



RECOVERABILITY OF ECONOMIC LOSS
UNDER CONSTRUCTION LAW
IN MALAYSIA: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

BY

SEOW HOCK PENG

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirement for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Law

Ahmad Ibrahim Kulliyah of Laws
International Islamic University Malaysia

NOVEMBER 2014

ABSTRACT

The recoverability of economic loss under construction law in Malaysia is still an unsettled area of the law. Economic loss has generally not been recoverable in Malaysia. The concept of pure economic loss draws its origin from English law. Even then, the English common law decisions on pure economic loss, for the past sixty years or so, have been swaying from one end of the equilibrium to the other. The English law established a general principle, the neighbour principle, for determining when a duty of care exists. It imposed a duty of care on manufacturers not to cause personal injury or physical damage to property through defects in their manufactured chattels. However, any defect in the chattel is considered pure economic loss and has traditionally not been recoverable in tort. It is as consequence of the defect in it, the chattel inflicts injury on a person or causes damage to property other than itself, the manufacturer would be liable in negligence. The position in Malaysia appears to be no different. This study will analyze the nature, history, concept and development of pure economic loss; and the development on pure economic loss in England, Malaysia and other Commonwealth jurisdiction. The study will then consider the correct jurisprudential approach on the recoverability of economic loss in Malaysia; whether it is recoverable or not; and whether it should be recoverable or not. In ascertaining the correct jurisprudential approach on the recoverability of economic loss from the Malaysian perspective, this study hopes to offer its own theory on the concept of pure economic loss, and will attempt to offer some suggestions to overcome the problems relating to the application of the law on pure economic loss in the construction industry.

ملخص البحث

تعتبر إمكانية تعويض الخسارة الاقتصادية تحت قانون البناء في ماليزيا قضية قانونية غير مفصول فيها. عموماً وإلى حد الآن، لا تبدو الخسارة الاقتصادية آخذة منحى إمكانية تعويضها. يستمد مفهوم الخسارة الاقتصادية الخالصة جذوره من القانون الإنجليزي، الذي لم تتمتع قراراته المتعلقة بالخسارة الاقتصادية بالاستقرار على مدى الستين سنة الماضية تقريباً. لقد أنشأ القانون الإنجليزي مبدأ الجار كمبدأ عام، لغرض تحديد الحالات الموجبة لواجب الرعاية. فقد فرض واجب الرعاية على المصنعين بحيث لا يتسببون في الإصابات الشخصية أو الأضرار المادية للممتلكات بسبب عيوب في السلعة المصنعة. ومع ذلك، يعتبر أي خلل في السلعة خسارة اقتصادية خالصة، والتي لم يكن من المعتاد تعويضها في قانون المسؤولية التقصيرية. وكتيجة للعبء الموجود في السلعة، الذي من شأنه أن يلحق الضرر بالأشخاص، أو التلف للممتلكات، فإن المصنّع يعتبر مسؤولاً قانونياً بسبب الإهمال. ولا يعد موقف ماليزيا في هذا الشأن مختلفاً. ستعتمد الدراسة الحالية إلى تحليل طبيعة، وتاريخ، ومفهوم، وتطور مفهوم الخسارة الاقتصادية. كما ستتناول دراسة تطور المفهوم في إنجلترا، وماليزيا، وباقي دول الكومنولث. ستعتمد الدراسة بعد ذلك المقاربة التشريعية الصحيحة فيما يخص قانون تعويض الخسارة الاقتصادية في ماليزيا، وذلك من جانبين: مدى قابليتها، ومدى وجوب قابليتها لتعويض الخسارة الاقتصادية. وتأمل هذه الدراسة من خلال عملية التحقق من المقاربة التشريعية الصحيحة في تعويض الخسارة الاقتصادية من وجهة نظر ماليزية، أن تخرج بنظريتها الخاصة حول مفهوم الخسارة الاقتصادية الخالصة، كما أنها ستحاول تقديم بعض الإقتراحات من أجل التغلب على المشاكل المتعلقة بتطبيقات القانون على مفهوم الخسارة الاقتصادية الخالصة في قطاع الصناعة البنائية.

APPROVAL PAGE

The thesis of Seow Hock Peng has been examined and is approved by the following:

Syed Ahmad Shihabuddin Abdurrahman Alsagoff
Supervisor

Mohd Akram Bin Shair Mohamed
Internal Examiner

Mohd Altaf Bin Hussain Ahangar
External Examiner

Hassan Ahmed Ibrahim
Chairperson

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this thesis is the result of my investigations, except where otherwise stated. I also declare that it has not been previously or concurrently submitted as a whole for any other degrees at IIUM or other institutions.

Seow Hock Peng

Signature:

Date:

INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY MALAYSIA

**DECLARATION OF COPYRIGHT AND AFFIRMATION OF
FAIR USE OF UNPUBLISHED RESEARCH**

Copyright © 2014 by Seow Hock Peng. All rights reserved.

**RECOVERABILITY OF ECONOMIC LOSS UNDER
CONSTRUCTION LAW IN MALAYSIA: A CRITICAL
ANALYSIS**

No part of this unpublished research may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior written permission of the copyright holder except as provided below.

1. Any material contained in or derived from this unpublished research may only be used by others in their writing with due acknowledgement.
2. IIUM or its library will have the right to make and transmit copies (print or electronic) for institutional and academic purposes.
3. The IIUM library will have the right to make, store in a retrieval system and supply copies of this unpublished research if requested by other universities and research libraries.

Affirmed by Seow Hock Peng.

.....
Signature

.....
Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible, had it not been for Associate Professor Datin Grace Xavier. She is my teacher, mentor and friend. Her encouragement to me was steadfast and unwavering. For that, I'm most grateful.

I'm indebted to Associate Professor Dr. A. Mohaimin Ayus, who has graciously guided me on my initial research proposal. .

