

**This Grounds of Decision is subject to final editorial corrections approved by this Strata Titles Board and/or redaction in compliance with prevailing government regulations/rules, for publication in LawNet and/or on the Strata Titles Boards' website.**

**BUILDING (STRATA MANAGEMENT) ACT 2004  
BUILDING MAINTENANCE AND STRATA MANAGEMENT  
(STRATA TITLES BOARDS) REGULATIONS 2005**

STB No. 127 of 2025

In the matter of an application under **sections 29(1)(b), 46, 47, 48, 56, 101(1)(a), 101(1)(c)** and **section 117(2)** of the Building (Strata Management) Act 2004 in respect of the development known as **Sixth Avenue Ville** (MCST Plan No. 2522)

Between

**Weibinanto Halimdjati and Syenny Setiawan**

... Applicant(s)

And

**The MCST Plan No. 2522**

... Respondent

---

**GROUND OF DECISION**

---

**BUILDING (STRATA MANAGEMENT) ACT 2004**  
**BUILDING MAINTENANCE AND STRATA MANAGEMENT**  
**(STRATA TITLES BOARDS) REGULATIONS 2005**

STB No. 127 of 2025

In the matter of an application under **sections 29(1)(b), 46, 47, 48, 56, 101(1)(a), 101(1)(c)** and **section 117(2)** of the Building (Strata Management) Act 2004 in respect of the development known as **Sixth Avenue Ville** (MCST Plan No. 2522)

Between

**Weibinanto Halimdjati and Syenny Setiawan**

... Applicant(s)

And

**The MCST Plan No. 2522**

... Respondent

28 April 2026

**25 June 2026**

<b>Coram:</b>	Ms Kan Shuk Weng	Deputy President
	Ms Hazel Tang	Member
	Mr Goh Heng Hoon	Member

**INTRODUCTION**

1. This case involved the subsidiary proprietors of a residential unit in Sixth Avenue Ville located at 43 Sixth Avenue, Singapore 276484 (the “Development”) and the Development’s Management Corporation Strata Title Plan No. 2522 (the “MCST”).
2. The Applicants, Weibinanto Halimdjati (“Mr Weibinanto”) and Syenny Setiawan (“Mdm Syenny”), were the subsidiary proprietors (the “Applicants”) of unit #XX-XX while the Respondent is the MCST.

3. The Applicants were represented by Mr Weibinanto at the hearing while the Respondent was represented by Rajah & Tann Singapore LLP.

## **BACKGROUND**

4. The Development was a freehold development completed in 1999 and comprised 49 units. At all material times, Haus Property Management Pte Ltd, an affiliate of CWL Facilities Management Pte Ltd, was the managing agent for the Development and the council of the MCST was the 24<sup>th</sup> Management Council (the “Council”).
5. In December 2025, the Applicants filed an application before the Strata Titles Boards (the “STB”). The orders sought by the Applicants could be classified into three categories as follows:
  - i. Physical repairs and timetable (“Prayer 1”)
    - (a) Clean dirty or mould/fungus-stained façade (the “Dirty Façade”).
    - (b) Clean main corridor area and repair visible cracks on the wall and staircase.
    - (c) Replace broken light fitting and light cover at the lift lobby.
    - (d) Inspect and rectify loose/damaged floor tiles at basement carpark.
    - (e) Repair/replace broken LED signage light.
  - ii. Procedure for maintenance complaints and separation of roles (“Prayer 2”)
    - (a) Adopt and circulate to all subsidiary proprietors a written procedure (the “Complaint Procedure”) for handling common-property maintenance complaints, stating indicative timeframes for acknowledgement and reply/rectification.
    - (b) Provide in the Complaint Procedure that the managing agent be responsible for day-to-day handling of complaints within the stipulated timeframes. If the managing agent fails to act within the timeframes, the complaints shall be escalated to the Council which shall then respond to the complaints and such responses stating the decision of the Managing Council and new timeframes shall be signed off by the Chairperson or Secretary.
    - (c) Ensure that the Complaint Procedure is filed within the minutes and circulated to all subsidiary proprietors and made available for inspection.
  - iii. Governance and rights to information (“Prayer 3”)
    - (a) Provide all subsidiary proprietors, by way of a circular and on the Development notice boards, the names and positions of all current Council office-bearers and members with a direct contact channel to the Council.

