

ANNEX 4

TABLE OF MS LIYANI'S INCONSISTENCIES (DENOTED IN RED)

Legend: 1st Charge – LML 2nd Charge – Karl 3rd Charge – May Others

TABLE A: Items in the possession of LML and May

S/N	Item	Inconsistency	Statements	Case for the Defence	Trial: Examination-in-Chief	Trial: Cross-Examination
1st Charge – Items in the possession of Liew Mun Leong (“LML”)						
1.	Pioneer DVD player valued at S\$1,000	Whether she informed anyone that she would take the DVD player	Ng Lai Peng (“NLP”) told her to dispose of it because it was spoilt; Ms Liyani wanted to bring it back to Indonesia to fix it. 1 st statement: told NLP that she would take the DVD player back to Indonesia. 2 nd statement: did not tell anyone that she would take the DVD player.	Three to four years ago, NLP wanted to throw the DVD player away as it was broken. Ms Liyani asked NLP if she could get it fixed in Indonesia, and NLP said she could take it if she wanted to.	Obtained sometime in 2012 or 2013 from May’s room. NLP wanted to throw it away. Ms Liyani asked for the DVD player and NLP agreed. Ms Liyani intended to bring it back to Indonesia to fix it. ¹	She kept it without knowing what was wrong with the DVD player. She assumed it could be repaired in Indonesia. ² She asked NLP for permission to take the DVD player which was placed outside of the house. NLP said, “it’s up to you”. ³
2.	Brown Longchamp bag valued at S\$200	Where she found it	She found this in a luggage bag at a rubbish disposal area.	Five to six years ago, Ms Liyani found the bags as trash in a large black suitcase outside one of the houses at	Found in a big bag near the rubbish bin at 49D CL at the end of 2010 after renovation. ⁴	Maintained her account in EIC.

¹ ROP, pp 1689–1690.
² ROP, p 182.
³ ROP, p 2111.
⁴ ROP, p 1711.

S/N	Item	Inconsistency	Statements	Case for the Defence	Trial: Examination-in-Chief	Trial: Cross-Examination
3.	Blue Longchamp bag valued at S\$200			Chancery Lane. It was worn-out and used.		
3rd Charge – Items in the possession of May Liew (“May”)						
4.	One leather “Vacheron Constantin” watch with unknown value	How she obtained it	2 nd statement: gift from her friend Diah in 2013 – 14. 5 th statement: picked it up from May’s trash .	Cannot recall if photo shown during statement taking. May threw away a number of items after she moved back from London, including a small lady’s watch with cross on watch face with black colour on the inside, with white frame and a black leather strap. May confirmed she wanted to throw the item away when asked by Ms Liyani.	In 2011 or 2012, May discarded the watch after sorting things from storage facility. Ms Liyani took it from May’s rubbish bin . ⁵	Explaining her answer in her 2 nd statement (that it was gift from Diah), she said the photo was blurry and she did not recognise it: <i>“At that point of time, I was given blurry photograph. I did not recognise the item well. Then after my lawyer and I went to see the item clearly. I then know that I --- that item I picked up from May Liew dustbin.”</i> ⁶
5.	One white coloured “Swatch” watch with orange coloured design valued at S\$75	How she obtained it	2 nd statement: gift from her friend Diah in 2013–14. 5 th statement: picked it up from May’s trash .	Not shown photo, unable to provide defence.	Found it in a rubbish bin , but cannot remember if it was from LML’s or May’s bin. She saw it was not working, and so she kept them. ⁷	Explaining her answer in her 2 nd statement (that it was gift from Diah), she said the photo was blurry and she did not recognise it. <i>“During the recording statement, I was given a blurry picture or photograph. So I did not recognise the items clearly. But after my lawyer and I went to the</i>

⁵ ROP, p 1693.

⁶ ROP, p 2213.

⁷ ROP, pp 1694–1695.

