

1 **IN THE GRAND COURT OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS**
2 **CIVIL DIVISION**

3
4 Cause No: G606/2008

5
6 **BETWEEN:**



7 **STRATEGIC TECHNOLOGIES PTE LTD**

8 **PLAINTIFF/JUDGMENT CREDITOR**

9
10
11 **AND:**

12 **THE ARMAMENTS BUREAU OF THE**
13 **MINISTRY OF NATIONAL DEFENCE OF THE**
14 **REPUBLIC OF CHINA successor to the**
15 **PROCUREMENT BUREAU OF THE REPUBLIC**
16 **OF CHINA MINISTRY OF NATIONAL**
17 **DEFENCE**

18 **DEFENDANT/JUDGMENT DEBTOR**

19
20 **AND**

- 21 1. **CHANG PU WANG (ANDREW WANG),**
22 2. **CHIA HSING WANG (BRUNO WANG)**
23 3. **CHIA JUN YEAH WANG (PAULINE WANG)**

24 **INTERESTED PARTIES/APPLICANTS**

25
26
27
28 **Appearances:**

29 **Mr. Colm Flanagan, of Nelson & Co., for the**
30 **Plaintiff/Judgment Creditor**

31 **Mr. Stuart Diamond of Diamond Jones for the**
32 **Defendant/Judgment Debtor**

33 **Mr. Thom Lowe Q.C. instructed by Mr. Peter**
34 **Huth-Wallis of Harneys for the Interested**
35 **Parties/Applicants**

36
37
38 **Before:**

The Hon. Mr. Justice Charles Quin

39 **Heard:**


12th August 2013

40
41 **EX TEMPORE RULING**
42

1 1. Leading counsel Mr. Thomas Lowe Q.C. (“Mr. Lowe”) made an application on
2 behalf of Andrew Wang, Bruno Wang and Pauline Wang, (“the Wangs”), for:

3 i. Leave to intervene in the proceedings;

4 ii. Leave to appeal to the Court of Appeal.



5 2. I have heard leading counsel on behalf of the Interested Parties, and I have read the
6 Skeleton Argument in support of the application. I have heard Mr. Flanagan, on
7 behalf of the Plaintiff, and Mr. Diamond on behalf of the Defendant, opposing the
8 application.

9 3. For many of the same reasons set out in my Extempore Ruling dated the 2nd August
10 2013, refusing the Wangs their application to adjourn the hearing of the Plaintiff’s
11 application for the Charging Order Nisi to be made absolute, I reject the Wangs’
12 application to be granted leave to intervene in these proceedings as interested
13 parties.

14 4. As I said at paragraph 20 of my Extempore Ruling dated the 2nd August 2013, the
15 Wangs have known of these proceedings for a long time. Their previous attorneys,
16 Charles Adams Ritchie & Duckworth (“CARD”) knew of the proceedings and
17 appeared on behalf of the Wangs from time to time. Throughout those appearances,
18 over many months and years, the Wangs’ attorneys brought no application on
19 behalf of the Wangs to be joined as a party. They did not file any submissions or
20 write any letters explaining their position.

21 5. The Plaintiff had kept the Wangs’ previous attorneys abreast of the proceedings
22 since the 6th January 2009.

1 6. Accordingly, the Court rejects this application by the Wangs for leave to intervene
2 in these proceedings some ten days after the Charging Order Absolute, which I
3 made on the 2nd August 2008.

4 7. The Court cannot allow a party who has had Cayman Islands attorneys instructed
5 and acting for years in Grand Court Cause Numbers G 0606 of 2008 and POCL 15
6 of 2009, to intervene after the Court has made its decision. There must be certainty
7 and finality. Any application of this nature after the court has made a Charging
8 Order absolute would cause great prejudice, delay, and cost to the Plaintiff and
9 probably the Defendants.


10 8. The Wangs have only themselves to blame for not having instructed their attorneys
11 to intervene at a much earlier stage in the proceedings.


12 9. Accordingly, I am satisfied that such an application should not be granted by this
13 Court.

14 10. I order that the costs of this morning's application be borne by the Wangs.

15 11. As I made my decision on the 2nd August 2013 I am now functus officio. In
16 addition, as the Wangs are not parties to these proceedings, I have no jurisdiction to
17 grant them leave to appeal.

18

19 **Dated this the 12th day of August 2013**
20 
21



22 **Honourable Mr. Justice Charles Quin**
23 **Judge of the Grand Court**