I'm also indebted to Associate Professor Dr. Syed Ahmad Alsagoff. He was more than a thesis supervisor. From him, I learned patience, fortitude and strength.

I'm also indebted to Professor Dr. Razali Nawawi and Asst. Professor Dr. Mohamad Asmadi Abdullah for their guidance in Islamic law.

To my dear wife and daughter, Catherine and Chloe, I will never forget their support and love through these years. And I am eternally grateful to my parents.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Abstract in Arabic	iii
Approval Page.....	iv
Declaration	v
Copyright Page.....	vi
Acknowledgements	vii
List of Abbreviations	xiv
List of Cases.....	xv
List of Statutes	xx
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the Research	1
1.2 Statement of Problem	5
1.3 Hypothesis.....	7
1.4 Literature Review	9
1.5 Scope and Limitations of the Study	22
1.6 Research Methodology.....	22
CHAPTER TWO: ECONOMIC LOSS: A GENERAL OVERVIEW	23
2.1 Introduction	23
2.2 Understanding the Concept of Economic Loss	25
2.2.1 Tort	25
2.2.2 Ingredients for Negligence	25
2.2.3 Losses / Damage	26
2.2.4 Economic Loss	26
2.2.5 Pure Economic Loss	27
2.2.6 Pure Economic Loss – Damage to the Property Itself.....	28
2.3 The Rule and Rationale for Pure Economic Loss	31
2.4 Exception to the Rule: Negligent Misstatement.....	31
2.5 Classifications of Economic Loss	33
2.5.1 Negligent Misrepresentation.....	35
2.5.2 Negligent Performance of a Service	35
2.5.3 Defective Products / Building Structures	37
2.5.4 The Liability of Statutory Public Authorities	41
2.5.5 Relational Economic Loss	47
CHAPTER THREE: THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE LAW IN THE UNITED KINGDOM.....	53
3.1 The Law Pre-Donoghue V Stevenson.....	53
3.1.1 The Privity of Contract Fallacy – <i>Winterbottom v Wright</i>	53
3.1.2 Relationship of proximity – <i>Heaven v Pender</i>	54
3.1.3 The Exclusionary Rule – <i>Cattle v Stockton Waterworks Co;</i> <i>Simpson v Thompson</i>	56
3.1.4 The Charter Cases	58
3.2 The Neighbour Principle – The Rule and the Exception	61

3.2.1	The General Rule – <i>Donoghue v Stevenson</i>	61
3.2.2	Exception to the general rule – <i>Hedley Byrne and Company v Heller and Partners Limited</i>	63
3.2.3	Implication and impact of <i>Hedley Byrne v Heller</i>	64
3.3	The Expansionist Era – <i>Dutton V Bognor Regis Urban Council; Anns & Ors V London Borough Council of Merton; Junior Books Ltd V Veitchi Co Ltd</i>	69
3.3.1	An Impossible Distinction – <i>Dutton v Bognor Regis United Building Co Ltd</i>	69
3.3.2	Artificial Distinction between Physical and Economic Loss: The Two-Stage Test – <i>Anns v Merton London Borough</i>	72
3.3.3	A Sufficient Degree of Proximity – <i>Junior Books Ltd v Veitchi Co Ltd</i>	78
3.4	The Retreating Phase- <i>D&F Estates Ltd & Ors V Church Commissioners for England & Ors; Murphy V Brentwood District Council; Department of The Environment V Thomas Bates & Sons Ltd</i>	83
3.4.1	The Complex Structure – <i>D&F Estates Ltd & Ors v Church Commissioners for England & Ors</i>	83
3.4.2	Rejection of the Two-Stage Test – <i>Murphy v Brentwood District Council</i>	87
3.4.3	Reaffirmation of the principle of irrecoverability – <i>Department of the Environment v Thomas Bates & Sons Ltd</i>	95

CHAPTER FOUR: THE COMMONWEALTH POSITION – CANADA, AUSTRALIA, NEW ZEALAND AND SINGAPORE97

4.1	The Development of the Law in Canada.....	97
4.1.1	Introduction	97
4.1.2	Damage to the property itself: Economic loss resulting directly from avoidance of threatened physical harm – <i>Rivtow Marine Ltd v Washington Iron Works</i>	98
4.1.3	A modified two-stage test: Liability of statutory public authority based on private law duty imposed by statute - <i>City of Kamloops v Nielsen</i>	102
4.1.4	Concept of Proximity and the Known-Plaintiff Test - <i>Canadian National Railway Co v Norsk Pacific Steamship Co</i>	106
4.1.5	Defects that poses a real and substantial danger: A rejection of <i>D&F Estates</i> – <i>Winnipeg Condominium Corp No. 36 v Bird Construction Co</i>	112
4.2	The Development of the Law in Australia.....	115
4.2.1	Introduction	115
4.2.2	Reasonable foreseeability test and the requirement of proximity	117
4.2.3	Relationship of proximity in respect of defective premise – <i>Bryan v Maloney</i>	122
4.2.4	Further development of the proximity concept.....	126
4.2.5	A retreat from <i>Bryan v Maloney</i> ?.....	129
4.3	The Development of the Law in New Zealand	132

4.3.1	Introduction	132
4.3.2	Distinction between economic loss and physical damage – <i>Bowen v Paramount Builders (Hamilton) Ltd</i>	134
4.3.3	The development of the law – 1978 to 1990: post <i>Anns v Merton</i>	136
4.3.4	The development of the law - post <i>Murphy</i>	141
4.4	The Development of the Law in Singapore	145
4.4.1	The development of the law – 1973 to 1995: Application of the rule in <i>Donoghue v Stevenson</i>	145
4.4.2	The development of the law: Application of the rule in <i>Hedley Byrne v Heller</i>	150
4.4.3	Pure economic loss recoverable where there is a relationship of proximity: The Pragmatic Route concept – Management Corp Strata Title Plan No 1272 v Ocean Front Pte Ltd (Ssangyong Engineering & Construction Co Ltd & Ors, third parties)	151
4.4.4	Rejection of <i>Murphy</i> ; adoption of <i>Anns</i> and <i>Junior Books</i> – <i>RSP Architects Planners & Engineers v Ocean Front Pte Ltd</i> ...	155
4.4.5	Affirmation of <i>Ocean Front</i> and the two-stage test – <i>RSP Architects Planners & Engineers (Raglan Squire & Partners FE) v Management Corporation Strata Title Plan No. 1075</i>	161

