



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

The legal conditionality of performance bond in Malaysian construction contract

Supardi, Azizan and Adnan, Hamimah and Yaakob,
Jamaluddin

Universiti Teknologi MARA

2007

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/33904/>
MPRA Paper No. 33904, posted 19 Oct 2011 17:52 UTC

THE LEGAL CONDITIONALITY OF PERFORMANCE BOND IN MALAYSIAN CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT

Azizan Supardi¹, Hamimah Adnan² and Jamaluddin Yaakob³

^{1,2} Department of Quantity Surveying, Faculty of Architecture, Planning and Surveying, Universiti Teknologi MARA, 40450 Shah Alam, Malaysia

³ Department of Quantity Surveying, Faculty of Built Environment, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, 81310 Skudai, Johor, Malaysia

¹E-mail: zzan_65@yahoo.com

³E-mail: contrmgmt@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

In construction contracts, a 'performance bond' is a bond taken out by the contractor, usually with a bank or insurance company (in return for payment of a premium), for the benefit of and at the request of the employer, in a stipulated maximum sum of liability and enforceable by the employer in the event of the contractor's default, repudiation or insolvency. There are two types of performance bonds: Conditional bond or default bond; and Unconditional bond or on-demand bond. However, in Malaysia, the question of whether the performance bond in a construction contract is a conditional or an unconditional guarantee is still one of the issues relating to performance bond that has been discussed. Therefore, the objective of this research is to determine the phrase(s) in the Performance Bond in a construction contract that determine whether the performance bond is a conditional or unconditional on demand guarantee. In order to achieve this objective, the research was conducted by analyzing relevant court cases. From the findings, it can be concluded that unless an undisputed meaning of the words in the performance bond to make the performance bond to be purely conditional or unconditional 'on-demand' bond, most court interpreted performance bond to be an on-demand performance bond which is only conditional upon the beneficiary asserting the basis of the claim upon the issuer of the bond contending that there has been breach of contract.

Keywords: Performance Bond, Conditional Bond, Unconditional on-demand Bond, Malaysian Construction Contract

Introduction

A performance bond is a bond giving security for the carrying out of a contract, where a bond is a deed by which one person (the obligator) commits himself to another (the obligee) to do something or refrain from doing something (Martin, 2003). In construction contracts, a 'performance bond' is a bond taken out by the contractor, usually with a bank or insurance company (in return for payment of a premium), for the benefit of and at the request of the employer, in a stipulated maximum sum of liability and enforceable by the employer in the event of the contractor's default, repudiation or insolvency (Robinson et al. 1996).

There are two types of performance bond. The distinction between conditional and unconditional 'on demand' guarantee is discussed in the case of *China Airlines Ltd v Maltran Air Corp Sdn Bhd (formerly known as Maltran Air Services Corp Sdn Bhd) and Another Appeal* [1996] 2 MLJ 517 and later is agreed upon in the case of *Government of Malaysia v South East Asia Insurance Bhd* [2000] 3 MLJ 625. In the former case, the court cited that:

A bank guarantee is a performance bond. There are two types of performance bond. The first type is a conditional bond whereby the guarantor becomes liable upon proof of a breach of the terms of the

principal contract by the principal and the beneficiary sustaining loss as a result of such breach. The guarantor's liability will therefore arise as a result of the principal's default. The second type is an unconditional or 'on demand' performance bond which is so drafted that the guarantor will become liable merely when demand is made upon him by the beneficiary with no necessity for the beneficiary to prove any default by the principal in performance of the principal contract.

However, in Malaysia, for the past 20 years and since the famous *Teknik Cekap Sdn Bhd v Public Bank Berhad* [1995] 3 MLJ 449 to the recent *Suharta Development Sdn Bhd v United Overseas Bank (M) Bhd & Anor* [2005] 2 MLJ 762, the question of whether the performance bond in a construction contract is a conditional or an unconditional guarantees is still one of the issues relating to performance bond that been discussed.

In *Suharta Development Sdn Bhd v United Overseas Bank (M) Bhd & Anor* [2005] 2 MLJ 762, Abdul Wahab Said Ahmad JC stated that:

A performance bond or guarantee is in fact a written contract to guarantee due performance in the event of breach or non performance of the contract. In determining whether it is conditional or otherwise, the court is concerned with the contractual construction or interpretation of the bond or guarantee itself. A great deal depends on the wording of the guarantee itself to discover the intention of the parties.