S/N	Item	Inconsistency	Statements	Case for the Defence	Trial: Examination-in-Chief	Trial: Cross-Examination
						<i>police station and open up all the items one by one, then I realized that item I picked up from the dustbin.”⁸</i>
6.	One silver-coloured ring with blue shiny stones valued at S\$150	Whether she found it from May’s trash, or obtained from May directly	2 nd statement: May asked her to throw it away in 2009 and she kept it for herself. 5 th statement: picked it up from May's trash.	Not able to provide defence as she was shown an assortment of accessories during statement taking but does not remember the specific ring.	Picked from May’s rubbish bin in 2011 or 2012 and kept it for her niece. ⁹	Found the item in May’s rubbish bin in 2012 (est.). Does not know whom it belongs to. May was present when she took the item from the rubbish bin.
7.	One pair of silver-coloured earrings with white opaque stone valued at S\$150	Whether she found it from May’s trash, or obtained from May directly	2 nd statement: May asked her to throw it away in 2009 and she kept it for herself. 5 th statement: picked it from May's trash.	Not able to provide defence as she was shown an assortment of accessories during statement taking but does not remember the specific earrings. It is “possible” that this was from May’s trash, and that May confirmed she wanted to throw it away when Ms Liyani asked.	Picked from May’s rubbish bin in 2011 or 2012 and kept it for her niece. ¹⁰	Found the item in May’s rubbish bin in 2012 (est.). Does not know whom it belongs to. May was present when she took the item from the rubbish bin. Explained the answer in her 2 nd statement by saying that the IO asked her about all the items together, by showing a picture with all the items together: <i>“because just --- the IO just asked me not one by one, but put it all together same --- I mean, whole picture together and then the answer also --- that’s why the answer from the beginning the same as ---</i>

⁸ ROP, p 2213.

⁹ ROP, p 1696.

¹⁰ ROP, p 1696.

S/N	Item	Inconsistency	Statements	Case for the Defence	Trial: Examination-in-Chief	Trial: Cross-Examination
						<p>same answer, 5 answers this time.¹¹</p> <p>When told that the above answer only explains why her answers were the same for various accessories, but does not explain the inconsistencies, she said: “I told the IO wrongly or incorrectly. I just give a roughly idea that it was 7 years ago.”</p> <p>When pressed on why she specifically said that May asked her to throw it away, “I did say that I took --- May Liew throw it away. And I picked it up from the dustbin.”¹²</p>
8.	One yellow coloured earring with one white opaque ball valued at S\$75	How she obtained it:	2nd statement: Bought it at an unknown shop in Lucky Plaza in around 2013 or 2014, at a price of 3 for \$10.	Shown an assortment of accessories during statement taking but has no specific recall of item. Ms Liyani owns a pair of yellow-coloured earring which the Police took away from her.	Picked from May’s rubbish bin in 2011 or 2012 and kept it for her niece. ¹³	Found the item in May’s rubbish bin in 2012 (est.). Does not know whom it belongs to. May was present when she took the item from the rubbish bin.

¹¹ ROP, p 2172.

¹² ROP, p 2173.

¹³ ROP, pp 1696–1697.

S/N	Item	Inconsistency	Statements	Case for the Defence	Trial: Examination-in-Chief	Trial: Cross-Examination
9.	An assortment of fashion accessories valued at S\$400	<p>How she obtained the assortment in general</p> <p>How she obtained P1-38: found in the trash (5th statement) vs bought from Lucky Plaza (testimony).</p>	<p>2nd statement: May asked her to throw away these accessories in 2009 and she kept them for herself.</p> <p>5th statement: found many of these accessories in May's trash.</p> <p>Purchased some items, specifically:</p> <p>(a) Ms Liyani said she bought the pearl hook earrings from the Taka shop at Marine Parade (A16, referring to Annex 2, page 6, picture 2), which is the same item as P1-33.</p> <p>(b) Ms Liyani said she found the single earring in the trash (A21, referring to Annex 2, page 7, picture 2), which is the same item as P1-38 (p 2827 of ROP).</p>	Part of the assortment belongs to her. The rest were retrieved from May's trash.	<p>Purchased P1-33 for \$10 from Taka Jewellery in Marine Parade. Purchased P1-38 from Lucky Plaza in 2010 (3 for \$10) – lost 1 side.</p> <p>Rest were picked from May's rubbish bin in 2011 or 2012 and kept it for her niece.¹⁴</p> <p>Pearl hook earrings: bought from Taka Jewellery at Marine Parade (on sale for \$10) in 2011.¹⁵</p> <p>Single earring: bought from Lucky Plaza (3 for \$10) in 2010.¹⁶</p>	<p>Found the items (save for P1-33 and P1-38) in May's rubbish bin in 2012 (est.). Does not know whom the items belong to. May was present when she took the items from the rubbish bin.</p> <p>Purchased P1-33 for \$10 from Taka Jewellery in Marine Parade. Purchased P1-38 from Lucky Plaza in 2010 (3 for \$10) – lost 1 side.</p> <p>Explained the answer in her 2nd statement by stating that the IO asked her about all the items together, by showing a picture with all the items together.</p> <p><i>“because just --- the IO just asked me not one by one, but put it all together same --- I mean, whole picture together and then the answer also --- that's why the answer from the beginning the same as --- same answer, 5 answers this time.”</i>¹⁷</p> <p>When told that above answer only explains why her</p>

¹⁴ ROP, pp 1697–1701.