**CHAPTER FIVE: THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE LAW IN MALAYSIA
& THE ISLAMIC LAW PERSPECTIVE..... 170**

5.1	Introduction	170
5.1.1	The development of the law in Malaysia.....	170
5.1.2	Negligent misrepresentation: Application of the rule in <i>Hedley Byrne v Heller</i>	172
5.2	‘Local Circumstances’ Approach to Allow Recoverability: S.3 of the Civil Law Act 1956 – <i>Nepline V Jones Lang Wootton</i>	174
5.3	Recoverability for Defective Premises: The Malaysian breakthrough – <i>Dr Abdul Hamid Abdul Rashid & Anor V Jurusan Malaysia Consultants (Sued As A Firm) & Ors</i>	177
5.4	Non-Recoverability for Non-Usage of Motor Vehicle: <i>Pilba Trading V South East Asia Insurance Bhd</i>	180
5.5	Affirmation of <i>Dr Abdul Hamid Abdul Rashid V Jurusan Malaysia Consultants: Steven Phoa Cheng Loon & Ors V Highland Properties Sdn Bhd & Ors</i>	182
5.5.1	Facts.....	183
5.5.2	Pure economic loss	184
5.5.3	Claims against the local authority – Immunity under s.95 (2) of the Street, Drainage & Building Act 1974	186
5.5.4	Pre-collapse and post-collapse immunity	187
5.6	Nature of the Damage Not Determinative: Arab-Malaysian Finance <i>Berhad V Steven Phoa Cheng Loon & Ors</i>	188
5.6.1	Facts.....	188
5.6.2	Pure economic loss	189
5.6.3	Immunity of local authorities: Pre-collapse position.....	191
5.6.4	Immunity of local authorities: Post-collapse position	193

5.7	The ‘Just, Fair and Reasonable’ Element Duty of Care: Majlis Perbandaran Ampang Jaya V Steven Phoa Cheng Loon & Ors	194
5.7.1	Facts.....	194
5.7.2	Pure economic loss	196
5.7.3	Immunity of the local authority: Pre-collapse liability.....	199
5.7.4	Claim for post-collapse economic loss	202
5.8	Latest Development in the Malaysian Law.....	206
5.8.1	Lim Teck Kong v Dr Abdul Hamid Abdul Rashid & Anor	206
5.8.2	The Co-Operative Central Bank Ltd v KGV & Associates Sdn Bhd	208
5.9	The Islamic Law Perspective- A Comparison	211
5.9.1	Introduction: Civil liability in Islamic law	211
5.9.2	Negligence in Islamic jurisprudence	214
5.9.3	Defective premises in Islamic law – A general overview	222
5.9.4	Losses arising from personal injury and damage to property.....	228
5.9.5	Recovery of economic loss.....	232
5.9.6	Conclusion.....	238

CHAPTER SIX: RATIONALE FOR RECOVERY: PRINCIPLES, THEORIES, POLICIES & SOLUTIONS.....241

6.1	The Law’s Reluctance to Impose Pure Economic Loss.....	241
6.1.1	Why do negligence claims arise?	241
6.1.2	Liability for personal injury different from pecuniary loss	243
6.1.3	Multiple Liability / Floodgates Argument.....	244
6.1.4	Overlap and conflict between contract and tort.....	245
6.1.5	Mere defects not in the domain of tort law.....	246
6.1.6	Liability targeted at the wrong defendant / the “Deep Pocket” syndrome	248
6.1.7	Loss spreading	249
6.1.8	Fostering competition	250
6.1.9	Protection should come from the legislature	251
6.1.10	Providing certainty in the law	251
6.2	Rules, Approach and Categorization.....	252
6.2.1	The approach in recovery of pure economic loss	252
6.2.2	Criticism against the rules governing liability.....	253
6.2.3	The simplistic categorization.....	254
6.2.4	Categorization by fact-situations	255
6.2.5	Categorization by types of loss.....	258
6.3	Why Recovery of Pure Economic Loss Should be Allowed	263
6.3.1	The law on non-recovery produces “capricious” results	263
6.3.2	Floodgates argument not fully understood	266
6.3.3	Problem of damage caused by the product itself.....	269
6.3.4	No distinction between property damage and economic loss.....	270
6.3.5	Distinction between building and chattels – a building to last longer than a product	272
6.3.6	Primary of commercial bargain – Claim allowable for dwelling; but not for commercial building	273
6.3.7	Negligent advice – Reliance on building inspector	274
6.3.8	No incentive to mitigate potential loss	275

6.4	Considerations and Policy Issues Affecting Pure Economic Loss.....	276
6.4.1	Multiplicity of litigation – the ‘ripple effect’	276
6.4.2	Vulnerability	277
6.4.3	The nature of the loss-causing activity: Legitimate commercial competitor	278
6.4.4	The class of claimants.....	279
6.4.5	The conduct of claimant	280
6.4.6	Loss spreading and insurance consideration	281
6.4.7	Loss deterrence	283
6.5	Possible Solutions	285
6.5.1	Concurrent duties in contract and tort: Relaxation of the rules of privity	285
6.5.2	Transmissible warranty: Imposing strict liability obligations	288
6.5.3	Assignment of a builder / developer’s contractual rights	290
6.5.4	Legislation with regard to buildings	290
6.5.5	Liability in respect of cost of rectification.....	293
6.5.6	Defects that pose a real and imminent danger to persons or other property	295
6.5.7	Relational economic loss	297
6.5.8	‘Policy concerns’ approach	300
6.5.9	‘Sub-categories’ argument.....	304

CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS306

7.1	Understanding the Concept of Economic Loss: Critique and Analysis.....	306
7.1.1	Summary of the concept of economic loss	306
7.1.2	Summary of the concept of pure economic loss	307
7.1.3	Rule and rationale in respect of pure economic loss	309
7.1.4	Defective premises – A general overview	310
7.1.5	The rationale to disallow recovery for defective premises	313
7.1.6	Classes of claimants in defective premises.....	314
7.1.7	Classes of defendants in defective premises.....	320
7.1.8	Types of claims in defective premises.....	322
7.1.9	Conclusion	327
7.2	Critical Study of the Approaches in Foreign Jurisdictions	329
7.2.1	Classes of claimants, defendants and types of claims – A comparison study	329
7.2.2	Principles, rules & approach: A comparison study	333
7.2.3	Conclusion – Favoured tests and principles	342
7.3	Critical Study of the Position in Malaysia	348
7.3.1	Misconception of the existing position / law?	348
7.3.2	The plea for Parliament’s intervention?	351
7.3.3	Classes of claimants, defendants and types of claims – A comparison study	354
7.3.4	Principles, rules & approaches: A comparison study	356
7.4	Suggestions & Solutions	360
7.4.1	The need for a different set of rules: Why defective premises is distinct from defective products.....	360
7.4.2	Identification of problem areas: The need for categorization.....	365

7.4.3 Recoverability of pure economic loss for defective premises	
– Type of loss & the special case for local authorities	368
7.4.4 How to enforce recoverability of pure economic loss:	
Legislative concerns and possible common law approaches to	
be adopted by the Courts	373

BIBLIOGRAPHY	383
---------------------------	------------

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AC	Appeal Cases
ACTR	Australian Capital Territory Reports
ALR	Australian Law Reports
ALJ	Australian Law Journal
ALJR	Australian Law Journal Reports
All ER	All England Law Reports
AMR	All Malaysian Reports
BCL	Building and Construction Law
BLR	Building Law Reports
CBLJ	Canadian Business Law Journal
CLJ	Current Law Journal
Const LJ	Construction Law Journal
Con LR	Construction Law Reports
DLR	Dominion Law Reports
ER	English Reports
EWHC	High Court of England and Wales
Exch.	Law Reports, Exchequer
HCA	High Court of Australia
ICLR	The International Construction Law Review
IUM LJ	International Islamic University Malaysia Law Journal
KB	King's Bench
LR	Law Reports
L.L.R.	Lloyd's Law Reports
LQR	Law Quarterly Review
M.&W.	Meeson and Welsby's Exchequer Reports
MLJ	Malayan Law Journal
NZLR	New Zealand Law Reports
NZBLC	New Zealand Business Law Cases
OR	Ontario Reports
QB	Queen's Bench
QBD	Queen's Bench Division
QdR	Queensland Reports
SCR	Canadian Law Reports, Supreme Court
SJLS	Singapore Journal of Legal Studies
SLR	Singapore Law Reports
TLJ	Torts Law Journal
Tort L Rev	Tort Law Review
UTLJ	University of Toronto Law Journal
WLR	Weekly Law Reports
WWR	Western Weekly Reports

LIST OF CASES

AC Billings & Sons Ltd v Riden (1958) AC 240
Agar v Hyde (2000) HCA 41
Al Saudi Banque & Ors v Clerk Pixley (a firm) (1990) Ch 313; (1989) 3 All ER 361
Allied Finance & Investments Ltd v Haddow & Co. (1983) NZLR 22
Aloe Coal Co v Clark Equipment 816 F 2 d 110 (1987)
Anns v London Borough Council of Merton (1977) 2 All ER 492; (1978) AC 728
Arab-Malaysian Finance Bhd v Steven Phoa Cheng Loon & Ors (2003) 1 MLJ 567
Askin v Knox (1989) 1 NZLR 248
Attorney-General for Ontario v Fatehi (1984) 2 SCR
Bates v Batey & Co Ltd (1913) 3 KB 351
Batty v Metropolitan Property Realisation Ltd (1978) QB 554; (1978) 2 All ER 445
BDC Ltd v Hofstrand Farms Ltd (1986) 1 SCL 228
BG Checo International Ltd v British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority (1993) 1 SCR 12
Bow Valley Husky (Bermuda) Ltd v Saint John Shipbuilding Ltd (1997) 3 SCR 1210; (1997) 153 DLR (4th) 385
Bowen v Paramount Builders (Hamilton) Ltd (1977) 1 NZLR 394
Brown v Heathcote County Council (1986) 1 NZLR 76; (1987) 1 NZLR 720
British Transport Commission v Gourley (1956) AC 185
Bryan v Maloney (1995) 128 ALR 163; (1995) 69 ALTR 375; (1995) 74 BLR 35; (1995) CLJ 503; (1995) 182 CLR 609
Burnie Port Authority v General Jones Pty Ltd (1994) 179 CLR 520
Caltex Oil (Australia) Pty Ltd v The Dredge "Willemstad" (1976) 136 CLR 529; (1976) 11 ALR 227
Canadian National Railway Co v Norsk Pacific Steamship Co. (1991) 17 CBLJ 356; (1992) 1 SCR 1021; (1992) 91 DLR (4th) 289
Candler v Crane, Christmas & Co. Ltd (1951) 1 All ER 426
Candlewood Navigation Corp Ltd v Mitsui OSK Lines Ltd (The Mineral Transporter) (1985) 2 All ER 935; (1986) AC 1
Caparo Industries plc v Dickman & Ors (1990) 1 All ER 568; (1990) 2 AC 605
Cattle v Stockton Waterworks Co (1875) LR 10; QB 453
CBD Investments Pty Ltd v Ace Ceramics Pty Ltd (1992) 8 BCL 437
Central Trust Co v Rafuse (1986) 31 DLR (4th) 481
Chargeurs Réunis Compagnie Francaise v English & American Shipping Co (1921) 9 Ll. L.R. 464
Chase v de Groot (1994) 1 NZLR 613
Chin Keow v Government of Malaysia & Anor (1967) 2 MLJ 45
Chin Sin Motor Works v Arosa Development (1992) 1 MLJ 23
City of Kamloops v Nielsen (1984) 2 SCR 2; (1984) 10 DLR (4th) 641
Clay v AJ Crump & Sons Ltd & Ors (1964) 1 QB 533
Clayton v Woodman & Son (Builders) Ltd & Ors (1962) 2 OB 533
Consumers Glass Co Ltd v Foundation Co of Canada (1985) 20 DLR (4th) 126
Craig v East Coast Bays (1986) 1 NZLR 99
Curran v Northern Ireland Co-ownership Housing Association Ltd (Stewart, third party) (1987) 2 All ER 13; (1987) AC 718