- (b) Comply with the Applicants' statutory requests to inspect and obtain a copy of the Development strata roll (the "Strata Roll"), and ensure that future requests would be responded to within seven days on receipt, and inspection completed within 30 days therefrom.
- (c) Provide the Applicants a copy of the AGM/EOGM resolutions delegating powers to the managing agent, and indicating the functions which remain with the Council and the functions which are delegated, and confirm in writing if the resolutions remain in force.
- (d) Ensure that any complaints/correspondences expressly addressed to the Council, the Chairperson or the Secretary and raising serious maintenance, safety or governance issues are brought to the Council for consideration and that such complaint/correspondence be responded to in writing in the name of the Council and signed off by the Chairperson or the Secretary.
- (e) The Secretary be directed to place the Complaint Procedure and the information and governance arrangements in Prayer 3 on the agenda of the next AGM/EOGM, and circulate a brief explanation of these arrangements and a notice of that AGM/EOGM to all subsidiary proprietors.

## **EVENTS PRIOR TO THE HEARING**

- 6. With respect to Prayer 1, it was confirmed that the items in Prayer 1 had all been rectified except for the Dirty Façade and the broken concrete of the planter near the fountain (the "Broken Concrete").
- 7. It was further confirmed by the Applicants and the Respondent that Mr Weibinanto had inspected the Strata Roll (duly redacted) on 5 March 2026 and a copy of the same was extended to him on 13 March 2026.
- 8. As the Applicants raised issues during the second mediation that were not covered in Form 8 (the Applicants' application to the STB), the Applicants were reminded that the Board would only be determining issues that were raised in Form 8. This was acknowledged by Mr Weibinanto.

## **THE APPLICANTS' CASE**

- 9. At the hearing, Mr Weibinanto was the only witness who gave evidence for the Applicants. With regard to Prayer 1, he confirmed that other than the Dirty Façade, all the defects in Form 8 had been rectified and that he was no longer pursuing the issue regarding the Broken Concrete as it did not pose any safety issues. However, Mr Weibinanto raised the following issues which were not, on the face of it, covered in Form 8:

- i. With regard to the Dirty Façade, Mr Weibinanto raised the possibility of water-seepage affecting unit #XX-XX. While the issue of water seepage was not raised in Form 8, Mr Weibinanto took the view that it was part of the Dirty Façade issue.
  - ii. In relation to the Strata Roll, while Mr Weibinanto confirmed that he had inspected it and was given a copy, he claimed that the Respondent had failed to maintain a strata roll which complied with the requirements specified in the Building (Strata Management) Act 2004 (the “BSMA”).
  - iii. In the course of the hearing, Mr Weibinanto made a request to inspect certain quotation(s) pertaining to the cleaning of the Dirty Façade which was not raised in Form 8. Mr Weibinanto claimed that he was entitled to do so as the Respondents had made reference to the quotation(s) in Form 18A which was the Respondent’s submission to the STB, in response to Form 8.
10. Apart from the three points in [9], in Mr Weibinanto’s Affidavit-in-Chief (A2) (“AEIC”), the Applicants claimed, *inter alia*, that:
  - i. the integrity of certain records and minutes of meetings were questionable, substantive issues were re-directed into procedural channels, and the lack of transparency in relation to communication channels, accessibility and the handling of documents<sup>1</sup>.
  - ii. there was unequal treatment in concerns brought to the Council by the residents of the Development<sup>2</sup>.
  - iii. there was no express declaration of conflict and proper recusal by the chairperson of the Council, Ms Yip Sook Fun (“Ms Yip”) when matters relating to one of her units in the Development was discussed at one of the Council Meetings<sup>3</sup>.
11. In the Applicants’ Closing Submissions, the Applicants appeared to focus on the following main areas:
  - i. The Dirty Façade and the possibility of water seepage concerning #XX-XX<sup>4</sup>.
  - ii. The inadequacy of the data in the Strata Roll maintained by the Respondent<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pgs 23 to 26, A2.

<sup>2</sup> Pgs 26 & 27, A2.

<sup>3</sup> Pgs 30 & 31, A2.

<sup>4</sup> Pgs 34 to 37, Applicants’ Closing Submissions.

<sup>5</sup> Pg 26, Applicants’ Closing Submissions.

