



Your Ref : EFA/China0575/dh
Our Ref : CI/LAW18010324/N

8 May 2018

M/s United Legal Alliance LLC
20 Maxwell Road
#13-00
Maxwell House
Singapore 069113

**AUTOMOBILE TECHNICAL INVESTIGATION REPORT OF ACCIDENT
INVOLVING SHD 899H AND SJC 1685H ON 29 MARCH 2017**

1. We refer to your letter dated 19 April 2018 and the instructions therein to comment on the damage consistency of the motor taxi SHD 899H involved in the captioned accident, in particular to establish whether there was possibly contact between the left front portion of the motor taxi SHD 899H and the right portion of motor car SJC 1685H; and if there was contact, whether the damage on the left front portion of the motor taxi SHD 899H is consistent to the accident.
2. The following documents were provided to us for our review and consideration in the preparation of this report:-
 - a) Singapore Police Report and Accident Statement of the driver of the motor taxi SHD 899H (herein referred to as "Taxi"), where amongst other information, the circumstances of accident was described together with 6 coloured photographs of the Taxi at the time of reporting;
 - b) Singapore Police Report of the driver of the motor car SJC 1685H (herein referred to as "Lexus");
 - c) 8 coloured photographs of the Lexus taken by the driver of the Lexus;
 - d) 10 coloured photographs of the damage to the Taxi taken during the Pre- Repair Survey conducted by LKK Auto Consultants Pte. Ltd.;
 - e) 57 coloured photographs taken during our physical inspection of the Lexus;
 - f) 4 post-accident coloured photographs taken by the driver of the Taxi;
 - g) Marked estimate of the repair bill by Trans- Cab Auto Services Pte. Ltd.

3. In preparation of this report, we had conducted height measurements of the left front portion of the Taxi (using a similar make and model). We had also conducted a physical inspection and thereafter height measurements of the right portion of the Lexus; both collectively referred herein as **"Involved Motor Vehicles"**. An analysis of all the available documents and information gathered was subsequently carried out.
4. An analysis of all the available documents and information gathered was subsequently carried out.
5. We now set out below our detailed findings and analysis.

Nature of Accident

6. From the Singapore Police Report and Accident Statement of the driver of the Taxi, Ho Kok Kong (herein referred to as **"Mr Ho"**) on 29 March 2017 at 1850 hours he was driving along Nicoll Highway towards the KPE on the 3rd lane. As he approached Java Road, he saw the Lexus turning left into Nicoll Highway from the slip road. The driver did not look out for traffic on the major road and merged without checking his blind spot. As a result, the Lexus collided into the left front portion of the Taxi. Mr Ho horned at the driver of the Lexus but he drove off while talking to his front left passenger. Mr Ho only managed to get the registration number of the Lexus. The Taxi sustained dents to the left portion of the bonnet and paint chip marks. Mr Ho suffered from a stiff neck and arms as well as a swollen left ankle due to the impact of the collision. Mr Ho went to the hospital and was given 5 days of medical leave. He is unsure if the Lexus sustained any damages.
7. The Singapore Police Report of the driver of the Lexus, Ms Lim Kim Eng (herein referred to as **"Ms Lim"**) had however stated that she received a letter from her insurance company when she returned to Singapore from an overseas trip on 15 April 2017. The letter had stated that the Lexus was involved in an accident with the Taxi on 29 March 2017. Ms Lim mentioned that she was not involved in any traffic accident on the aforementioned date, time and location.

Damage to the Taxi

8. We had conducted a Pre- Repair Survey of the Taxi on 31 March 2017. We took 10 photographs of the damages detected on the Taxi. We note that the Taxi had sustained damages mostly on the left front portion. The front bumper was dislodged at the left corner edge. Paint graze marks were also found on the left portion of the front bumper as well as on the left front tyre fender. The damages which we detected were not old damages and they were consistent with the description of the accident by the taxi driver and the photographs of the damaged Taxi exhibited in the Singapore Accident Statement filed on 30 March 2017. See photos 1 – 3 below.



Photo 1 shows the general left view of the front portion of the Taxi at the time of the Pre- Repair Survey conducted by LKK Auto Consultants Pte. Ltd. which was taken 2 days after the accident. The damages to the Taxi were observed to be confined to the left front portion, particularly to its front bumper and left front tyre fender (circled).



Photo 2 shows a closer view of the left front portion of the Taxi. The front bumper was dislodged at the left corner edge (arrowed). Paint graze marks were also found on the left portion of the front bumper as well as on the left front tyre fender (circled).



Photo 3 shows a close up view of the dislodgement of the Taxi's front bumper at the left corner edge (arrowed).