D&F Estates Ltd & Ors v Church Commissioners for England & Ors (1988) 15 Con LR 35; (1988) 3 WLR 368; (1988) 41 BLR 1; (1989) AC 177
D'Amato v Badger (1996) 2 SCR 1071
David Securities Pty Ltd v Commonwealth Bank of Australia (1992) 66 ALJR 768; (1992) 175 CLR 353
Day v Ost (1973) 2 NZLR 385
Department of the Environment v Thomas Bates & Sons (1991) 1 AC 499
Deep Sea Tankers Ltd v S.S. Tricape (1958) 16 DLR (2d) 600
Dillingham Construction Pte Ltd v Downs (1972) 13 BLR 97
Director of War Service Homes v Harris (1968) Qd R 275
Dobb & Co. Ltd v Hecla (1973) 2 MLJ 128
Donoghue v Stevenson (1932) AC 562
Dorset Yacht Co Ltd v Home Office (1970) AC 1004
Dr. Abdul Hamid Abdul Rashid v Jurusan Malaysia Consultants (1997) 3 MLJ 561
Dutton v Bognor Regis United Building Co Ltd (1971) 3 BLR 11; (1972) 1 All ER 462; (1972) 1 QB 373
East River SS Corp v Trans America Delavel Inc 106 S Ct 2295 (1986)
Elliot Steam Tug Co v The Shipping Controller (1922) 1 K.B. 127
Esanda Finance Corporation Ltd v Peat Marwick Hungerfords (1997) 188 CLR 241; (1997) 142 ALR 750
Esso Petroleum v Mardon (1976) QB 801
Farr v Butters Brothers & Co (1932) 2 KB 606
Frederick W. Nielsen (Canberra) Pty Ltd v PDC Constructions (A.C.T) Pty Ltd & Anor (1987) 71 ACTR 1
French Knit Sales Pty Ltd v N Gold & Sons Pty Ltd (1972) 2 NSWL 132
Gala & Ors v Preston (191) 172 CLR 243
Ganesan Carlose & Partners v American Home Assurance Co (1994) 2 SLR 332
Gartside v Sheffield, Young & Ellis (1983) NZLR 37
Governors of the Peabody Donation Fund v Sir Lindsay Parkinson & Co Ltd (1984) 3 All ER 529, at p. 534; (1985) AC 210
Grant v Australian Knitting Mills Ltd (1936) AC 85
Harris v Demolition Contractors (1979) 2 NZLR 166
Hawkins v Clayton (1988) 164 CLR 539; (1988) 78 ALR 69
Heaven v Pender (1883) 11 QBD 503
Hedley Byrne & Co Ltd v Heller & Partners (1963) 2 All ER 575; (1964) AC 465
Helicopter Sales (Australia) Pty Ltd v Rotor Work Pty Ltd & Anor (1974) 48 ALJR 390
Hill v Van Erp (1997) 188 CLR 159; (1997) 142 ALR 687
Ikumene Singapore Pte Ltd v Leong Chee Leng (1993) 3 SLR 24
Inland Revenue v Hambrook (1956) 2 QB 641
Invercargill City Council v Hamlin (1994) 3 NZLR 513; (1996) 1 All ER 756
J. & J.C. Abrams v Ancliffe (1978) 2 NZLR 420
Jaensch v Coffey (1984) 155 CLR 549
Junior Books Ltd v Veitchi Co Ltd (1982) 3 All ER 201; (1983) 1 AC 520
Kerajaan Malaysia v Cheah Foong Chiew (1993) 2 MLJ 439
K.M.A. Abdul Rahim & Anor v Owners of 'Lexa Maersk' & Ors (1973) 2 MLJ 121
Konstantinidis World Tankers Corp "The World Harmony" (1965) 2 W.L.R. 1275; (1967) P341
Kripps v Touche Ross & Co (1992) 94 DLR (4th) 284