¹⁵ ROP, p 1699.

¹⁶ ROP, p 1700.

¹⁷ ROP, p 2173.

S/N	Item	Inconsistency	Statements	Case for the Defence	Trial: Examination-in-Chief	Trial: Cross-Examination
						<p>answers were the same for various accessories, but does not explain the inconsistencies, she said: “I told the IO wrongly or incorrectly. I just give a roughly idea that it was 7 years ago.”</p> <p>When pressed on why she specifically said that May asked her to throw it away, “I did say that I took --- May Liew throw it away. And I picked it up from the dustbin.”¹⁸</p>
10.	One pair of black “Gucci” Sunglasses valued at S\$250	How she obtained it	<p>2nd statement: given to her by LML’s previous maid</p> <p>5th statement: found it in the cupboard of her room when she started working, and did not know whom it belonged to.</p>	<p>Found in her room when she moved into 49CL. Kept it in her room for eight years. She packed it in as she was in a hurry. She did not intend to take it dishonestly.</p>	<p>Found in her room when she started working at 49CL in 2007, does not know why it was there, she simply kept it.¹⁹</p>	<p>Maintained her account in EIC. Did not intend to bring the sunglasses back to Indonesia; she had packed in a rush.</p> <p>Disagreed that the answer in her statement dated 4 Dec 2016 (that LML’s previous maid gave it to her) referred to this pair of Gucci sunglasses.²⁰</p>

¹⁸ ROP, p 2173.
¹⁹ ROP, p 1701.
²⁰ ROP, pp 2181–2182 and 2184.

S/N	Item	Inconsistency	Statements	Case for the Defence	Trial: Examination-in-Chief	Trial: Cross-Examination
Others						
11.	N.A.	Reason for returning to Singapore	1 st statement: Planned to visit a friend and go sightseeing. ²¹ 5 th statement: Returned to get in touch with her agent, who had told her that they would try to find her another employer in Singapore. ²²			To seek employment. ²³ When confronted with her 1 st statement, she insisted she told the IO that she needed to see her agent. ²⁴
12.	NTUC Link Card belonging to “Nyan Min Soe”	When she received this	2 nd statement: “given the card to me to use when I want to buy items at NTUC sometime in 2009”. 5 th statement: “He passed to me before he went back in 2001 or 2002”.			
13.	3 jumbo boxes	Whether the three jumbo boxes were sealed	2 nd statement (at [A8]): “Thereafter I went to closed and sealed one of the boxes with tape while Robin went to closed and seal the other two boxes with tape.”	At [11]: After the first box was filled, the Accused helped Robin in taping that box. As the other boxes were filled, Robin then taped the two other boxes himself. The	Asserted that two out of her three boxes were unsealed when she left 49CL. ²⁵	When asked about her answer at [A8], she said: “At that point of time I did answer the I sealed one of the boxes and two other boxes. I didn’t know---I didn’t know whether it’s already been

²¹ Statement of Ms Liyani dated 3 December 2016 (A53)
²² Statement of Ms Liyani dated 29 May 2017 (A69).
²³ ROP, pp 1873–1874.
²⁴ ROP, pp 2133–2135.
²⁵ ROP, p 1868.

S/N	Item	Inconsistency	Statements	Case for the Defence	Trial: Examination-in-Chief	Trial: Cross-Examination
				Accused was ushered out of the house...		sealed or not” and claimed she did not give the answer in [A8]. ²⁶