- iii. The appropriateness of including foreign addresses under “Name and Address for Service of Notice” in the Strata Roll<sup>6</sup>.
  - iv. The fulfilment of the Applicants’ right to inspect the Strata Roll as the request was delayed and the information in the Strata Roll was inadequate<sup>7</sup>.
  - v. The inspection of certain document(s)/quotation(s) relating to the Dirty Façade and the cleaning of the corridor referred to in [5(i)(b)]<sup>8</sup>.
  - vi. Prayer 2<sup>9</sup>.
12. In relation to the areas referred to in [11(i)] to [11(v)], the Applicants argued that they could be subsumed under the orders sought in Form 8.
13. The Applicants also made the following claims against the Respondent<sup>10</sup>:

S/N	Item	(S\$) Sum
1.	STB filing fees	S\$500
2.	Arbitration fee – first hearing	S\$300
3.	Arbitration fee – second hearing	S\$300
	Total	S\$1,100

## THE RESPONDENT’S CASE

14. The Respondent called Ms Yip as its only witness. It was the evidence of Ms Yip that in relation to Prayer 1, with the exception of the Dirty Façade and the Broken Concrete, the Respondent had already attended to the requisite cleaning and rectifications<sup>11</sup>. These rectifications and cleaning were completed by March 2026, and two of the rectifications were completed even before Form 8 was filed.
15. In relation to the Dirty Façade, the Respondent intended to clean it during the repair and redecoration exercise in the last quarter of 2026<sup>12</sup>. As for the Broken Concrete, the Respondent was still in the midst of deliberating whether to repair it and there was no confirmed course of action by the time of the hearing<sup>13</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> Pg 26, Applicants’ Closing Submissions.

<sup>7</sup> Pg 26, Applicants’ Closing Submissions.

<sup>8</sup> Pg 43, Applicants’ Closing Submissions.

<sup>9</sup> Pg 43, Applicants’ Closing Submission.

<sup>10</sup> Pg 51, Applicants’ Closing Submissions.

<sup>11</sup> Pgs 14 to 20, Ms Yip’s AEIC (R3).

<sup>12</sup> Pg 21, R3.

<sup>13</sup> Pg 15, R3.

16. It was also the evidence of Ms Yip that the Respondent had provided, prior to the hearing, the information sought by the Applicants:

i. Information on the Council office bearers and members<sup>14</sup>

Names and positions of the Council members had been made available in the minutes of Council Meetings which were displayed on the Development notice boards and the online platform, iCondo. As for a direct contact channel to the Council, pursuant to the second mediation on 25 February 2026, the Respondent had created a “dedicated feedback email address mcst2522.feedback@gmail.com” for residents to communicate directly with the Council.

ii. The Strata Roll<sup>15</sup>

The Strata Roll was inspected by Mr Weibinanto on 5 March 2026 who also took photographs of the Strata Roll. The Respondent further extended a copy of the Strata Roll to the Applicants on 13 March 2026.

iii. AGM/EOGM resolution delegating powers to the managing agent<sup>16</sup>

The Respondent provided a copy of the relevant minutes of meeting with the requisite resolution to the Applicants on 2 December 2025 and 2 February 2026, and had also informed the Applicants that the requisite resolution was still in force.

17. With respect to the Complaint Procedure, the separation of roles between the Council and the managing agent, how complaints/correspondences were to be dealt with and other related matters, Ms Yip’s testimony was that the Respondent already had in place “proper estate management procedures”<sup>17</sup> and if such orders were to be made, they would amount to improper micromanagement of the Development.

18. In the Respondent’s Closing Submissions, the Respondent submitted, *inter alia*, that the Board did not have jurisdiction to grant orders for matters which were not in Form 8<sup>18</sup>. In addition, most of the prayers in Form 8 had already been fulfilled by the Respondent, while Prayer 2 and the prayers relating to procedures for dealing with complaints/correspondences/requests for strata roll should be dismissed<sup>19</sup>.

---

<sup>14</sup> Pgs 24 & 25, R3.

<sup>15</sup> Pgs 25 & 26, R3.

<sup>16</sup> Pg 27, R3.

<sup>17</sup> Pgs 27 & 28, R3.

<sup>18</sup> Pgs 21 to 27, R3.

<sup>19</sup> Pgs 19 & 20, R3.