*The defendant contended that the terms of the guarantee is conditional and cited *Teknik Cekap Sdn Bhd v Public Bank Bhd* [1995] 3 MLJ 449 whilst the plaintiff relied on *LEC Contractors (M) Sdn Bhd* (formerly known as *Lotterworld Engineering & Construction Sdn Bhd*) v *Castle Inn Sdn Bhd & Anor* [2000] 3 MLJ 339. In both the cases the terms of the bond are similar to that in the case before me. The Court of Appeal in *Teknik Cekap Sdn Bhd* held the bond to be conditional but in *LEC Contractors (M) Sdn Bhd* held it is an on demand bond.*

*In *LEC Contractors (M) Sdn Bhd Mokhtar Sidin JCA* distinguished the case of *Teknik Cekap* and at p 358 said:*

*That is the position of an on demand performance bond. It is clear to us that the bank guarantee in the present appeal is a performance bond. From the wordings of the guarantee it is clear to us that it is 'on demand' performance bond as stated in *Esso Petroleum Malaysia Inc v Kago Petroleum Sdn Bhd*: 'All that was required to trigger them was a demand in writing'; or in the words of *Mohamed Dzaidin FCJ* in the case of *China Airlines Ltd v Maltran AirCorp Sdn Bhd*: 'the guarantor will become liable merely when demand is made upon the beneficiary with no necessity for the beneficiary to prove any default by the principal in performance of the principal contract'.*

*The appellant claimed that the bank guarantee is a conditional bond. To support this contention learned counsel for the appellant referred to the case of *Teknik Cekap*, a decision of this court where the court held that a performance bond was a conditional bond. It was held by the court that because the bond began the words: 'If the subcontractor ... shall in any respect fail to execute the contract or commit any breach of his obligations thereunder then the guarantor shall pay'. Apparently this is the case in Malaysia where similar wordings has been used where the court has held*

that it was a conditional bond.

From the above case, therefore, it is important to determine the content of the performance bond: whether the client can call upon the bond in the case of non-performance of the contractor or can the bank restraint the client from calling the bond among other. So, the phrase(s) in the bond shall be the issue of discussion.

This phrase(s) should also be in written form. A clear written phrase(s) that make up the content of the performance bond can clear the distinction between conditional and unconditional on demand guarantee.

Hence it is important and necessary to understand the circumstances in performance bond, which will be available to the parties to a building contract. And from that, the parties involved will clearly defined their rights and liability against bonds and guarantee to assist the respective party in construction contract (Ismail, 2007).

Research Objective

As such, this research has the objective to determine the phrase(s) in the Performance Bond in a construction contract that determine whether the performance bond is a conditional or an unconditional on demand guarantee. By clearing this issue, it is hoped that no more dispute will arise under the interpretation of the content of the Performance Bond especially in a construction contract.

Literature Review


The success of a construction project is measured by its timely completion to specification within the budget allocated. However, in the execution of any engineering project there is invariably an element of risk involved (Radhakrihnan, 1999): that is to say, construction is a highly risky business, where the level of risk is considered much higher than in other types of economic activities (Abdul-Rashid, 2004).

All parties take some form of risk when they enter into construction contract. The acceptance of an obligation brings with it the acceptance of a commensurate risk, i.e. the risk of being unable to fulfill the obligation because one's own inadequacy, incapacity, inadvertence or error, or because of interference from outside sources or supervening events (Robinson et al. 1996).

Risks are inevitable and cannot be eliminated. They can, however, be transferred (Murdoch and Hughes, 2000). One of the main roles of a contract is to distribute risks between the parties. Standard forms of contracts contained express risks distributing provisions. Risk transferring contracts commonly exist between the various parties concerned in construction (Robinson et al. 1996).

In the context of public infrastructure work in Malaysia, one major risk to the Government is non-performance of construction contracts by the contractors (Abdul-Rashid, 2004). Performance bond, however, is a legal and management instrument used by employers to manage risk with respect to contractor's nonperformance.

In construction contracts, a 'performance bond' is a bond taken out by the contractor, usually with a bank or insurance company (in return for payment of a premium), for the benefit of and at the request of the employer, in a stipulated maximum sum of liability and enforceable by the employer in the event of the contractor's default, repudiation or insolvency (Robinson et al. 1996). These relationships can be illustrated in Figure 1.




