

Lim Slott v Wong Chiew Huong
[2010] SGHC 91

Case Number : Divorce No 601832 of 2002 (RAS No 720020 of 2009)
Decision Date : 22 March 2010
Tribunal/Court : High Court
Coram : Choo Han Teck J
Counsel Name(s) : Appellant in-person; Respondent in-person.
Parties : Lim Slott — Wong Chiew Huong

Family Law

22 March 2010

Choo Han Teck J:

1 This is an appeal by Lim Slott (“the appellant”) for a variation of access ordered by the court below. Both parties were unrepresented and appeared in person. Before me, the appellant applied for an order that would allow him a total of four weeks or more of access to their daughter, now 12 years old, during the June and December school holidays. The appellant presently has access on Mondays and Thursdays from 6–9pm, as well as overnight access every alternate weekend from 2pm on Saturday until 8pm on Sunday. In addition, he has access every alternate public holiday from 9am – 6pm except on 25 December.

2 The appellant said that he is currently based in Brisbane, Australia and would remain there until May or June 2011. He was inconsistent and incoherent in articulating basic facts such as his employment details and was further, uncertain as to his plans in the near future when asked. He claimed to be practising law and still in training as a lawyer at the same time. He also said that he was unable to find a job in Singapore and also claimed that he has a teaching post at the Singapore Institute of Management. The respondent informed the court that the daughter was reluctant to stay overnight with the appellant and thus the appellant should not be allowed extended periods of overnight access.

3 Since the appellant will not be in Singapore for most of the year, and it was also uncertain that he will be in Singapore during the June and December school holidays, I offered an extra day of non-overnight access to the appellant in lieu of the four weeks of access during the school holidays. However the appellant refused it.

4 Although I was uncomfortable with the child having any overnight access with the appellant, I decided that the original order should remain. I therefore dismissed the appeal.