Physical Inspection of the Lexus

9. The Lexus was physically inspected on 5 May 2018 at the basement carpark of Ms Lim's home premises located at 961 Bukit Timah Road, Singapore 589655.
10. The mileage recorded was 90,021km.
11. The physical inspection carried out had primarily focused on the right portion of the Lexus as the driver of the Taxi had reported the accident to be of a head to side collision where the Lexus was beside the Taxi at the material time.
12. Our review of the photographs showing the Lexus taken by Ms Lim after receiving the letter from her insurance did not produce any significant information as the photographs were all taken from afar, without any close up photographs of the body parts at the front portion or the right front portion of the Lexus.
13. Our visual examination during the physical inspection of the right portion of the Lexus revealed that there was a misalignment of the Lexus's front bumper at the right corner edge. Whitish marks were found on the right side mirror. There were relatively minor marks of grazing nature around the edges of the right front wheel rim. Paint graze marks were found near the handle of the driver door. There was a dent on the driver door body chrome trim. We noticed paint graze marks on the right rear tyre fender as well as relatively minor marks of grazing nature around the edges of the right rear wheel rim. See photos 4 – 14 below.



Photo 4 shows the general view of the front portion of the Lexus taken by Ms Lim after receiving the letter from her insurance company. Our review of this photograph did not produce any significant information as the photograph was taken from afar, without any close up photograph of the body parts at the front portion of the Lexus.



Photo 5 shows the general view of the right front portion of the Lexus taken by Ms Lim after receiving the letter from her insurance company. Our review of this photograph did not produce any significant information as the photograph was taken from afar, without any close up photograph of the body parts at the right front portion of the Lexus.



Photo 6 shows a general right view of the front portion of the Lexus at the time of our physical inspection.



Photo 7 shows the misalignment of the Lexus's front bumper at the right corner edge (arrowed).



Photo 8 shows the whitish marks found on the right side mirror of the Lexus (circled).



Photo 9 shows a close up view of the relatively minor marks of grazing nature observed around the edges of the right front wheel rim of the Lexus (circled).



Photo 10 shows the paint graze marks found near the handle of the driver door of the Lexus (circled).



Photo 11 shows a close up view of the dent found on the driver door body chrome trim (circled).



Photo 12 shows the right rear portion of the Lexus. We observed several paint graze marks on the right rear tyre fender as well as relatively minor marks of grazing nature around the edges of the right rear wheel rim (circled).



Photo 13 shows a close up view of the paint graze marks on the right rear tyre fender (circled) as well as relatively minor marks of grazing nature around the edges of the right rear wheel rim (red arrows).



Photo 14 shows a close up view of the paint graze marks on the right rear tyre fender (red arrows).

Accident Scene Photographs

14. For this case, we obtained several photographs taken by Mr Ho, depicting the damages sustained to the Taxi post- accident. Upon closer examination of these photos, the damages seem to be consistent with the photos taken during the accident reporting as well as the Pre- Repair Survey. See photo 15 below.



Photo 15 shows a close up view of the damages sustained to the left front portion of the Taxi post- accident (circled). Upon closer examination of these photos, the damages seem to be consistent with the photos taken during the accident reporting as well as the Pre- Repair Survey.

Height Measurement

15. We had conducted a height configuration test to determine whether the damages observed on the left front portion of the Taxi could have possibly been caused by the right portion of the Lexus. In order to determine this, we had measured the height above ground level of the damaged area on the left front portion of the Taxi (using a similar make and model). We had thereafter compared this measured height against the right portion of the Lexus. See photos 16 - 18 below.



Photo 16 shows the height measurement being conducted on the left front portion of the Taxi (using a similar make and model). The paint graze marks and the dislodgement of the front bumper on the left front portion of the Taxi were measured to be between the height ranges of 50cm to 65cm above ground level.



Photo 17 shows the height measurement being conducted on the right front portion of the Lexus. The body part within the height range of 50cm to 65cm above ground was the edges of the right front wheel rim where the graze marks were found.



Photo 18 shows the height measurement being conducted on the right rear portion of the Lexus. The body part within the height range of 50cm to 65cm above ground was the edges of the right rear wheel rim as well as the right rear tyre fender where the graze marks were found.

16. We now set out below the findings that we had gathered following the height measurements that was conducted:-

- a) the paint graze marks and the dislodgement of the front bumper on the left front portion of the Taxi were measured to be between the height ranges of 50cm to 65cm above ground level;
- b) the body part within the height range of 50cm to 65cm above ground was the edges of the right front wheel rim of the Lexus where the graze marks were found;
- c) the body part within the height range of 50cm to 65cm above ground was the edges of the right rear wheel rim as well as the right rear tyre fender of the Lexus where the graze marks were found;
- d) the height measurements appear to support the findings of possible contact between the left front portion of the Taxi and the right portion of the Lexus. The damage observed on the left front portion of the Taxi was a result of this contact and corresponds to the damage observed on the right portion of the Lexus.