Source: (Fong, 2004a)

Figure 1: Relationships of Parties to a Bond and the Underlying Contract

In Malaysia, most of the need of a performance bond is made through an agreement between the Government, the contractor and a third party (usually a bank or insurance company), whereby the third party agrees to pay a sum of money to the Government, in the event of non-performance of the construction contract by the contractor (Abdul-Rashid, 2004). It is provided in Clause 37(a) of the *P.W.D. Form 203A (Rev. 10/83) Standard Form of Contract to be Used Where Bills of Quantities Form Part of the Contract* that the Contractor shall either deposit with the Government a performance bond in cash or alternatively by way of a Treasury's Deposit or Banker's Draft or approved Banker's or Insurance Guarantee equal to 5% of the Contract Sum as a condition precedent to the commencement of work. In other words, the Contractor is not permitted to carry out any work under the Contract unless and until the performance bond is given. The failure of the Contractor to give the performance bond may amount to a fundamental breach of contract entitling the Government to discharge the Contract and sue the Contractor for damages accordingly (Fong, 2004b).

The validity period of the performance bond is as indicated in Figure 2 below. By clause 37(b), the performance bond is required to be maintained for such period as provided in the PWD Bond, i.e. until 6 months after the expiry of the Defects Liability Period stated in the Contract calculated from the date of completion of the Works or any authorized extension thereto or if the contract is determined, until one year after the date of determination (Fong, 2004b).



Source: (Abdul-Rashid, 2004)

Figure 2: Time line indicating the validity period of the performance bond

Rekhraj J in the case of *Lotterworld Engineering & Construction Sdn Bhd v Castle Inn Sdn Bhd & Anor* [1998] 7 MLJ 105 stated that the purpose of performance bond is as follows:

It is to be understood that the purpose of the performance bond in the construction industry is to perform the role of an effective safeguards against non-performance, inadequate performance or delayed performance and its production provides a security as readily available to be realized, when the prescribed event occurs, viz a viz simply failing to complete the work which had been contracted to carry out.

The purpose of a bond is therefore to provide the employer with some financial security in the form of a cash payable by the bank for the contractor's failure to perform his obligation under the construction contract.

Whether or not a contractor is required to provide performance bond depends on the terms of the contract. In Malaysia, as in the above definition, Clause 37(a) of the *P.W.D. Form 203A (Rev. 10/83) Standard Form of Contract to be Used Where Bills of Quantities Form Part of the Contract* states that the Contractor shall either deposit with the Government a performance bond in cash or alternatively by way of a Treasury's Deposit or Banker's Draft or approved Banker's or Insurance Guarantee equal to 5% of the Contract Sum as a condition precedent to the commencement of work. In other words, the Contractor is not permitted to carry out any work under the Contract unless and until the performance bond is given. The failure of the Contractor to give the performance bond may amount to a fundamental breach of contract entitling the Government to discharge the Contract and sue the Contractor for damages accordingly (Fong, 2004b). However, it is not the only places where performance bond is mentioned.

Under Clause 10 of the Conditions of Tendering in the *Form of Tender (PWD 203B Rev. 1/82)* states the following:

The successful tenderer shall so soon as it practicable but before the commencement of the Works deposit with the Superintending Officer Performance Bond amounting to 5% of the Contract Sum;

Another place where the requirement of performance bond is mandatory before commencement of contractor's works is under Clause 4 of the *Letter of Acceptance (PWD 203D – Rev. 1/82)*, which states:

I wish to draw your attention to the Conditions of Tendering whereby as conditions precedent to the commencement of the Works, you are required to deposit with the Government or the Superintending Officer Performance Bond amounting (being 5% of the Contract Sum) in cash or in the form of Treasury's Deposit, Banker's Draft or an approved banker's or Insurance Guarantee.

It is also unusual for private projects to require the contract to provide performance bond. Performance Bond, however, is the precondition for:

- ***Taking possession of site***

By Clause 38(a) of the *P.W.D. Form 203A (Rev. 10/83) Standard Form of Contract to be Used Where Bills of Quantities Form Part of the Contract* it is made clear that even if possession of the Site has been given, the Contractor cannot commence work unless and until the performance bond and the insurance policies required under the Contract have been deposited with the Government or the Superintending Officer. Thus if the Contractor delays in depositing the performance bond or insurance, he does so at his own peril as the time available for the execution of the Works under the Contract would be ticking away (Fong, 2004b).

- ***Advance payment***
The advance payment is paid to the Contractor upon application from him together with a bank or insurance guarantee for the amount of advance to be paid, and provided that he has returned the Letter of Acceptance duly signed and witnessed, and submitted the Performance Bond and the requisite insurance policies required by the Contract (Jabatan Kerja Raya, 1988).
- ***First interim payment***
It is further provided that, other than for the first Interim Certificate, the Superintending Officer need not issue further Interim Certificates unless and until the Contractor has returned to the Government the Letter of Acceptance of Tender duly signed by the Contractor, and has deposited with him or the Government the insurance policies and performance bond required under clauses 33, 34, 36 and 37 of these Conditions in the *P.W.D. Form 203A (Rev. 10/83) Standard Form of Contract to be Used Where Bills of Quantities Form Part of the Contract* respectively (Fong, 2004b).