19. The Respondent submitted that the Applicants' application was "largely unmeritorious or had been resolved prior to the hearing"<sup>20</sup> and sought costs of \$25,000<sup>21</sup> from the Applicants.

## THE BOARD'S DECISION

### A. Prayers in Form 8

#### *Prayer 1 – Physical repairs and timetable*

20. By the time of the hearing of the application, there were only two outstanding issues under Prayer 1 which were unresolved – the Broken Concrete and the Dirty Façade.
21. During the hearing, Mr Weibinanto informed the Board that he was no longer pursuing the issue of the Broken Concrete. The only outstanding issue was therefore the Dirty Façade. In this regard, it was the evidence of Ms Yip that the Respondent had scheduled for the Dirty Façade to be cleaned in the last quarter of 2026 during the repair and redecoration exercise. Ms Yip further explained that it was not viable economically for the Respondent to engage contractors just to clean the Dirty Façade which "remained in acceptable condition"<sup>22</sup>.
22. It is a well-established principle that the decisions of a management council should not be interfered with unless they are clearly improper and/or unreasonable<sup>23</sup>:

The Board should only interfere where the *decision* of a Management Corporation is *clearly improper and/or unreasonable*. [Emphasis added]

23. Ms Yip gave a detailed explanation in her AEIC on why the Council had decided to defer the cleaning of the Dirty Façade. After careful consideration of her explanation, the Board did not find the decision of the Council on this matter to be clearly improper and/or unreasonable.

#### *Prayer 2 – Procedure for maintenance complaints and separation of roles*

24. Prayer 2 did not appear to be supported by any evidence as there was no mention of Prayer 2 at all in Mr Weibinanto's AEIC. While Mr Weibinanto's AEIC made reference to "agenda inclusion and equal treatment"<sup>24</sup>, it was not clear if that was with reference to Prayer 2 and it was not for the Board to infer if the Applicants were indeed relying on the narration in that portion of Mr Weibinanto's AEIC to support Prayer 2. This being the case, the Board was of the view that the Applicants did not provide any reason to support

---

<sup>20</sup> Pg 29, R3.

<sup>21</sup> Pg 29, R3.

<sup>22</sup> Pg 21, R3.

<sup>23</sup> *Lee Lay Ting Jane v MSCT Plan No 3414* [2015] SGSTB 5 at [60]. This principle was endorsed by the High Court in *Fu Loong Lithographer Pte Ltd & Ors v Mok Wing Chong (Tan Keng Lin & Ors, third parties)* [2018] 4 SLR 645 at [110].

<sup>24</sup> Pgs 26 & 27, A2.

why the Complaint Procedure was necessary or why “common-property maintenance complaints” had to be handled in the way prescribed by the Applicants. While the Applicants attempted to justify the need for a Complaint Procedure for “common-property complaints” in their Closing Submissions, this did not address the fundamental defect in the Applicants’ case that there was no evidence given by them to support Prayer 2.

25. Be that as it may, the Board gave consideration to the merits of Prayer 2 for completeness. According to the Respondent, a “dedicated feedback email address [mcst2522.feedback@gmail.com](mailto:mcst2522.feedback@gmail.com)” was created for residents to communicate directly with the Council. This was not disputed by the Applicants and no reason was given by them at the hearing to challenge the adequacy, or lack thereof, of the dedicated feedback channel. It appeared to the Board that the Complaint Procedure by the Applicants was based solely on their preference and there was no indication that the Complaint Procedure was adopted by other strata developments in Singapore and that the Respondent was found wanting in not adopting the Complaint Procedure in Prayer 2.
26. The duties of a management corporation in a strata development are set out in section 29 of the BSMA and include control, management, administration and proper maintenance of common property. This would include the handling of complaints relating to common property, which in the view of the Board, constituted the day-to-day running of a strata development. The Board, therefore, was not minded to interfere with the feedback channel set up by the Respondent unless there is clear evidence that the Respondent’s decision to adopt that feedback channel was improper and/or unreasonable.

