



Your Ref : AWE/NBN/MSIG/0452/ns
Our Ref : CI/LAW18016035/D

01 September 2018

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

**AUTOMOBILE TECHNICAL INVESTIGATION REPORT OF INCIDENT
INVOLVING SKC 1085C AND SHA 2598D ON 04 JANUARY 2017**

1. I refer to your request dated 04 June 2018 to comment on whether there was possibly contact between the motor car SKC 1085C and the motor taxi SHA 2598D; and if there was contact, whether the impact force arising from the contact could have possibly cause bodily injury to the driver of the motor taxi SHA 2598D.
2. The following documents were provided to me for my review and consideration in the preparation of this report: -
 - a) Singapore Accident Statement of the driver of the motor car SKC 1085C (herein referred to as "**Motor Car**"), where amongst other information, the circumstance of incident was described;
 - b) Singapore Accident Statement of the driver of the motor taxi SHA 2598D (herein referred to as "**Motor Taxi**"), where amongst other information, the circumstance of incident was described;
 - c) Copy of medical report of the driver of the Motor Taxi dated 13 February 2017;
 - d) Copy of Vehicle Damage Inspection Report of the Motor Taxi dated 13 January 2017, including 23 coloured photographs of the Motor Taxi taken at the time of inspection;
 - e) A 25secs video recording of the incident taken from the CCTV camera onboard the Motor Taxi.
3. I now set out below my detailed findings and analysis based purely on my review of the documents that were made available to me.

Nature of Incident

4. From the Singapore Accident Statement of the driver of the Motor Taxi, it was stated that on 04 January 2017 at about 1150hrs, the Motor Taxi was stationary along Ang Mo Kio Street 12 waiting for passenger. The Motor Car, which was in front of the Motor Taxi reversed and collided onto the frontal portion of the Motor Taxi.
5. The Singapore Accident Statement of the driver of the Motor Car, on the other hand, had stated that he had reversed the Motor Car and came close to the Motor Taxi without contact. Both the driver of the Motor Taxi and driver of Motor Car had checked and agreed that there was no contact or any damage

Video Recording

6. The video recording that was provided to me in preparation of this report was taken from a recording device that was mounted onto the front windscreen of the Motor Taxi. The recording was provided to me in a single recording and had showed the events just before the incident, the incident itself and the immediate events after the incident. The length (duration) of the video recording was 25secs. The images seen from this video recording were all captured directly from the recording device that was mounted onto the front windscreen of the Motor Taxi.
7. From the video recording, the Motor Taxi could be seen initially behind the Motor Car, which was stationary along the left side of the roadway. Shortly after, the Motor Car started reversing, crossing over a road hump that separated the frontal portion of the Motor Taxi and the rear portion of the Motor Car.
8. At the 11secs to 12secs mark of the video recording, I note that the image captured directly from the recording device was slightly shaky before the image stabilize again almost instantaneously. This was when the rear portion of the Motor Car was very close to the frontal portion of the Motor Taxi. The capturing of such shaky image directly from the video recording device that was mounted on the front windscreen of the Motor Taxi is a sign that there was a slight shaking of the Motor Taxi itself.

9. This shake indicates that there was contact between the rear portion of the Motor Car and the frontal portion of the Motor Taxi. Upon the contact, the Motor Taxi had shook slightly causing the recording device to shake as the recording device was directly mounted onto a body part (front windscreen) of the Motor Taxi. See screenshot below showing the 11secs plus mark of the video recording. One would have to view the video recording to see this slight shaky image.



Screenshot shows the 11secs plus mark of the video recording. The image captured directly from the video recording device became slightly shaky between the 11secs to 12secs mark, indicating that there was contact between the rear portion of the Motor Car and the frontal portion of the Motor Taxi. Focusing on the lamppost (arrowed) that was erected on the pedestrian walkway towards the front left side of the Motor Taxi, one would be able to also detect the slight shaky image.

Impact Force

10. Since the video recording had showed that there was contact between the rear portion of the Motor Car and the frontal portion of the Motor Taxi, the following paragraphs discusses the second part of your request ie whether the impact force arising from the contact could have possibly cause bodily injury to the driver of the Motor Taxi.
11. The Vehicle Damage Inspection Report dated 13 January 2017 had indicated that the Motor Taxi was inspected on 06 January 2017, which was 2 days after the incident involving the Motor Car. Body parts that required to be replaced was only the radiator grille, which was indicated as crack.