There are two types of performance bonds, as set out below (Robinson et al. 1996):

- ***Conditional bond or default bond.*** A default bond is a contract of guarantee whereby the surety accepts 'joint and several' responsibility for the performance of the contractor's obligations under the building contract: the contractor remains primarily liable for his performance and not protected by the bond.
- ***Unconditional bond or on-demand bond.*** An on-demand bond is a covenant by the surety (usually a bank) to indemnify the employer following contractor's default, subject to stated terms and up to a sum commonly between 10 and 20% of the main contract sum. The contractor is not a party to this arrangement.

A sample of a conditional performance bond can be found in the case of *Teknik Cepak Sdn Bhd v Public Bank Berhad* [1995] 3 MLJ 449 as follows:

If the sub-contractor (unless relieved from the performance of any clause of the contract or by statute or by the decision of a tribunal of competent jurisdiction) shall in any respect fail to execute the contract or commit any breach of his obligations thereunder then the guarantor shall pay to the contractor up to and not exceeding the sum of RM422,000 (Malaysian Ringgit four hundred twenty two thousand) only representing 10% of the contract value or such part thereof on the contractor's demand notwithstanding any contestation or protest by the sub-contractor or by the guarantor or by any other third party, provided always that the total of all partial demands so made shall not exceed the sum of RM422,000 (Malaysian Ringgit four hundred twenty two thousand) only and that the guarantor's liability to pay the contractor as aforesaid shall correspondingly be reduced proportionate to any partial demand having been made as aforesaid.

On the other hand, a sample of an unconditional on demand performance bond can be found in the case of *Kirames Sdn Bhd v Federal Land Development Authority* [1991] 2 MLJ 198 as follows:

We, Jerneh Insurance Corporation Sdn Bhd Limited, having the registered office at 7th Floor, Wisma MISC, No 2, Jalan Conlay, Kuala Lumpur do hereby irrevocable and absolutely guarantee that the sum of Ringgit 117,535 by way of security deposit under the said contract shall be paid to you by us as per the following terms:

- (a) the said sum of Ringgit 117,535 shall be paid by us forthwith on demand by you in writing without your having to assign any reason whatsoever for such demand;*

- (b) *the said sum of Ringgit 117,535 shall be paid by us forthwith to you irrespective of whether or not there is any dispute between the said contract and yourselves (the Authority) in respect of or relating to the said contract or in respect of any other matter and irrespective of whether or not such said dispute, if any, has been settled, resolved, litigated or adjudicated upon otherwise howsoever.*

Thus it is seen in the above samples that the main distinction between the two types of bond is with respect to the requirements for making call on the bond. In conditional performance bond, the beneficiary must comply with conditions precedent for calling the bond. In on demand performance bond, on the other hands, the only condition precedent for calling the bond is a written notice to the guarantor.

In order to determine the construction of a performance bond, Sir Denys Buckley stipulated in the case of *IE Contractors Ltd v Lloyds Bank PLC, and Rafidain Bank* [1990] 2 Lloyd's Rep 496, SI Build LR 1 that:

I am in entire agreement with the proposition that to discover what the parties intended should trigger the indemnity under the bond involves a straightforward exercise of construction, or interpretation, of the bond to discover the intention of the parties in that respect.

Research Methodology

The main aim of paper is analyzing and commenting the content of the Performance Bond in relation to whether it is a conditional or an unconditional on demand guarantee through the legal point of view from the examples of judgment held in law cases. By using the words 'Performance Bond', 67 cases for the past 20 years were downloaded from the Malayan Law Journal and analyzed further. From the first reading and screening of the above cases, the judge of 25 cases did interpret the distinction between 'conditional' and 'unconditional' Performance Bond. Further screening was done from the 25 cases whereby only cases which the judge discussed on the wordings or phrase(s) of the Performance Bond were further analyzed. This made 15 cases were identified and further consumed.

Data Analysis

The judgment of fifteen law cases had been analysed to differentiate the conditionality of the performance bond by its wordings. Some of the cases held that the performance bonds were conditional performance bond and some of them held the performance bond to be unconditional 'on-demand' performance bond. However, some interesting conclusion can be made from the words in the performance bond.

