeal awarded the respondents costs fixed at \$65,000 inclusive of disbursements.
13	CA/CA 38/2020 & CA/CA 126/2020 <i>Solomon Lew v Kaikhushru Shiavax Nargolwala & 4 Ors</i>	Agency, Contract, Trusts, Conflict of Laws, Civil Procedure	Half day	Yes, SC appointed by the appellant in CA 38 and respondent in CA 126.	05/03/2021	The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal in CA 38 and allowed the appeal in CA 126. The Court of Appeal awarded the first and second respondents in CA 38 and appellants in CA 126 costs fixed at \$141,796.20 (all-in, including costs of two applications), awarded the third and fourth respondents in CA 38 costs fixed at \$70,000 (all-in), and awarded the fifth respondent in CA 38 costs fixed at \$55,000 (all-in).

Annex: Costs awards made in previous SICC cases

S/N	Case Name	Nature of case	Length of hearing	Whether SC/KC or RFL involved	Date of costs award	Outcome and costs award (excluding costs orders in respect of interlocutory applications)
14	CA/CA 100/2020 & CA/CA 185/2020 <i>Beyonics Asia Pacific Limited & 4 Ors v Goh Chan Peng & Anor</i>	Abuse of process, Companies	Half day	Yes, SC appointed by the respondents.	02/06/2021	The Court of Appeal allowed CA 100 in part, and dismissed CA 185. The Court of Appeal awarded the appellants costs fixed at \$80,000 for CA 100 and costs fixed at \$3,000 for CA 185.
15	CA/CA 12/2021 <i>Tamar Perry & Anor v Jacques Henri Georges Esculier & Anor</i>	Civil Procedure	Half day	Yes, RFL appointed by the appellants.	04/08/2021	The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. The Court of Appeal awarded the respondents costs fixed at \$45,000 (inclusive of disbursements, and also for an originating summons).
16	CA/CA 136/2020 & CA/CA 197/2020 <i>CBX & Anor v CBZ & 2 Ors</i>	Arbitration	Half day	Yes, SC appointed by the respondent.	02/09/2021	The Court of Appeal allowed the appeals. The Court of Appeal awarded the appellants costs fixed at \$58,000 for both appeals inclusive of disbursements.
17	CA/CA 42/2021 <i>CKH v CKG</i>	Arbitration	Half day	No.	22/11/2021	The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal, save in one respect. The Court of Appeal awarded the respondent costs fixed at \$50,000 inclusive of disbursements.
18	CA/CA 3/2021 <i>Esben Finance Limited & 3 Ors v Neil Wong Hou-Lianq</i>	Restitution, Tort, Equity	Half day	Yes, SC appointed by both parties.	10/01/2022	The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. The Court of Appeal awarded the respondent costs fixed at \$70,000 inclusive of disbursements.
19	CA/CA 18/2021	Contract	Half day	No.	10/01/2022	The Court of Appeal allowed the appeal. The Court of Appeal awarded the appellant costs fixed at \$70,000 (all-in).

Annex: Costs awards made in previous SICC cases

S/N	Case Name	Nature of case	Length of hearing	Whether SC/KC or RFL involved	Date of costs award	Outcome and costs award (excluding costs orders in respect of interlocutory applications)
	<i>Carlsberg Breweries A/S v CSAPL (Singapore) Holdings Pte Ltd</i>					
20	CA/CA 46/2021 <i>CSDS Aircraft Sales & Leasing Inc v Singapore Airlines Limited</i>	Contract	Half day	Yes, KC/RFL appointed by respondent.	02/03/2022	The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. The Court of Appeal awarded the respondent costs fixed at \$70,000 (all-in).
21	CA/CA 7/2021, CA/CA 8/2021, CA/CA 22/2021, CA/CA 45/2021, CA/CA 47/2021 & CA//CA 48/2021 <i>Kiri Industries Limited v Senda International Capital Limited & Anor</i>	Companies	2 days	Yes, SC appointed for the first respondent in CA 7, CA 22 and CA 47, the appellant in CA 8, CA 45 and CA 48.	06/07/2022	The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeals in CA 8, CA 45 and CA 48, allowed the appeal in CA 7 in part, dismissed the appeal in CA 22 and allowed the appeal in CA 47. The Court of Appeal awarded the respondent in CA 8, CA 45 and CA 48 costs fixed at \$180,000 (inclusive of disbursements).
22	CA/CAS 4/2022 <i>Credit Suisse Trust Limited v Bidzina Ivanishvili & 4 Ors</i>	Civil Procedure	No hearing	Yes, SC appointed by both parties.	11/08/2022	The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. The Court of Appeal awarded the respondents costs fixed at \$20,000 (all-in).
23	CA/CAS 1/2022 <i>CKH v CKG</i>	Arbitration	Half day	No.	30/08/2022	The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. The Court of Appeal awarded the respondent costs fixed at \$30,000 .