L Shaddock & Associates Pty Ltd v Parramatta City Council (1981) 150 CLR 225;
 (1981) 36 ALR 385
La Société Anonyme de Remorquage à Helice v. Bennetts (1911) 1 KB 243
Lambert v Lewis (1980) 1 All ER 978; (1980) AC 225
Lee Siew Chun v Sourgrapes Packaging Products Pte Ltd (1993) 2 SLR 297
Leigh & Sillavan Ltd v Aliakmon Shipping Co Ltd, The Aliakmon (1986) 2 All ER
 145; (1986) AC 785
Lester v White (1992) 2 NZLR 483
*Linden Gardens Trust Ltd v Lenesta Sludge Disposals Ltd and St Martin's Property
 Corporation Ltd v Sir Robert McAlpine & Others* (1994) 63 BLR 1
London Drugs Ltd v Kuehne & Nagel International Ltd (1992) 3 SCR 299; 97 DLR
 (4th) 261
Londonwaste Ltd v Amex Civil Engineering Ltd (1997) 53 Con LR 66
Longmeid v Holliday (1851) 6 Exch. 761; 155 E.R. 752
Lumley v Gye (1853) 2 E. & B. 216
MacPherson v Buick Motor Co (1916) 217 N.Y. 382
Majlis Perbandaran Ampang Jaya v Steven Phoa Cheng Loon & Ors (2006) 2 MLJ
 389
*Malaysian International Merchant Bankers Bhd v Lembaga Bersekutu Pemegang
 Amanah Tinggi Islam Malaysia* (2001) 1 MLJ 375
*Management Corp Strata Title Plan No 1272 v Ocean Front Pte Ltd (Ssangyong
 Engineering & Construction Co Ltd & Ors, third parties)* (1995) 1 SLR 751
Marc Rich & Co AG v Bishop Rock Marine Co Ltd (1994) 3 All ER 686
Margarine Union GmbH v Cambray Prince SS Co (1969) 1 QB 219
Mayfair Ltd v Pears (1987) 1 NZLR 459
Meates v Attorney-General (1983) NZLR 308
Midland Bank Trust Co Ltd v Hett Stubbs & Kemp (a firm) (1978) 3 All ER 571;
 (1979) Ch 384
Miller v South of Scotland Electricity Board (1958) S.C.
Morrison Steamship Co v Greystoke Castle (Cargo Owners) (1946) 2 All ER 696;
 (1947) AC 265
Mount Albert Borough Council v Johnson (1979) 2 NZLR 234
*Mount Albert City Council v New Zealand Municipalities Co-operative Insurance Co
 Ltd* (1983) NZLR 190
Muchinski v Dodds (1985) 160 CLR 583
Muirhead v Industrial Tank Specialities Ltd (1985) 3 All ER 703; (1986) 1 QB 507
Murphy v Brentwood District Council (1990) 2 WLR 944; (1990) 2 All ER 908;
 (1991) 1 AC 398
Mutual Life and Citizens' Assurance Co Ltd v Evatt (1968) 122 CLR 556
New Zealand Forest Products Ltd v Attorney-General (1986) 1 NZLR 14
Nitrigin Eireann Teoranta v Inco Alloys Ltd (1992) 1 WLR 498
*Overseas Tankship (U.K.) Ltd v Morts Dock and Engineering Co Ltd (The Wagon
 Mound)* (1961) AC 388, 425
P & E Phontos Pty Ltd v McConnel Smith and Johnson Pty Ltd (1993) 9 BCL 259
Paris v Stepney Borough Council (1951) AC 367
Pavey and Matthews Pty Limited v Paul (1987) 61 ALJR 151; (1987) 162 CLR 221
Perre v Apand Pty Ltd (1999) 73 ALJR 1190; (1999) 164 ALR 606
Pilba Trading & Agency v South East Asia Insurance Bhd (1998) 2 MLJ 53
Port v New Zealand Dairy Board (1982) 2 NZLR 282

Portsea Island Mutual Co-operative Society Ltd v Michael Brasher Associates (1990) 6 PN 43; (1990) 6 Const LJ 63
Quackenbush v Ford Motor Company 153 NYS 131 (1915)
Riddell v Porteous (1999) 1 NZLR 1
Rivtow Marine Ltd v Washington Iron Works (1973) 40 DLR (3d) 530; (1973) 6 WWR 602; (1974) SCR 1189
Ross v Counters (a firm) (1979) 3 All ER 580; (1980) Ch 297
Rothfield v Manolakos (1989) 2 SCR 1259
RSP Architects Planner & Engineers v Ocean Front Pte Ltd (1996) 1 SLR 113
RSP Architects Planners & Engineers (Raglan Squire & Partners FE) v Management Corporation Strata Title Plan No 1075 (1999) 2 SLR 449
Ruxley Electronics and Construction Limited v Forsyth (1995) 73 BLR 1
Ryland v Fletcher (1866) LR1 Ex 265; (1868) LR3 HL 330
San Sebastian Pty Ltd v Minister Administering the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (1986) 162 CLR 340; (1986) 68 ALR 161
SCM (UK) Ltd v WJ Whittall & Sons Ltd (1971) 1 QB 337
Scott Group Ltd v McFarlane (1978) 1 NZLR 553
Seaway Hotels Ltd v Gragg (Canada) Ltd and Consumers Gas Co (1959) O.R. 581
Simaan General Contracting Co. v Pilkington Glass Ltd (No. 2) (1988) 1 All ER 791; (1988) QB 758
Simpson & Co v Thompson (1877) 3 App Cas 279
South Pacific Manufacturing Co Ltd v New Zealand Security Consultants & Investigation Ltd (1992) 2 NZLR 282
Spartan Steel & Alloys Ltd v Martin & Co. (Contractors) Ltd (1972) 3 WLR 502; (1973) 1 QB 27
Standard Chartered Bank & Anor v Coopers & Lybrand (sued as a firm) (1993) 3 SLR 712
Steven Phoa Cheng Loon & Ors v Highland Properties Sdn Bhd (2004) 4 MLJ 200
Stieller v Porirua City Council (1986) 1 NZLR 84
Storey v Charles Church Development Ltd (1996) 12 Construction Law Journal 206
Sullivan v Moody (2001) 207 CLR 562
Sutherland Shire Council v Heyman (1985) 157 CLR 424; (1985) 60 ALR 1
Swiss Singapore Overseas Enterprise Pte Ltd v Horng Chong Enterprise Pte Ltd & Ors (1993) 2 SLR 478
Tai Hing Cotton Mill Ltd v Liu Chong Hing Bank Ltd (1986) AC 80
Takaro Properties Ltd v Rowling (1978) 2 NZLR 314
Taupo Borough Council v Birnie (1978) 2 NZLR 397
Teh Khem On v Yeoh & Wu Development Sdn Bhd (1995) AMR 1558
Tesco Stores Ltd v Costain Construction Ltd (2003) EWHC 1487 (QB)
The Mergus (1947) 81 Ll.L.R 91
The Okehampton (1913) P 173
The Queen in right of Canada v Saskatchewan Wheat Pool (1983) SCR 205
Thomson v Lord Clanmorris (1900) 1 Ch 718
Townsend (Builders) Ltd v Cinema News & Property Management Ltd (1959) 1 All ER 7
Ultramares v Touche (1931) 255 NY 170
Voli v Inglewood Shire Council (1963) 110 CLR 74
Walter Cabott Construction Ltd v The Queen (1974) 44 DLR (3d) 82
Weller & Co v Foot and Mouth Disease Research Institute (1966) 1 QB 569