- **Law Cases No. 1**

In *Suharta Development Sdn Bhd v United Overseas Bank (M) Bhd & Anor* [2005] 2 MLJ 762, Abdul Wahab Said Ahmad JC followed *LEC Contractors (M) Sdn Bhd (formerly known as Lotterworld Engineering & Construction Sdn Bhd) v Castle Inn Sdn Bhd & Anor* [2000] 3 MLJ 339, and hold this guarantee is an unconditional on demand guarantee.

- **Law Cases No. 2**

In *Daewoo Engineering & Construction Co Ltd v The Titular Roman Catholic Archbishop of Kuala Lumpur* [2004] 7 MLJ 136, Abdul Wahab Said Ahmad JC stated that:

I agree with the learned defendant's counsel that the Letter of Guarantee seen in isolation is payable on demand because of the presence of the no contestation clause, i.e. 'notwithstanding any contestation or protest by the contractor or by the guarantor or by any third party.'

- **Law Cases No. 3**

In *Sime Engineering Sdn Bhd & Anor v Public Bank Berhad* [2004] 7 MLJ 475, Vincent Ng J stated that:

The area of law concerning bank guarantees is well established; in the absence of fraud, the bank is obliged to pay on the guarantee promptly on demand.

- **Law Cases No. 4**

In *Danaharta Managers Sdn Bhd v Huang Ee Hoe & Ors* [2002] 2 MLJ 424, Kang Hwee Gee J impliedly followed Mohamed Dzaidin FCJ (as he then was) in *Government of Malaysia v South East Asia Insurance Bhd* [2000] 3 MLJ 625, held at p 636B that:

In our judgment, on its true construction this Gerenti Pelaksanaan is and unconditional bond or an on demand bond and all that is required to activate it is a written demand (Easal). It is simply a performance bond whereby the insurance company guarantees performance by the Contractor of the works under the said contract, and in the event of non performance or any breach of the terms thereof, the insurance company undertakes to pay the Government a sum not exceeding RM420,645 upon a formal demand. (Emphasis added)

- **Law Cases No. 5**

As the previous case, in *Government of Malaysia v South East Asia Insurance Bhd* [2000] 3 MLJ 625, Mohamed Dzaidin FCJ, following Ackner LJ in *Easal (Commodities) Ltd v Oriental Credit Ltd; Banque Du Caire SA v Wells Fargo Bank NA* [1985] 2 Lloyd's Rep 546, further stated that:

*Paragraph 1 is so drafted that the guarantor shall become liable merely when demand is made by the Government notwithstanding any contestation or protest by the contractor or the guarantor or by any third party. It is clear that the overall purpose of the Insurance Guarantee is for the reimbursement of the advance payment of RM1,069,035, less whatever amounts of payment made by the guarantor and deductions out of the progress payments under paras 3 and 4 upon a written demand made. In *Esal*, the bank 'undertake to pay the said amount on your written demand in the event that the supplier fails to execute the contract'. It was held that the latter words did not alter the fact that the moneys were payable upon a written demand. Likewise, in the present case, the words 'notwithstanding any contestation or protest by the contractor or by ourselves or by any other third party' in para 1 above, do not alter the fact that the money is payable on a written demand under and pursuant to the said Insurance Guarantee. Therefore, on its true construction this Insurance Guarantee is an on demand performance bond.*

- **Law Cases No. 6**

In *LEC Contractors (M) Sdn Bhd (formerly known as Lotterworld Engineering & Construction Sdn Bhd) v Castle Inn Sdn Bhd & Anor* [2000] 3 MLJ 339, Mokhtar Sidin JCA referred to several cases (*Teknik Cekap Sdn Bhd v Public Bank Bhd* [1995] 3 MLJ 449, *Damatar Paints (P) Ltd v Indian Oil Corp* AIR 1982 Delhi 57, *Pesticides India v State Chemicals & Pharmaceuticals Corp of India* AIR 1982 Delhi 78, *China Airlines Ltd v Maltran Air Corp Sdn Bhd (formerly known as Maltran Air Services Corp Sdn Bhd)* and another appeal [1996] 2 MLJ 517, *Esal (Commodities) Ltd and Esso Petroleum Malaysia Inc v Kago Petroleum Sdn Bhd*), and therefore stated that:

From the authorities we have referred earlier it is clear to us that to determine whether a performance bond is a conditional or unconditional bond, the court should not be concerned whether there was actual breach being committed or not. It is for the parties to litigate as to whom the blame is to be placed. The court is only concerned whether on the wordings of the bond, it is an on demand bond. If it is so then the bank has

to pay the person whom it guaranteed. The only exception to this is in the case of fraud which comes to the notice of the bank. As we have said earlier it is clear to us that this is an on demand performance bond. A proper demand had been made and as such the bank (second defendant) is obliged to pay the first defendant the amount stated in the bond. As to whether the plaintiff or the first defendant was at fault is not the concern of the bank. That dispute is for the parties to the contract to settle either by arbitration or by litigation in court. The bank has no choice but to pay the amount demanded. The first defendant is entitled to that sum not under the contract but under the performance bond.

