

**SUNCORP TECHNOLOGIES LTD:
THE TALLY OF CLAIMS PLUS ONE**

[SunCorp Technologies Ltd \(\)](#) (Code: 1063, Main Board, The Stock Exchange of Hongkong Ltd) will have to recalculate, once again, its financial position, following the filing in the High Court of the Hongkong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) of the People's Republic of China (PRC) of Action, Number 2287.

Because this Action brings the number of alleged Claims against SunCorp Technologies and/or its Group of Companies to at least 57, while the total amount of money, allegedly owed to those 57 Plaintiffs, to not less than \$HK70 million.

The latest Action is between Tianma Microelectronics Company Ltd () of Shenzhen, the PRC, proper, being distinct and separate from the HKSAR of the PRC, and SunCorp Industrial Ltd (), a wholly owned subsidiary of SunCorp Technologies Ltd.

The Statement of Claim, attached to Writ of Summons, Number 2287, is just 2 paragraphs long and reads as follows:

'1. The Plaintiff claims against the Defendant for the sum of HK\$8,365,570.65 being the amount due and owing by the Defendant to the Plaintiff for goods sold and delivered, particulars whereof have already been served to the registered address of the Defendant on the 28th day of October 2008.

PARTICULARS

'Particulars of the said sum of HK\$8,365,570.65 being the amount due and owing by the Defendant to the Plaintiff are set out in Schedule attached hereto.

'2. Further the Plaintiff is entitled to claim and does claim interests on the said sum of HK\$8,365,570.65 at the rate of 8.25% per annum from the date of Writ to the date of Judgment pursuant to the provisions of section 48 of the High Court Ordinance (Cap. 4).

'AND the Plaintiff claims:

- (1) HK\$8,365,570.65;*
- (2) interests pursurant(sic) to section 48 of the High Court Ordinance (Cap. 4); and*
- (3) costs.'*

It would appear that the general administration of the Plaintiff is not, exactly, up to scratch because it is stated, in the Schedule, attached to the Statement of Claim, that some goods had been delivered to the Defendant in December 2008!

No doubt, this date should have been December 2007 and, in due course, an amendment to the Statement of Claim in respect of the dates of alleged deliveries will be lodged, **TARGET** () assumes.

Aside ... [CLICK TO ORDER FULL ARTICLE](#)

*While **TARGET** makes every attempt to ensure accuracy of all data published, **TARGET** cannot be held responsible for any errors and/or omissions.*

*If readers feel that they would like to voice their opinions about that which they have read in **TARGET**, please feel free to e-mail your views to editor@targetnewspapers.com. **TARGET** does not guarantee to publish readers' views, but reserves the right so to do subject to the laws of libel.*