TABLE B: Items in the possession of Karl

S/N	Item	Inconsistency	Statements	Case for the Defence	Trial: Examination-in-Chief	Trial: Cross-Examination
2nd Charge – Items in the possession of Karl Liew (“Karl”)						
14.	120 pieces of clothing valued at S\$150 each	Whether she had permission to take the 10 to 15 pieces of men’s clothing	In her 1 st and 2 nd statements, she admitted to taking 10 to 15 pieces of men’s clothing without informing LML / NLP.	There were less than 120 pieces of clothing. Some items were given by May’s husband (Jason) and NLP. Did not pack Karl’s clothes (which were from the black bag given to Jane) into the 3 Boxes.	Some of the clothes are from the black bag that Karl had given to the previous maid (Jane). ²⁷ Some of the clothes belong to her: (1) Cream polo t-shirt: bought from Toa Payoh for \$7 in 2011. ²⁸ (2) Black dress: bought at Holland Drive night market for \$1 in 2010. ²⁹ (3) Red t-shirt: bought for \$5 at Toa Payoh but cannot remember when. ³⁰ (4) Blue corduroy shirt: bought it for \$10 before starting work in Liew’s. ³¹	Explaining the statements about her admitting to taking 10 to 15 clothes without permission, <i>“What I meant during the police interview I did not ask permission during packing only, not during taking the clothes because I got permission by taking the clothes”</i> . ³² She stated that NLP had given her permission to take the clothes if Karl did not want the clothes. However, she did not check with Karl as to whether he wanted the 10-15

²⁶ ROP, pp 2208–2212.

²⁷ ROP, pp 1761–1765.

²⁸ ROP, p 1722.

²⁹ ROP, p 1720.

³⁰ ROP, p 1720.

³¹ ROP, p 1723.

³² ROP, p 2105.

S/N	Item	Inconsistency	Statements	Case for the Defence	Trial: Examination-in-Chief	Trial: Cross-Examination
						items of clothing before taking them. ³³
15.	One blanket valued at S\$500	How she obtained it	<p>1st statement: bought two blankets for \$10.</p> <p>2nd statement: bought one blanket for \$10 while the other blanket had been thrown away by the Liew.</p> <p>5th statement: bought two blankets for \$15, and found another in her room when she started working at 49CL.</p>	<p>Remembers being shown two blankets in statement-recording.</p> <p>Black blanket: NLP allowed her to take.</p> <p>White blanket: Purchased for \$15 at Jalan Ampang three years ago; she did not use it as it was for bringing back to Indonesia.</p>	<p>Sometime in 2012, May gave her the black blanket (came together with the white bedsheet and blue bedsheet) and said that she no longer had any need for it.³⁴</p>	<p>May gave her the white quilt, dark blanket and blue bedsheet. May said she no longer had use of them.</p> <p>Purchased the quilt cover from Ikea.³⁵</p>
16.	Three bedsheets valued at S\$100 each		<p>Bought one bedsheet from Ikea. Found another blue bedsheet in her room when she started working at 49CL.</p>	<p>Does not remember being shown bedsheets at statement-recording.</p> <p>Ms Liyani owns bedsheets bought from IKEA (white with stripes), and second-hand queen-sized bedsheets purchased from Jalan Ampang.</p> <p>NLP gave Ms Liyani three single-sized bedsheets, two of which were in Ms Liyani's sleeping area and had never been used (flower motif).</p>	<p>Purchased one bedsheet from 'IKEA' for \$49. The remaining two bedsheets were retrieved from May, who wanted to discard them. Does not know who placed the bedsheets in the 3 Boxes.</p>	<p>Purchased one bedsheet from 'IKEA' for \$49. Received the other two bedsheets from May, who intended to discard them.</p>

³³ ROP, pp 2106–2107.

³⁴ ROP, pp 1691–1692.

³⁵ ROP, pp 1835–1838.

S/N	Item	Inconsistency	Statements	Case for the Defence	Trial: Examination-in-Chief	Trial: Cross-Examination
17.	One Philips DVD player valued at S\$150	<p>Whether she intended to pack it into the boxes.</p> <p>Whether she told NLP that she would take it back to Indonesia.</p>	<p>NLP told her to dispose of it because it was spoilt; Ms Liyani wanted to bring it back to Indonesia to fix it.</p> <p>*Issue 1: 2nd statement: she personally placed the DVD player into the boxes; however, in her Case for the Defence (see next column), she claimed she did not remember packing or having an intention to pack the DVD player into the boxes.</p> <p>*Issue 2: 1st statement: told NLP that she would take the DVD player back to Indonesia.</p> <p>2nd statement: did not tell anyone that she would take the DVD player.</p>	<p>NLP allowed Ms Liyani to use it during her stay at the residence.</p> <p>Ms Liyani does not remember packing it into the 3 Boxes, or intending to pack it in.</p>	<p>Taken from storage facility, after renovation to 49CL in 2010. Ms Liyani asked NLP for TV and DVD player for the room, and NLP allowed her use of this DVD player. Used by Ms Liyani in her room every day.³⁶</p> <p>Did not intend to bring it back with her.³⁷</p>	<p>Explaining her answer in her 2nd statement (that she personally placed it into the boxes), she said that she said she placed it near the box (not into the box).</p> <p>Also, she did not know that one of the drivers eventually put it in the box.³⁸</p>
18.	An assortment of kitchenware and utensils valued at S\$300	Minor discrepancies as to cost of items.	<p>1st statement: Bought these items at the same secondhand shop at</p>	Spoons, teaspoons, big knife, small knife, ceramic pot were bought from Jalan Ampang second-hand shop.	Purchased utensils from 2 nd hand shop in Jalan Ampang (called Hock Siong) sometime between 2011 and 2013. ³⁹	Purchased the large stainless-steel pot for S\$49 from Toa Payoh Cash Convertors. ⁴³