- **Law Cases No. 7**

In *Fasda Heights Sdn Bhd v Soon Ee Sing Construction Sdn Bhd & Anor* [1999] 4 MLJ 199, Steve Shim J, while referring to *Bocotra Construction Pte Ltd v A-G (No 2)* [1995] 2 SLR 733 (CA), *Esal (Commodities) Ltd & Reltor Ltd v Oriental Credit Ltd & Wells Fargo Bank NA* [1985] 2 AC 546, *IE Contractors Ltd v Lloyd's Bank plc & Rafidain Bank* and *Teknik Cekap*, stated that:

From the contents therein, it is clear that the plaintiff had asserted positively that the contractor had failed to execute the works under the building contract. There was also annexed to the letters of demand two certificates issued by the architect. In my view, the assertions as reflected in the two letters of demand were sufficient 'to trigger off the guarantee' (in the words of Shaik Daud JCA in Teknik Cekap) and on that basis, it is clear that the condition stipulated in the bank guarantee had been complied with and therefore the second defendant (bank) had no option but to release the monies to the plaintiff. In the circumstances, it was wrong for the second defendant to withhold or refuse to pay the monies to the plaintiff when the demand was made on the bank guarantee at the material time.

- **Law Cases No. 8**

In *Lotterworld Engineering & Construction Sdn Bhd v Castle Inn Sdn Bhd & Anor* [1998] 7 MLJ 165, Rekhraj J referred to *Edward Owen Engineering Ltd v Barclays Bank International Ltd & Anor* [1978] QB 159 and *Re Esal (Commodities) Ltd* [1985] BCLC 450 stated that:

The performance bond was procured by the plaintiff to the first named defendant and the plaintiff was fully aware of the choice of words expressing the intention -- that it was payable, notwithstanding any contestation or protest by the contractor. It would be superfluous to submit now that it was not so intended and that the payment was subject to a dispute being decided because s 94 of the Evidence Act 1950, which reads -- 'when language used in a document is plain (ie unambiguous) in itself and when it applies accurately to existing facts, evidence may not be given to show that it was not meant to apply to such facts'. The words of the performance bond are clear in the context and consistent with an immediate undertaking to pay on written demand without any protest by the plaintiff, in that, the beneficiary is entitled to forfeit the cash deposit -- if such had been obtained or in the case of a bond, an advantage to immediate payment before the underlying dispute is determined either by trial or by arbitration'. This court will not therefore attribute an intention contrary to the plain meaning of the words used to attach liability towards payment upon demand.

- **Law Cases No. 9**

In *Ramal Properties Sdn Bhd v East West-Umi Insurance Sdn Bhd* [1998] 5 MLJ 233, Kamalanathan Ratnam JC, in referring *Esal (Commodities) Ltd v Oriental Credit Ltd* [1985] 2 Lloyd's Rep 546, *Teknik Cekap Sdn Bhd v Public Bank Bhd* [1995] 3 MLJ 449 and *Esso Petroleum*, stated that:

... There was nothing there that could suggest that the demand was not proper, and for complying with the simple words there of making a claim by 'a demand in writing', the said letter was sufficiently compliant even though it was verbose.

- **Law Cases No. 10**

In *China Airlines Ltd v Maltran Air Corp Sdn Bhd* (formerly known as *Maltran Air Services Corp Sdn Bhd*) and *Another Appeal* [1996] 2 MLJ 517, Mohamed Dzaidin FCJ (delivering the grounds of judgment of the court), after considering the cases of *Esal (Commodities) Ltd, Esso Petroleum Malaysia Inc v Kago Petroleum Sdn Bhd* [1995] 1 MLJ 149, *Edward Owen Engineering Ltd v Barclays Bank International Ltd* [1978] 1 QB 159 and *RD Harbottle (Mercantile) Ltd v National Westminster Bank Ltd* [1978] 1 QB 146, stated that:

In her grounds of judgment, the learned judge recognized that AC4 is an 'on demand guarantee'.