Annex: Costs awards made in previous SICC cases

S/N	Case Name	Nature of case	Length of hearing	Whether SC/KC or RFL involved	Date of costs award	Outcome and costs award (excluding costs orders in respect of interlocutory applications)
24	CA/CA 14/2022	Costs	Half day	Yes, SC appointed by the appellant.	25/11/2022	The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. The Court of Appeal awarded the respondent costs of \$123,250 and disbursements of \$7,982.61 .
25	CA/CAS 7/2022 <i>Perry, Tamar & Anor v Esculier, Jacques Henri Georges & Anor</i>	Conflict of Laws, Trusts	Half day	Yes, KC appointed by the appellants.	18/01/2023	The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. The Court of Appeal awarded the respondents costs fixed at \$150,000 (all-in).
26	CA/CA 10/2022 <i>BCBC Singapore Pte Ltd and Anor v PT Bayan Resources TBK and Anor</i>	Contract	Half day	Yes, SC appointed by both parties.	30/03/2023	The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. The Court of Appeal awarded the respondents costs fixed at \$131,120 , plus disbursements (inclusive of a summons).
27	CA/CAS 8/2022 <i>CSDS Aircraft Sales & Leasing Inc v Singapore Airlines Limited</i>	Damages	Half day	No.	05/05/2023	The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. The Court of Appeal awarded the respondent costs fixed at \$100,000 (all-in).
28	CA/CAS 5/2023 <i>Lim Chang Huat v Stronghold Global Holdings Limited (in liquidation)</i>	Contract	Half day	No.	13/09/2023	The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. The Court of Appeal awarded the respondent costs fixed at \$80,000 (all-in).
29	CA/CAS 4/2023	Costs	Half day	Yes, SC appointed by	23/10/2023	The Court of Appeal allowed the appeal. The Court of Appeal set aside the costs order made by the court below in relation to the respondents' post-transfer costs. The

Annex: Costs awards made in previous SICC cases

S/N	Case Name	Nature of case	Length of hearing	Whether SC/KC or RFL involved	Date of costs award	Outcome and costs award (excluding costs orders in respect of interlocutory applications)
	<i>BCBC Singapore Pte Ltd and Anor v PT Bayan Resources TBK and Anor</i>			the appellants.		<p>Court of Appeal ordered the first appellant to pay to the first respondent its post-transfer costs to the following extent: from the respondents' claimed figure of \$4,947,753.70, costs solely attributable to the second respondent's withdrawn claim were to be deducted. The resulting figure was subject to a 10% discount for the respondents' lack of particularisation in the court below and a further 70% discount. The second appellant was liable to the second respondent for its post-transfer costs in so far as these were solely attributable to the second appellant's withdrawn claim, which was subject to the same 10% discount. Parties were to agree on the quantum of such costs.</p> <p>The Court of Appeal made no order as to the costs of the appeal on the basis that while the appellants prevailed, they had only done so by reason of the new points they had taken on appeal.</p>
30	CA/CAS 6/2023 <i>CVV & Ors v CWB</i>	Arbitration	Half day	Yes, SC appointed by both parties.	01/12/2023	<p>The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal.</p> <p>The Court of Appeal awarded the respondent costs fixed at \$100,000 (excluding disbursements).</p>
31	CA/CAS 1/2023 <i>The Republic of India v Deutsche Telekom AG</i>	Arbitration	1 day	Yes, SC appointed by both parties.	15/12/2023	<p>The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal.</p> <p>The Court of Appeal awarded the respondent costs fixed at \$130,000 (excluding disbursements).</p>