

From: Helmy <helmy.m@protonmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, 13 July 2021 2:10 PM

To: Adelia TAY (SUPCOURT) <Adelia_TAY@supcourt.gov.sg>; Alice CHUA (SUPCOURT) <Alice_CHUA@supcourt.gov.sg>; Susan HO (SUPCOURT) <Susan_HO@supcourt.gov.sg>

Cc: Mohamed Helmy <helmy.m@gmail.com>

Subject: Confidential and urgent

HC/S 413/2021

HC/SUM 3000/2021

HC/SUM 2650/2021

HC/SUM 2991/2021?

HC/SUM 3650/2021?

To

Justice Lee Seiu Kin, PJG, PBS

Justice of the Court of Appeal, Justice Steven Chong

Justice Audrey Lim Yoon Cheng

c/o

Ms Adelia Tay

Ms Alice CHUA

Ms Susan HO

Justice,

1 I am Mohamed Mustafa Mahmoud Helmy (FIN G63363781R), the Plaintiff in HC/S 413/2021, suit against Nanyang Technological University for unlawful termination and the tort of extortion.

2 On behalf of the Defendant, Mr. Timothy Ang and Mr. Wilson Zhu at Rajah & Tann filed HC/SUM 2650/2021 under 'O. 18, r. 19(1)(a), (b), and/or (d)' but with no pleadings. Defence is held 'in abeyance'. The affidavit to support that application was deponed by Mr. Kevin Goh, an employee of the University. The affidavit makes false and harmful allegations against me, and does not address an issue.

3 I filed and served HC/SUM 3000/2021 for judgement on default of defence and damages to be assessed, and a request for judgement in the requisite form.

4 I also filed and served HC/SUM 2991/2021 to strike out Mr. Kevin Goh's affidavit because it is harmful to me.

5 The hearing for all 3 applications is tomorrow, 14 July 2021, 10 am. I was reassured by the Registry that a special half-day hearing is in no way different from a bulk-rostered hearing except that it is longer. This was after Mr. Ang proposed and requested a special-half day hearing for the reason that I had recently received 'directions' from Court - that did not and could not happen. As I had replied to Mr. Ang, I had and have no doubt regarding the Court's decision on time and nature of a hearing.

6 On another occasion, Mr. Ang requested an 'urgent pre-trial conference for directions to be given on the proper and expeditious conduct of SUM 2650' to strike out the action - and allowed me less than a day to answer, or, indeed, attend that pretrial conference.

7 On Thursday 8 July I downloaded files made accessible to me in HC/S 413/2021, after my request to inspect documents was granted. I filed and served my Written submissions yesterday afternoon (Monday 12 July). I later received Mr. Ang's Written submissions.

8 I cannot reconcile significant data in original documents I filed at Lawnet Service Bureau, from the Registry, from Mr. Ang, with what I downloaded, and with what Mr. Ang put in the Bundle of documents he sent me yesterday. I believe inconsistencies are salient.

9 After litigation missteps over which I have no control, Ms. Eunice Chan generously granted me audience to clarify likely resolutions. I also asked Ms. Chan if O. 33, r. 2 in the Registrar's Notice of 18 June sent to me was system- and not party-generated, as was explained to me on phone by an Officer of the Registry. Ms. Chan assured me that there is not any O. 33, r. 2 in my case file (HC/S 413/2021). When I showed her the Notice I had received stating O. 33, r. 2, I understood from Ms. Chan that it must have been an error. It appears that that error has persisted or resurfaced: in the hearing list, 14 July 2021 at 10 am, #28 in the pdf downloadable from the Supreme Court website hearing list, O. 33, r. 2 is mentioned (accessed recently).

10 Inconsistencies in the Bundle of documents Mr. Ang sent me yesterday compelled me to scrutinize the material; in addition to the Written submissions, the content of which is novel to me. By 'scrutiny' I mean in the time I have had since receiving the files from Mr. Ang (less than a day with no sleep). One error in particular stood out: HC/SUM 2991/2021 is an application to strike out the Affidavit by Mr. Kevin Goh, filed in support of HC/SUM 2650/2021. I noticed that on the Court-issued summons for HC/SUM 2991/2021, the affidavit to be struck refers to a summons I do not know - HC/SUM 3650/2021. To the best of my knowledge, there is no HC/SUM 3650/2021 in HC/S 413/2021. And yet at the same time, HC/SUM 2991/2021 appears in my hearing list for tomorrow - does that mean it cannot be a typographical error? I am concerned if HC/SUM 3650/2021 should be under another suit. In substantive terms, my intentions were expressed, clearly and honestly, to Mr. Ang, and the Registry of course, between 28 June and 1 July 2021.

11 I will send an email to Mr. Ang and Mr. Zhu shortly, to ask for original documents to be available in hearing, unless of course the Court may instruct me not to. Should urgent contact be required, I would be honored to receive a call from Your Honour and Staff at your convenience.

12 I humbly repeat what I oft submitted to Court in my submissions for this matter: I stand ready to present evidence for every single statement of fact I made.

13 I am at the disposal of anyone serving Singapore.

14 I attach here Mr. Ang's Written Submissions and mine, and I apologise for not attaching the Bundles of documents for their size.

[Attachments: (i) *Helmy_WS.pdf*; and (ii) *2021.07.12 - Defendant's Written Submissions (final).pdf*]

Yours sincerely,
Mohamed Helmy
MD, PhD

helmy.m@protonmail.com

+65 83 555 817
10 Jurong Lake Link, #15-39
Singapore, 648131