- **Law Cases No. 11**

In *Esso Petroleum Malaysia Inc v Kago Petroleum Sdn Bhd* [1995] 1 MLJ 149, Peh Swee Chin FCJ (delivering the grounds of judgment of the court) following the case of *IE Contractors* [1989] 2 Lloyd's Rep 205 stated that:

On the type of such pure on demand performance bonds, the issuer should unquestionably pay on demand except in the case of fraud. Any argument of immediate disadvantage to the party who caused such a document to be in use is of no avail to the party who must face the risks of such unquestioned payment except where there is fraud; there was even no allegation of it, let alone any evidence of it.

- **Law Cases No. 12**

In *Nik Sharifuddin Bin Nik Kadir v Mohaiyani Securities Sdn Bhd* [1994] 3 MLJ 551, Zakaria Yatim J, with the help of *IE Contractors* 51 BLR 5, *Australasian Conference Association Ltd v Mainline Constructions Pty Ltd (In Liquidation) & Ors* (1978) 141 CLR 335, *Jowitt v Callaghan* (1938) 38 SR (NSW) 512 and *Re Conley* [1938] 2 All ER 127, stated that:

In my opinion, the banker's guarantee is not an unconditional guarantee. In the circumstances, the court should look at the underlying contract. Clause 6(ii) of the agreement provides that the plaintiff is to indemnify the defendant against all losses where a buying client has failed to pay within the time allowed by the KLSE Rules and where the defendant has to sell in the open market for the same securities and incurs a loss in doing so. Clause 11 provides for the termination of the agreement.

- **Law Cases No. 13**

In *Kirames Sdn Bhd v Federal Land Development Authority* [1991] 2 MLJ 198, Zakaria Yatim J stated that:

It is clear that the above document is a guarantee given by Jerneh Insurance Corp Sdn Bhd on behalf of the plaintiff for the due performance of the contract dated 3 October 1985. The guarantee is an 'on-demand' guarantee.

- **Law Cases No. 14**

In *Patel Holdings Sdn Bhd v Estet Pekebun Kecil & Anor* [1989] 1 MLJ 190, Wan Adnan J stated followed *Edward Owen Engineering Ltd v Barclays Bank International Ltd* [1978] QB 159 that:

All this leads to the conclusion that the performance guarantee stands on a similar footing to a letter of credit. A bank which gives a performance guarantee must honour that guarantee according to its terms. It is not concerned in the least with the relations between the supplier and the customer; nor with the question whether the supplier has performed his contractual obligation or not; nor with the question whether the supplier is in default or not. The bank must pay according to its guarantee, on demand, if so stipulated, without proof or conditions. The only exception is

when there is clear fraud of which the bank has notice.

• **Law Cases No. 15**

In *Teknik Cekap Sdn Bhd v Public Bank Bhd* [1995] 3 MLJ 449, in also referred to several cases (*IE Contractors Ltd v Lloyds Bank plc and Rafidain Bank* (1990) 51 BLR 1, *Edward Owen Engineering Ltd v Barclays Bank International Ltd & Anor* [1978] 1 All ER 976; [1977] 3 WLR 764, *Kirames Sdn Bhd v Federal Land Development Authority* [1991] 2 MLJ 198, *Esso Petroleum Malaysia Inc v Kago Petroleum Sdn Bhd* [1995] 1 MLJ 149 and *Esal (Commodities) and Relton v Oriental Credit and Wells Fargo Bank NA* [1985] 2 Lloyd's Rep 546), Shaik Daud JCA stated that:

Teknik interprets that clause to be just this -- that the performance bond is an on demand performance bond and the liability to pay arises once a demand is made and the fact that the demand in this case is silent as to any wrongdoing or omission committed by the sub-contractor is immaterial to the validity of the demand as the issuance of the demand itself implies that a breach had already been committed by the sub-contractor.....

Conclusion

From this, it seems that most of the judges referred to the surrounding five law cases which were discussed below to interpret whether the wording of the performance bonds are conditional or unconditional 'on-demand' bonds.

The first and mostly referred is *Easal (Commodities) Ltd & Relton Ltd v Oriental Credit Ltd & Wells Fargo Bank NA* [1985] 2 AC 546 which gives the conclusion that there are three possible meanings for the words used in the performance bond, i.e. no more a written demand is required; the demand must assert a failure to perform the contract; and there must in fact have been a failure to perform. However, most of the judge rejected the last possible meaning of the words used.

In interpreting the words of the performance bond, the second case of *Esso Petroleum Malaysia Inc v Kago Petroleum Sdn Bhd* [1995] 1 MLJ 149 referred the third case of *IE Contractors Ltd v Lloyd's bank plc and Rafidain Bank* [1990] 2 Lloyd's Rep 296, which a conclusion can be made that there was a bias or presumption in favour of the construction that performance bond was to be conditioned upon documents rather than facts.