***Prayer 3 – Governance and rights to information***

27. Prayer 3 could be divided into three sub-categories:
  - i. Information on the Council office bearers and members, and provision of AGM/EOGM resolution delegating powers to the managing agent.
  - ii. Inspection of the Strata Roll and provision of a copy of the same, and the procedure for handling such requests in future.
  - iii. Provision of a procedure to handle complaints/correspondences relating to “serious maintenance, safety or governance issues”.
28. According to Ms Yip’s testimony, information on the Council officer bearers and members had been made available in the minutes of Council Meetings which were displayed on the Development notice boards and the online platform, iCondo. The Board did not find anything improper or unreasonable in the way the information was disseminated to the subsidiary proprietors including the Applicants. Consequently, the Board did not think it was necessary for the information to be disseminated by way of a circular to the Applicants and “all subsidiary proprietors” as submitted by the Applicants.

29. In any event, it was not clear from the Applicants what they meant by “circular” – whether it had to be by way of a physical copy or whether it was sufficient that the information was circulated to the subsidiary proprietors online which was the practice of the Respondent. There was also no evidence that the other subsidiary proprietors required the information to be disseminated by way of a “circular”.
30. In relation to the requisite AGM/EOGM resolution, the Respondent confirmed that the Applicants were given a copy on 2 December 2025 and another on 2 February 2026. Ms Yip further confirmed in her AEIC that the resolution was still in force<sup>25</sup>. We therefore made no order in relation to Prayer 3 sub-category (i)<sup>26</sup> as the Applicants had already been given the requisite information/resolution.
31. In relation to the Strata Roll, the Respondent had since allowed Mr Weibinanto to inspect the Strata Roll and also provided him with a copy. However, in the Applicants’ Closing Submissions, Mr Weibinanto appeared to query whether the request was fulfilled given that the inspection was delayed and the information was inadequate. In Prayer 3, the Applicants sought an order to compel the Respondent to respond to the Applicants stating “the date, time, manner and fee (if any) for inspection” and for such inspection (and provision of) the Strata Roll to take place within 30 days of its response<sup>27</sup>. As the event had already taken place, the Board did not find it necessary to make any further comment or order on the issue of fulfilment.
32. The Applicants further urged the Board to compel the Respondent to adhere to certain timelines and to give “lawful reason for refusal [of inspection], with reference to the relevant” BSMA provision for future requests. The Board declined to give such an order as the duties and obligations of a management corporation in relation to a request for the inspection of a strata roll and/or a provision of a copy of the same are already set out clearly in section 47 of the BSMA.
33. Prayer 3 sub-category (iii)<sup>28</sup> appeared to be similar in substance to Prayer 2 in that both related to how complaints/correspondences are to be handled. As the Board had explained above, handling of complaints is part and parcel of a management council’s scope of work. The Board therefore declined to impose such an order on the Respondent, and this was quite apart from the fact that the Applicants had furnished no reason at the hearing as to why their proposed procedure was justifiable and reasonable, and whether it was a procedure which was widely practised by other strata developments in Singapore and that the Respondent had therefore acted improperly and/or unreasonably by failing to adopt that procedure.

---

<sup>25</sup> Pg 27, R3.

<sup>26</sup> [27(i)], Grounds of Decision.

<sup>27</sup> [3.2(a)], Form 8.

<sup>28</sup> [27(iii)], Grounds of Decision.

## **B. Jurisdiction to grant orders outside the scope of Form 8**

34. A Board’s power to make orders to settle disputes or rectify complaints pursuant to an application brought before it is essentially derived from section 101(1) of the BSMA. This application is in the form of Form 8 which requires an applicant to particularise the order(s) he is seeking from the Board. Therefore, if a claim is not reflected in Form 8, the Board technically does not have cognisance of it and consequently the Board will not have the jurisdiction to make any order which is not pursuant to an application.
35. Quite apart from whether a Board had the jurisdiction to make orders for a claim which was not specifically pleaded, it would be unfair to an opposing party who would be responding to what was filed and would not have the opportunity to refute an un-pleaded claim. In addition, confining an applicant to what was pleaded by him in Form 8 is necessary to ensure that an applicant does not add on more issues as and when desired in the course of the proceedings. This is to ensure that there is finality in any application before a Board, and that proceedings do not become unwieldy and protracted.
36. In the present case, the Applicants raised additional issues belatedly in A2 and their Closing Submissions. They did not apply to amend Form 8 prior to the hearing to include these additional issues. The Board categorised these issues as follows:
  - i. The possibility of water seepage concerning #XX-XX<sup>29</sup>.
  - ii. The inadequacy of the data/information in the Strata Roll maintained by the Respondent<sup>30</sup>.
  - iii. The appropriateness of including foreign addresses under “Name and Address for Service of Notice” in the Strata Roll<sup>31</sup>.
  - iv. The inspection of certain document(s)/quotation(s) relating to the Dirty Façade and the cleaning of the corridor in [5(i)(b)]<sup>32</sup>.
37. The Board was of the view since that the above issues were not in Form 8, the Board had no jurisdiction to make any orders in relation to them.
38. The Applicants argued that the issues referred to in [36(i)] and [36(iv)] were part of the Dirty Façade claim, in that water seepage was in fact the cause of the Dirty Façade and that the request for inspection came about as the Respondent had made reference to quotation(s) for the cleaning of the Dirty Façade in Form 18A.
39. The Board was not persuaded by the argument for the following reasons:

---

<sup>29</sup> Pgs 34 to 37, Applicants’ Closing Submissions.

<sup>30</sup> Pg 26, Applicants’ Closing Submissions.

<sup>31</sup> Pg 26, Applicants’ Closing Submissions.

<sup>32</sup> Pg 43, Applicants’ Closing Submissions.

- i. The cleaning of a façade is substantially different from an investigation into a possible water seepage occurrence – they pertain to different problems requiring different expertise. The cleaning of a high wall façade requires professional cleaners while the investigation of a water seepage problem (and the rectification of it, if any) requires possibly a surveyor or a water-proofing expert.
- ii. The Applicants were very specific in Form 8 with regards to Prayer 1, and gave detailed description of the different areas which required rectifications and/or cleaning. If indeed water seepage into #XX-XX was a main/fundamental concern, the Applicant should have stated so in Form 8 so that the Respondent could be given a chance to respond to that, instead of merely stating “cleaning the dirty or mould/fungus-stained façade”.
- iii. An order directing the Respondent to investigate a water seepage issue was fundamentally different from an order directing the Respondent to clean a dirty façade and it would not be fair for the Respondent if the Board were to give an order on the issue of water seepage as the Respondent was not given a chance to address this in its AEIC.
- iv. With regards to the inspection of quotation(s)/document(s), involving the Dirty Façade, this related to section 113 of the BSMA which had to be specifically pleaded. Section 113 states:

113. Where, pursuant to an application by any person, a Board considers that the management corporation or subsidiary management corporation to which the application relates, or a managing agent or the chairperson, secretary or treasurer of that management corporation or subsidiary management corporation has *wrongfully*

- 
- (a) *withheld* from the applicant any information to which the applicant is entitled under this Act; or
  - (b) *failed to make available for inspection* by the applicant or the applicant’s agent any record or document that, under this Act, the applicant is entitled to inspect,

the Board may order that management corporation, subsidiary management corporation, managing agent, chairperson, secretary or treasurer to supply or make available the information or to make so available the record or document, as the case may require, to the applicant.

[Emphasis added]

Not only did the Applicants fail to plead it in Form 8, there was no evidence before the Board that the Respondent had “wrongfully” withheld information/document(s) relating to the cleaning of the Development from them, or failed to make available for inspection by the Applicants such document(s). The fact that the Respondent had made reference to a quotation for cleaning the Dirty Façade did not automatically bring the request for inspection of the quotation(s)/document(s)

within the ambit of Prayer 1. Therefore, the Board was of the view that it did not have the jurisdiction to order the Respondent to supply information or document(s) relating to the cleaning of the Dirty Façade to the Applicants. Even if the Board had the jurisdiction, the Board declined to make the order as the Applicants failed to prove that the information/document(s) was wrongfully withheld from them, or that the Respondent wrongfully failed to make available for inspection by the Applicants such document(s).