12. The front bumper, front bumper reinforcement, front bumper sponge and front number plate amongst others were indicated as re-fit, which would mean that these body parts were undamaged and re-usable. The radiator grille chrome moulding, although found to be crack, was indicated as old damage.
13. Close examination of the photographs enclosed in the Vehicle Damage Inspection Report produced similar observations regarding the extent of damage to the Motor Taxi. See photo 1 – 4 below.



Photo 1 shows a general view of the front left portion of the Motor Taxi at the time of inspection, which was 2 days after the reported incident. No obvious damage could be seen on the frontal portion of the Motor Taxi.



Photo 2 shows a general view of the cracked (circled) radiator grille of the Motor Taxi. This was directly at the centre of the Motor Taxi's frontal portion, above the front number plate. Apart from this cracked radiator grille, all other body parts at the frontal portion of the Motor Taxi were undamaged and re-usable as indicated in the Vehicle Damage Inspection Report of the Motor Taxi dated 13 January 2017.



Photo 3 shows a closer view of the cracked (circled) radiator grille of the Motor Taxi. Apart from this cracked radiator grille, all other body parts at the frontal portion of the Motor Taxi were undamaged and re-usable as indicated in the Vehicle Damage Inspection Report of the Motor Taxi dated 13 January 2017.



Photo 4 shows the cracked (circled) radiator grille chrome moulding of the Motor Taxi. This was towards the left of the Motor Taxi's frontal portion. This damage was indicated as old damage in the Vehicle Damage Inspection Report of the Motor Taxi dated 13 January 2017.

14. In general, the physical damage seen on the Motor Taxi indicates that it had sustained an impact directly onto its frontal portion. This impact was relatively light/minor as there was no obvious misalignment at the corner edges of the front bumper, adjacent to the front fenders. Even the first 2 body parts that would come into contact with the rear portion of the Motor Car, namely the front bumper and front number plate, did not sustain any permanent damage. Given the extent of physical damage seen on the Motor Taxi, it would therefore be reasonable to say that the relatively light/minor impact force from the contact did not dissipate beyond the cracked radiator grille of the Motor Taxi. See photo 5 & 6 below.



Photo 5 shows no obvious misalignment at the corner edges of the Motor Taxi's front bumper, adjacent to its front right fender (circled). This would indicate that the impact onto the frontal portion of the Motor Taxi was relatively light/minor.



Photo 6 shows no obvious misalignment at the corner edges of the Motor Taxi's front bumper, adjacent to its front right fender (circled). This would indicate that the impact onto the frontal portion of the Motor Taxi was relatively light/minor.

15. Earlier in paragraph 8 and paragraph 9, I had commented that the contact from the Motor Car had resulted in the Motor Taxi to shake slightly. This would also mean that the impact force, although relatively minor/slight to cause permanent damage to the body parts at the frontal portion of the Motor Taxi, was however sufficient enough to cause the Motor Taxi to shake slightly.
16. To put into context the impact force required to shake the Motor Taxi, one can take the example of a reasonably able-bodied person exerting a force onto the body panels of the motor vehicle by way of using his/her palms to press onto the body panels and releasing the press in a quick multiple continued motion that is akin to rocking the motor vehicle. The force created by rocking the motor vehicle would not cause any permanent damage to the body panels. Such example is commonly seen at petrol stations in Malaysia where drivers can often be seen shaking/rocking their motor vehicles during re-filling of petrol.

17. Co-relating the aforesaid example with this particular case, it can be reasonable to determine that the impact force onto the Motor Taxi arising from the contact from the Motor Car was akin to a person physically rocking the Motor Taxi; and given that the shaky image captured by the recording device stabilized almost instantaneously, the Motor Taxi can be said to have shook for a single time. The shaking/rocking of the Motor Taxi for a single time would not cause bodily injury to the occupant(s) inside the Motor Taxi as a single shake will not create any vigorous/violent/awkward etc movement of the occupant's body.

Conclusion

18. Having technically analyzed the documents provided to me, I am of the opinion that there was contact between the rear portion of the Motor Car and the frontal portion of the Motor Taxi.
19. The impact force from the contact was relatively light/minor causing no obvious permanent damage to the frontal portion of the Motor Taxi except for a crack to its radiator grille. The impact force was however sufficient enough to cause the Motor Taxi to shake/rock for a single time.
20. This single shaking/rocking for a single time would not cause bodily injury to the occupant(s) inside the Motor Taxi as the occupant's body will not move vigorously/violently/awkwardly etc from a single shake of the Motor Taxi.



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.