White v Jones (1995) 2 AC 207
Whittingham v Crease & Co (1978) 88 DLR (3rd) 353
Williams v Mount Eden Borough Council (1986) 1 NZBLC 102
Winnipeg Condominium Corp No. 36 v Bird Construction Co (1992) 91 DLR (4th)
289; (1993) 101 DLR (4th) 699; (1995) 1 SCR 85; (1995) 121 DLR (4th) 193
Winterbottom v Wright (1842) 10 M. & W. 109; 152 E.R. 402
Woolcock Street Investments Pty Ltd v CDG Pty Ltd (2004) 205 ALR 522; (2004) 20
BCL 176; (2004) HCA 16
Yianni v Edwin Evans and Sons (1981) 1 All E.R. 791
Yuen Kun Yeu v Attorney General of Hong Kong (1987) 2 All ER 705; (1987) 3 WLR
776; (1988) AC 175
Young v Tomlinson (1979) 2 NZLR 441
Young & Marten Ltd v MacManus Childs Ltd (1968) 3 WLR 630

LIST OF STATUTES

MALAYSIA

Civil Law Act 1956

Consumer Protection Act 1999 (Act 599).

Housing Developers (Control and Licensing) Act 1966 (Act 118)

Housing Developers (Control and Licensing) Regulations 1989

Housing Developers (Housing Development Account) Regulations 1991

Street, Drainage and Building Act 1974

Town and Country Planning Act 1976 (Act 1972)

Uniform Building By-laws 1984

UNITED KINGDOM

Building Act 1984

Building (Approved Inspectors) Regulations 1985

Defective Premises Act 1972

AUSTRALIA

Trade Practices Act 1974

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE RESEARCH

The recoverability of economic loss under construction law in Malaysia is still an unsettled area of the law. This can be seen from the recent case of *Majlis Perbandaran Ampang Jaya v Steven Phoa Cheng Loon & Ors*¹. Economic loss has generally not been recoverable in Malaysia. However, the High Court² in the *Steven Phoa's* case had allowed a claim for pure economic loss, but this was later reversed in the Court of Appeal³ and the Federal Court.

In order to appreciate the volatility of the law in this area, one would have to draw an analogy with the situation in the United Kingdom. The concept of pure economic loss⁴ draws its origin from English law. Even then, the English common law decisions on pure economic loss, for the past sixty years or so, have been swaying from one end of the equilibrium to the other. In many respect, *Donoghue v Stevenson*⁵ marked the new phase in the development of tortious negligence. This case was a major landmark because it established a general principle, the neighbour principle, for determining when a duty of care exists. It imposed a duty of care on manufacturers not to cause personal injury or physical damage to property through defects in their manufactured chattels. However, any defect in the chattel is considered pure

¹ *Majlis Perbandaran Ampang Jaya v Steven Phoa Cheng Loon & Ors* (2006) 2 MLJ 389

² *Steven Phoa Cheng Loon & Ors v Highland Properties Sdn Bhd* (2004) 4 MLJ 200 – judgement from James Foong J

³ *Arab-Malaysian Finance Bhd v Steven Phoa Cheng Loon & Ors and Other Appeals* (2003) 1 MLJ 567 – judgement by Gopal Sri Ram JCA)

⁴ Vincent Powell-Smith described pure economic loss as “...the financial consequences if products or services turn out to be defective in themselves but cause no physical damage to other property of injury to persons”

⁵ *Donoghue v Stevenson* (1932) AC 562

economic loss and has traditionally not been recoverable in tort⁶. It is as consequence of the defect in it, the chattel inflicts injury on a person or causes damage to property other than itself, the manufacturer would be liable in negligence.

Thirty years after *Donoghue v Stevenson*, the law took a new development in *Hedley Byrne v Heller*⁷, by creating an exception to the general rule on non-recoverability of pure economic loss. The court held that anybody who suffered financial loss as a result of reliance upon negligent professional advice could claim compensation from the negligent professional, provided there was a relationship of proximity between the advisor and the recipient of his advice. Thus it is now recognized that in special circumstances, pure economic loss caused by negligent misstatements or advice could be recoverable in tort⁸.

The shift in the English law came about in the series of cases of *Dutton v Bognor Regis UDC*⁹, *Anns v London Borough of Merton*¹⁰ and *Junior Books Ltd v Veitchi*¹¹, all of which allowed claims for pure economic loss. However, the expansion of the law in the trilogy of cases of *Dutton*, *Anns* and *Junior Books* ended with *D&F Estates Ltd v Church Commissioner of England*¹², where the House of Lords decided that a builder owes no duty of care in tort towards subsequent owners or occupiers of a building which he has erected in respect of pure economic loss. This decision in *D&F*

⁶ “Pure economic loss is irrecoverable” due to the need to “avoid the creation of liability for an indeterminate amount for an indeterminate time to an indeterminate class”- Cardozo CJ in *Ultramares v Touche*

⁷ *Hedley Byrne v Heller* (1964) AC 465

⁸ The *Hedley Byrne v Heller* principle was applied in the construction industry in various jurisdictions - see the Australian case of *Dillingham Construction Pty Ltd v Downs* (1972) 13 BLR 97: where the court held that there was no special relationship between parties in the pre-contract period to take reasonable care in the assembling of all material relevant to special site conditions; and the Canadian case of *Walter Cabott Construction Ltd v The Queen* (1974) 44 DLR (3d) 82: where the court held that there is no special relationship between the person who invites tenders and those who accepts that invitation.

