



**BAKER TECHNOLOGY LIMITED**  
(Unique Entity Number 198100637D)  
(Incorporated in the Republic of Singapore)

---

**CLARIFICATION OF PRESS RELEASE ISSUED BY SEMBCORP MARINE LTD (“SCM”) ON 12 AUGUST 2010 (THE “SCM PRESS RELEASE”)**

---

The Board of Directors of Baker Technology Limited (the “Company”) refers to the SCM Press Release in relation to the suit between SCM and PPL Holdings Pte Ltd (“PPLH”) and E-Interface Holdings Limited, in which PPL Shipyard Pte Ltd (“PPL Shipyard”) is also a party as second defendant to counterclaim.

Capitalised terms used in this announcement shall have the same meanings as defined in the circular dated 11 June 2010 issued by the Company (the “Circular”), unless the context otherwise requires.

The High Court hearing in the suit on 3 August 2010 and the ensuing orders of the High Court on 11 August 2010, which are referred to in the SCM Press Release, were interlocutory in nature, dealing with applications for interim relief pending trial and procedural and scheduling matters. The substantive merits of the case were not determined and remain to be determined at trial in due course.

The Company wishes to clarify the matters raised in the SCM Press Release and highlight the following relevant matters arising out of the hearing on 3 August 2010 and the ensuing orders of the High Court on 11 August 2010:-

(A) Mr Anthony Sabastian Aurol’s position as a director and an Executive Director of PPL Shipyard

PPLH had applied for an interim injunction requiring the reinstatement of Mr Aurol as a director of PPL Shipyard pending trial or preventing him from being treated as no longer an Executive Director of PPL Shipyard pending trial. The High Court on 11 August 2010 dismissed this application. The High Court’s decision was an interlocutory ruling made on an application for interim relief pending trial. The High Court has not decided whether or not Mr Aurol has been validly removed as a director of PPL Shipyard or whether he has ceased to be an Executive Director of PPL Shipyard.

PPLH holds the position that Mr Aurol has not been validly removed as a director of PPL Shipyard. The validity of the alleged removal of Mr Aurol as a director and

the alleged consequent termination of his employment as an Executive Director will be determined at the trial.

(B) Withdrawal of application for certain interim injunctions

PPLH had applied for interim injunctions pending trial to prevent PPL Shipyard board meetings being held without the presence of a director nominated by PPLH, to prevent PPL Shipyard shareholders' meetings being held without the presence of PPLH and to prevent PPL Shipyard from acting upon any Board resolution which was passed on the basis of the 6 PPL Shipyard directors nominated by SCM having a majority vote.

PPLH chose to reduce the scope of the hearing on 3 August 2010 by withdrawing its application for those interim injunctions, but without prejudice to a fresh application for such orders.

Instead, the High Court made an order prohibiting any PPL Shipyard board meeting from being held unless 7 days notice in writing is given of all agenda items and all resolutions to be passed, except where urgency prevents 7 days notice being given, in which case at least 24 hours notice in writing shall be given together with a written statement of the reason(s) for not giving 7 days notice.

This order safeguards PPLH's opportunity to make a fresh application for interim relief if it thinks fit to do so in the light of the notified agenda items and resolutions.

The validity of PPL Shipyard board resolutions passed on the basis of the 6 SCM nominated directors having a majority vote will be determined at trial.

PPLH also chose to reduce the scope of the hearing on 3 August 2010 by also withdrawing its application for other heads of interim relief pending trial, but again without prejudice to any fresh application for such relief.

(C) The position of the 2 other directors of PPL Shipyard nominated by PPLH

On 11 August 2010 the High Court granted PPLH's application for an interim injunction which stops PPL Shipyard directors nominated by SCM or anyone else acting on behalf of PPL Shipyard from requesting Dr Benety Chang and Mr Douglas Tan to vacate office as directors of PPL Shipyard pending trial.

(D) PPLH's application for an expedited trial

On 11 August 2010 the High Court made no order on PPLH's application for an expedited trial, but it is still open to PPLH to make a further application to obtain an early trial date.

At a pre-trial conference held on 13 August 2010, parties were ordered to exchange lists of documents by 3 September 2010 and to be prepared to take dates for filing affidavits of evidence in chief and trial dates at the next pre-trial conference to be held on 17 September 2010.

(E) The costs of the application

PPLH was ordered to pay SCM fixed costs of S\$15,000. This is party and party costs and not solicitor and client costs.

The key issues of the SCM Litigation (as set out in Section 12 of the Circular), including, *inter alia*, whether the implied terms in the Joint Venture Agreement and the supplemental agreement dated 5 July 2003 alleged by SCM on its pre-emptive rights to the 15% shareholding interest in PPL Shipyard held by PPLH and E-Interface exist and whether the Joint Venture Agreement between SCM and PPLH subsists, will be decided at trial.

The Company will keep shareholders apprised of any material developments, where appropriate.

By Order of the Board  
Baker Technology Limited

Aw Seok Chin  
Company Secretary

14 August 2010