³⁶ ROP, p 1690.

³⁷ ROP, pp 2142–2143.

³⁸ ROP, p 2144.

³⁹ ROP, p 1706.

⁴³ ROP, p 1839.

S/N	Item	Inconsistency	Statements	Case for the Defence	Trial: Examination-in-Chief	Trial: Cross-Examination
			<p>Macpherson where she bought the blankets.</p> <p>2nd statement: Bought the kitchenware and utensils from the secondhand shop at Jalan Ampang (except for a pot that she bought from NTUC), and gave a breakdown of the cost of the items (upon being confronted with the Liew family's claims that the kitchenware and utensils belonged to them).</p> <p>5th statement: Bought these items from a secondhand shop (at Jalan Ampang), and gave a breakdown of their cost similar to that provided in her 2nd statement.</p>	<p>Cooking pot with lid bought from NTUC.</p> <p>Stainless-steel pot bought from Toa Payoh.</p> <p>These items were stored outside her room in unsealed cardboard box and to be brought back to Indonesia.</p>	<p>Purchased the large stainless-steel pot for S\$39 from Toa Payoh Cash Convertors in 2012.⁴⁰</p> <p>Purchased the white ceramic pot from NTUC using NTUC points combined with \$10 cash in 2014.⁴¹</p> <p>Purchased pink knife from Toa Payoh Cash Convertors for \$15.⁴²</p>	<p>Generally maintained her account in EIC.</p> <p>Discrepancies between the costs reflected in Ms Liyani's statements vis-à-vis her testimony in Court are attributable to the recording officer's mistake(s).</p>
19.	One black "Gucci" wallet valued at S\$250 *removed from 2 nd charge	How she obtained the wallet	5 th statement: "cannot remember" how she obtained the wallet.	Given by "her friend".	Given by friend Diah in 2012. ⁴⁴ Could not recall at the time of her Police statement that she had received the wallet from Diah.	Given by friend Diah in 2012. ⁴⁵

⁴⁰ ROP, p 1702.

⁴¹ ROP, p 1704.

⁴² ROP, p 1705.

⁴⁴ ROP, p 1713.

⁴⁵ ROP, pp 1846–1847.

S/N	Item	Inconsistency	Statements	Case for the Defence	Trial: Examination-in-Chief	Trial: Cross-Examination
20.	One “Helix” watch valued at S\$50	Where she found the item	5 th statement: Found it in the cupboard of her room when she started working and did not know who it belonged to.	When moving out in 2009 for the renovations, Ms Liyani assisted Karl and Heather to pack and clean. Karl pointed to items in the dustbin as trash to be cleared. Ms Liyani brought down dustbin to carpark area to sort. The watch was in the dustbin as trash to be thrown away. Ms Liyani retrieved the watch as it was thrown away.	Before renovation of 49CL, found it in the rubbish bin in Karl’s room, so she took it and kept it. The straps were not in good condition and watch was not moving. She wanted to replace the battery. ⁴⁶	Explaining her answer in her 5 th statement (that she found it in the cupboard of her room), she said that she did not give this answer about the Helix watch. She had only given this account for the Gucci sunglasses.
21.	Two white iPhone 4 mobile phones with accessories valued at S\$2,056	Whether iPhones were found with accessories	Found iPhone and accessories in Karl’s trash outside 49CL, when Karl was moving out of 39CL.	Found in trash when Karl moved to 39CL. Ms Liyani retrieved the iPhones (without accessories).	Picked out from black plastic bag of rubbish at 49CL on the day after Heather and Karl’s move to 39CL. ⁴⁷ Did not find the accessories in the rubbish bags, and does not know how the accessories got into her possession.	Maintained account in EIC. ⁴⁸

⁴⁶ ROP, p 1733.

⁴⁷ ROP, p 1730.

⁴⁸ ROP, p 1887.