40. The Board next considered the Applicants' comment on the inadequacy of the data in the Strata Roll maintained by the Respondent and the appropriateness of including foreign addresses under "Name and Address for Service of Notice" in the Strata Roll.
41. At the hearing, Mr Weibinanto insisted that the Respondent had redacted other essential data in the Strata Roll other than the foreign addresses. Even after the Board had examined both the redacted and un-redacted copies of the Strata Roll, Mr Weibinanto continued to insist that additional data were redacted. Eventually, he agreed with the Board that data which were not captured on the Strata Roll did not amount to the Respondent wrongfully redacting the said data.
42. The Applicants were well aware that certain data, which were required under section 46 of the BSMA, were absent after Mr Weibinanto's inspection of the Strata Roll of 5 March 2026. However, for reasons best known to themselves, instead of amending Form 8 to challenge the adequacy of the Strata Roll, they instead insisted that the Respondent had wrongfully withheld the data from them.
43. Having forgone the opportunity to amend Form 8 when they had a chance to do so, the Applicants could not now invite the Board to rule on the adequacy of the Strata Roll which was not pleaded by them in Form 8 and which could not be subsumed under a prayer to be allowed access to the Strata Roll. An allegation of being denied a statutory right to view the Strata Roll was materially different from the adequacy of the Strata Roll, and the Board was of the view that it did not have the jurisdiction to give any order to the Respondent relating to the Strata Roll not reflecting certain data required under section 46 of the BSMA.
44. However, this should not be taken to mean that the Board agreed with the Respondent's submission that the Council's maintenance of the Strata Roll "must be premised on the management first having been provided with the necessary information to begin with"<sup>33</sup> – this interpretation was not supported by a plain reading of the legislative provision. Section 46 of the BSMA imposes a duty on a management corporation to record certain information on the strata roll regardless of whether a subsidiary proprietor had provided it with the information. The fact that it was not given the information could not be a defence as the information could be obtained from the relevant authorities.

---

<sup>33</sup> Pg 24, Respondent's Closing Submissions.

45. In relation to the presence of foreign addresses in the Strata Roll, this was not pleaded in Form 8 and as explained above, not an issue that the Board could rule on. However, the Board did make an observation that there was nothing in the BSMA to prohibit the inclusion of foreign addresses in the Strata Roll, and that under section 46(3A) of the BSMA, “a reference to an address within Singapore for the service of notices includes a reference to an email address (if provided).”
46. For completeness, the Board also dealt briefly with three other issues<sup>34</sup> raised by the Applicants in A2 which the Applicants did not seem to have actively pursued in their Closing Submissions. These three issues were not pleaded in Form 8, nor was there any indication what reliefs the Applicants were seeking from the Board regarding them. The Board therefore did not make any order in relation to these three issues, primarily because the Board did not have jurisdiction to do so and in any event, should not speculate what reliefs the Applicants were seeking in relation to them.

#### **THE BOARD’S ORDERS**

47. Having addressed the Applicants’ prayers in Form 8, the Board dismissed the Applicants’ application in its entirety. Prior to the hearing, a majority of the prayers were for defects which had already been rectified or scheduled to be rectified in the last quarter of 2026. The Applicants had also inspected the Strata Roll and were given a copy of the same in March 2026. In relation to the other information requested by the Applicants in Prayer 3, the Respondent had fulfilled them. The remaining Prayers relating to a Complaint Procedure, and a procedure for dealing with complaints/correspondences/future requests for Strata Roll inspection were also dismissed for the reasons stated above.
48. While the Board dismissed the Applicants’ application in its entirety, the Board noted that some of the prayers were fulfilled by the Respondent subsequent to the filing of Form 8, including the inspection of the Strata Roll. It therefore could not be said that the Applicants’ application was without merits. However, it was regrettable that the Applicants declined to settle the matter and proceeded for hearing even though the Respondent had already attended to a majority of their requests in Form 8 by early March 2026. It was equally regrettable that the Applicants made insinuations against Ms Yip in Mr Weibinanto’s AEIC, on matters which were wholly not relevant to the proceedings and which were unnecessary.
49. Given the above, the Board ordered that the Applicants pay the Respondent costs in the sum of \$4,500, all in. This is after taking into account the amount of \$500 filing fees paid by the Applicants which should be borne by the Respondent. In deciding the sum to be awarded, the Board also took into consideration the merits of the application, the facts of this case, the conduct of parties, the length of hearing and the number of witnesses

---

<sup>34</sup> [10], Grounds of Decision.

involved. Consequently, the Board was of the view that a sum of \$4,500 (all in) was fair and equitable. The payment is to be made by 9 July 2026.

Dated this 25<sup>th</sup> day of June 2026

---

Ms Kan Shuk Weng  
Deputy President

---

Mr Goh Heng Hoon  
Member

---

Ms Hazel Tang  
Member

*Applicants in person.  
Jeremy Gan & Zheng Yirong  
(Rajah & Tann Singapore LLP) for the Respondent.*