MAYER HOLDINGS LTD: NOW, IT IS GLOVES OFF AS FAR AS THIS COMPANY'S MANAGEMENT IS CONCERNED

The former Company Secretary, Chief Financial Officer and Authorised Representative of Mayer Holdings Ltd () (Code: 1116, Main Board, The Stock Exchange of Hongkong Ltd) has been sued in the High Court of the Hongkong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) of the People's Republic of China (PRC) by the publicly listed company in which he, once, held a high executive position.

He is Mr Tommy Chan Lai Yin () whose address is given in HKSAR Writ of Summons, Number 156 of 2015, as being:

21C, Paramount Mansion, Number Two, Shan Kwong Road, Hongkong Island.

On October 9, 2014, at a Board Meeting of the Plaintiff to this Action (Mayer Holdings Ltd), it was resolved *'that the duties of the Defendant* (Mr Tommy Chan Lai Yin) *as the Company Secretary of the Plaintiff and all other executive functions (if any) within the Group be suspended with immediate effect,'* according to the Statement of Claim, attached the Writ of Summons, Number 156.

Mayer Holdings Ltd is in the business of the producing steel sheets and steel pipes, used in the manufacture of products, such as sports equipment and spare parts of household appliances and motor vehicles.

On October 16, 2014, Mr Tommy Chan Lai Yin was removed as the Company Secretary, Chief Financial Officer and Authorised Person of Mayer Holdings Ltd, it is stated at Paragraph Six of the Statement of Claim.

About 10 days later, Mayer Holdings Ltd sent in a team of between six and seven professionals, including auditors, to visit the former office of the Defendant with a view to inspect the records of Mayer Holdings Ltd at that office.

Paragraph Seven of the Statement of Claim alleges, inter alia:

'In the end, it was discovered that a large number of assets and records of the Plaintiff and the Group have remained missing and they are set out in <u>Schedule I</u> hereto.'

The Statement of Claim continues by alleging that 'despite repeated requests and demands, the Defendant has wrongfully deprived the Plaintiff of any access to or possession of the items as set out in Schedule I'.

At Paragraph Nine, it is alleged that the Defendant maintained a computer server at his office and a laptop computer was discovered at his desk, but, once again, '*despite requests and demands*', the Defendant refused to disclose the relevant passwords for the computer server and/or the laptop.

Paragraphs ... <u>CLICK TO ORDER FULL ARTICLE</u>

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 <u>editor@targetnewspapers.com</u>. **TARGET** does not guarantee to publish readers' views, but reserves the right so to do subject to the laws of libel.