Cost of Repair

17. Having established that there was possible contact between the left front portion of the Taxi and the right portion of the Lexus, we now refer to the estimate repair bill provided by Trans- Cab Auto Services Pte. Ltd. which was marked by LKK Auto Consultants Pte. Ltd. during the Pre- Repair Survey. Our preliminary assessment based on the Pre-Repair Survey for the cost of repairs was \$1,772.70 and estimated normal period for repairs was 2 days. See Marked Repair Estimate 1 & 2 below.

TRANS-CAB AUTO SERVICES PTE LTD
NO.2 ANG MO KIO ST03 SINGAPORE 607111
TEL NO. 6267 6986 FAX NO. 6257 1535
COGST REG NO. 2013180290
SHD899H - CHINA

Not Attached
\$1772.70

ROEL

Vehicle No.:
Chassis No.:
Vehicle Make:
Vehicle Model:
Date of Accident:
Third Party Insurer:

SHD899H - ROEL
WDD221200128024280
MERCEDES BENZ
S220 CDI
29/03/2017
CHINA

PART		LIST	
1	1	Front Bumper	\$ 1,265.00
2	1	Front Bumper Reinforcement	\$ 155.00
3	1	Front Bumper Shock Absorber	\$ 248.00
4	1	Front Bumper Fog Lamp L/H	\$ 272.00
5	1	Front Bumper Fog Lamp Garnish L/H	\$ 48.00
6	1	Front Bumper Side Retainer L/H	\$ 88.00
7	1	Front Bumper Side Bracket L/H	\$ 40.00
8	1	Front Bumper Side Inner Frame L/H	\$ 45.00
9	1	Radiator Grille	\$ 632.00
10	2	Bonnet	\$ 2,912.00
11	2	Bonnet Hinge L/H	\$ 101.00
12	2	Bonnet Hinge R/H	\$ 101.00
13	2	Front Headlamp L/H	\$ 944.00
14	1	Front Headlamp Panel L/H	\$ 120.00
15	1	Front Headlamp Brace L/H	\$ 96.40
16	1	Front Fender L/H	\$ 865.31
17	2	Front Fender Inner Cowling L/H	\$ 76.00
18	1	Front Shock Absorber L/H	\$ 692.00
19	1	Front Upper Arm L/H	\$ 344.00
20	1	Front Lower Arm L/H	\$ 748.00
21	1	Front Knuckle Arm L/H	\$ 1,152.00
22	1	Rocket Panel	\$ 435.00
23	1	Front Door L/H	\$ 1,840.00
TOTAL		\$	14,441.71
10%		\$	1,444.17
		\$	12,997.54

Special Nett

1	1 Set	Front Fender Inner Cowling Insert Clip	\$ 40.00
2	1 Set	Front Bumper Clip	\$ 40.00

Marked Repair Estimate 1 shows the estimated cost of repairs to be \$1,772.70 after preliminary assessment by LKK Auto Consultants Pte. Ltd. during the Pre- Repair Survey (circled).

Conclusion

18. Having investigated and technically analyzing the material evidence available at the time of writing this report, we are of the opinion that there was possible contact between the left front portion of the Taxi and the right portion of the Lexus. The impact force from the contact was relatively minor and had occurred when the Lexus was switching lanes, resulting in a slight contact of grazing nature between the right portion of the Lexus and the left front portion of the Taxi, resulting in slight permanent damage to both vehicles.
19. Both damages are corresponding to their respective heights and are consistent to their nature of contact.
20. Given the extent of physical damage to the Taxi, we are further of the view that the energy forces generated from the impact were not significant enough to have dissipated and affected body parts that were beyond the front bumper of the Taxi to cause any and/or significant injury to the driver of the Taxi.
21. Our preliminary assessment based on the Pre-Repair Survey of the Taxi for cost of repairs was \$1,772.70 and estimated normal period for repairs was 2 days. A breakdown of this cost of repair is shown in paragraph 17 above.



Muhd Nazril

Technical Investigator



Ang Bryan Tani

AFF SAE-A, AMSOE AMIRTE, MATAI, Aff Inst AEA

Senior Technical Investigator

Technical Investigation & Reconstructionist (SAE-A)

DISCLAIMER OF LIABILITY TO THIRD PARTIES:- This Report is made solely for the use and benefit of the Client named on the front page of this Report. No liability or responsibility whatsoever, in contract or tort, is accepted to any third party who may rely on the Report wholly or in part. Any third party acting or relying on this Report, in whole or in part, does so at his or her own risk.