The fourth case is also the famous Malaysian case of *Teknik Cekap Sdn Bhd v Public Bank Bhd* [1995] 2 Lloyd's Rep 296 which held that because the performance bond because the bond began with the words '*if the subcontractor ... shall in any respect fail to execute the contract or commit any breach of his obligations thereunder then the guarantor shall pay ...*', the bond was a conditional bond.

Last but not least, the case of *Edward Owen Engineering Ltd v Barclays Bank International Ltd* [1978] 1 QB 159 stressed the general nature of a performance bond that a bank is not concerned in the least with the relations between the supplier and the customer nor with the question whether the supplier has performed his contractual obligation or not, nor with the question whether the supplier is in default or not, the only exception being where there is clear evidence both of fraud and of the bank's knowledge of that fraud.

However, Steve Shin J in *Fasda Heights Sdn Bhd v Soon Ee Sing Construction Sdn Bhd & Anor* [1999] 4 MLJ 199 made quite good critics as to the wordings of the performance bond. He said that there are two 'conditions' that the bank must adhere to. The first is that the demand is in writing. It has been said that such a 'condition' is merely to regulate the right to call on the guarantee and is therefore purely a procedural matter. It does not render a guarantee conditional in the true sense. The second is that the contractor fails to execute the

works and/or in breach of the contract. Three possible meanings for the words used: (i) that no more than a written demand was required; (ii) that the demand must assert a failure to perform the contract; or (iii) that there must in fact have been a failure to perform. Most of the courts unanimously rejected the third solution.

Kamalanathan Ratnam JC in *Ramal Properties Sdn Bhd v East West-Umi Insurance Sdn Bhd* [1998] 5 MLJ 233 also made quite interesting statements towards the meaning of the words in the performance bond. He said that the wordings of '*If the contractor ... shall in any respect fail to execute the contract or commit any breach of his obligations thereunder, then the guarantor will indemnify and pay the principal ...*' renders the performance bond to be an on-demand performance bond which is only conditional upon the beneficiary asserting the basis of the claim upon the issuer of the bond contending that there has been a breach of contract.

After discussing on the interpretation on application of injunction relief in performance bond, it is noticed that very careful choice of words should be adopted by the constructor of a performance bond so that a clear understanding of its conditionality can be achieved and undisputable. Therefore, the following possible suggestion should be made on the choice of words which could carry the meanings of the performance bond to be conditional or unconditional 'on-demand' bond.

The choice of words should be an undisputed meaning of the words in the performance bond. This should indicate whether the performance bond itself is either purely conditional or purely unconditional 'on-demand' bond. The best examples for this are in the cases of *Esso Petroleum Malaysia Inc v Kago Petroleum Sdn Bhd* [1995] 1 MLJ 149 and *IE Contractors Ltd v Lloyd's bank plc and Rafidain Bank* [1990] 2 Lloyd's Rep 296 which respectively as follows:

“... we hereby unconditionally and irrevocably guarantee the payment to EPMI”
“We undertake to pay you, unconditionally, the said amount on demand, being your claim for damages brought about by the abovenamed principal.”

References

- Abdul-Rashid, K. (2004). *Guarantee Against Non-Performance of Construction Contract by the Contractor: Performance Guarantee Sum versus Performance Bond*, Seminar, 1st International Conference, Toronto Canada, May 27 2004 – May 28 2004, World of Construction Project Management.
- Fong, C.K. (2004a). *Law and Practice of Construction Contracts*, 3rd Edition, Sweet & Maxwell Asia, Singapore.
- Fong, L.C. (2004b). *The Malaysian PWD Form of Construction Contract*, Sweet & Maxwell Asia, Petaling Jaya.
- Ismail, N. (2007). *Performance Bond and An Injunction*, Master's Project Report (Dissertation), Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.
- Jabatan Kerja Raya (1988). *A Guide on the Administration of Public Works Contracts*, Ibu Pejabat JKR Malaysia.
- Martin, E.A. (2003). *A Dictionary of Law*, 5th Edition reissued with new covers, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Murdoch, J. and Hughes, W. (2000). *Construction Contracts – Law and Management*, 3rd Edition, Spon Press, London.
- Radhakrishnan, S. (1999). *Legal Aspects of Insurance for Engineering Projects*, Article, [1999] 1 MLJ cxxx; [1999] 1 MLJA 130.
- Robinson, N.M., Lavers, A.P., Heng, G.T.K. and Chan, R. (1996). *Construction Law in Singapore and Malaysia*, Second Edition, Butterworths Asia, Singapore.