⁹ *Dutton v Bognor Regis UDC* (1971) 3 BLR 11

¹⁰ *Anns v London Borough of Merton* (1977) A.C. 728

¹¹ *Junior Books Ltd v Veitchi* (1982) 3 AER 201

¹² *D&F Estates Ltd v Church Commissioner of England* (1988) 2 WLR 368

Estates raises doubts as to the correctness of the law laid down in *Dutton and Anns*. This uncertainty was duly laid to rest by the subsequent House of Lords' decision in *Murphy v Brentwood D.C*¹³, in which *D&F Estates* was cited in approval.

The position in Malaysia appears to be no different. The principles in *Murphy v Brentwood* was generously applied in *Kerajaan Malaysia v Cheah Foong Chiew*¹⁴, where the court struck off an action for pure economic loss. The law in *Murphy* was again cited with approval in the later case of *Teh Khem On v Yeoh & Wu Development Sdn Bhd*¹⁵. However, the law took a drastic turn in *Dr. Abdul Hamid Abdul Rashid v Jurusan Malaysia Consultants*¹⁶, where the court surprisingly allowed a claim for pure economic loss in an action for negligence. A claim relating to a collapse of a house due to a landslide, the High Court took a bold step in not following *Cheah Foong Chiew* and *Teh Khem On*, and distinguishing the English precedents of *D&F Estates* and *Murphy v Brentwood*. Instead, the court relied on the alternative jurisprudence developed in the other Commonwealth jurisdictions¹⁷.

However, as in the shift in the English common law, the legal position enunciated in *Dr. Abdul Hamid Abdul Rashid v Jurusan Malaysia Consultants* was to be overruled by the Court of Appeal in *Arab Malaysian Finance v Steven Phoa Cheng Loon & Ors and other appeals*¹⁸, which was later reaffirmed by the Federal Court in *Majlis Perbandaran Ampang Jaya v Steven Phoa Cheng Loon & Ors*¹⁹. Therefore, as

¹³ *Murphy v Brentwood D.C.* (1990) 1 AC 398

¹⁴ *Kerajaan Malaysia v Cheah Foong Chiew* (1993) 2 MLJ 439

¹⁵ *Teh Khem On v Yeoh & Wu Development Sdn Bhd* (1995) AMR 1558

¹⁶ *Dr. Abdul Hamid Abdul Rashid v Jurusan Malaysia Consultants* (1997) 3 MLJ 561

¹⁷ See the New Zealand case of *Invercargill City Council v Hamlin* (1996) 1 AER 756, the Canadian case of *Winnipeg Condominium No. 36 v Bird Construction Co Ltd* (1995) 121 DLR (4th Ed) 193, the Australian case of *Bryan v Maloney* (1995) 28 ALR 163 and the Singaporean case of *RSP Architects Planner & Engineers v Ocean Front Pte Ltd* (1996) 1 SLR 113.

¹⁸ *Arab Malaysian Finance v Steven Phoa Cheng Loon & Ors and other appeals* (2003) 1 MLJ 567

¹⁹ *Majlis Perbandaran Ampang Jaya v Steven Phoa Cheng Loon & Ors* (2006) 2 MLJ 389

the current situation stands, the law remains as the position of *Donoghue v Stevenson*, *D&F Estates* and *Murphy v Brentwood*.

This area of the law in Malaysia is perhaps best described by Abdul Hamid Mohamed FCJ, who, whilst acknowledging the uncertainties in the law, decided against a claim for pure economic loss in *Majlis Perbandaran Ampang Jaya v Steven Phoa Cheng Loon & Ors*: -

“Now, reflecting on my own judgement in *Nepline Sdn Bhd* delivered ten years ago, I am afraid I am still of the same view regarding the approach that the court has to take in view of s 3(1) of the Civil Law Act 1956, the effect of the provision and the proviso thereto and the decision to accept claims for pure economic loss in negligence in limited cases, considering the local circumstances. However, I shall not venture to say where the line should be drawn. It may be said that this will lead to uncertainty in the law. The answer to that is that this whole area of common law itself is fraught with uncertainty”²⁰

The proposed dissertation will cover the following areas / issues: -

- a) To critically analyze the nature, history, concept and development of pure economic loss. The thesis will focus on theories, arguments and concepts by academicians²¹ and from case-law decisions²²;
- b) To critically analyze the development on pure economic loss in England, Malaysia and other Commonwealth jurisdiction²³;
- c) To critically analyze the correct jurisprudential approach on the recoverability of economic loss in Malaysia; whether it is recoverable or not; and whether it should be recoverable or not. In ascertaining the correct jurisprudential approach on the recoverability of economic loss from the Malaysian perspective, the thesis hopes to offer its own theory on the concept of pure economic loss, and will attempt to offer some suggestions to overcome the problems relating to the application of the law on pure economic loss in the construction industry, perhaps

²⁰ *Ibid.* at p. 421.

²¹ There appears to be two opposing camps in the views of the academicians – one group is pro-*Donoghue v Stevenson*, whilst the other pro-*Dutton* and *Anns*. There is also a group of so-called neutrals, preferring to accept both sides of the argument.

²² Lord Bridge’s Complex Structure Theory in *D&F Estates*.

²³ New Zealand, Australia, Canada and Singapore.