
Contract Law

The Dividing Line between Indemnities and Guarantees

The Takeaway

When drafting indemnities and guarantees, parties should take heed of the differences between the two.

In particular, parties should consider the following:

- (a) Whether parties intend:
 - i. for the promisor's obligation to hinge upon a default of the principal contract (thus rendering the contract between the parties a guarantee, rather than an indemnity); or
 - ii. for the promisor's obligation to be separately and independently enforced (this being a characteristic of an indemnity, rather than a guarantee); and,
- (b) Whether parties intend for a variation of the principal contract to have the effect of discharging the promisor's obligations (this again being a characteristic of a guarantee, as distinct from an indemnity).

This latest judgment of the Admiralty Court at Kuala Lumpur¹ ("**Judgment**") examines the scope of indemnities and guarantees, and the differences between the two.

In doing so, the Admiralty Court undertook a detailed examination of the documents in question and relied on leading Common Law authorities, which were read with provisions of the Malaysian Contracts Act.

The Background Facts

GJ Consultancy Sdn Bhd ("**GJ Consultancy**") entered into a Fixture Note ("**Principal Contract**") with Detik Timur Sdn Bhd ("**Detik Timur**"). Via the Principal Contract, Detik Timur chartered a vessel from GJ Consultancy to transport a shipment of cargo from Malaysia to China.² The Principal Contract required disputes between the parties to be arbitrated in Singapore.³ In failing to perform the Principal Contract, Detik Timur incurred dead freight and demurrage amounting to US\$280,000.⁴

¹ *GJ Consultancy Sdn Bhd v Gan Teck Lim* [2021] MLJU 933.

² Para 4.

³ Para 21.

⁴ Para 9.

Contract Law

Despite having reached a settlement with GJ Consultancy to pay dead freight and demurrage, Detik Timur failed to keep to the settlement terms.⁵ As payment from Detik Timur was not forthcoming, GJ Consultancy intended to make a claim against Detik Timur via arbitration in Singapore. This was in accordance with the arbitration clause found in the Principal Contract.⁶

However, the chairman of Detik Timur ("**Promisor**"), executed a '*Letter of Indemnity and Guarantee*' ("**Letter**") in favour of GJ Consultancy which, in short, promised that he would bear personal liability for any loss or damage suffered by GJ Consultancy.⁷ The Letter required disputes arising from it to be heard by the Malaysian courts.⁸ Relying on the Letter, GJ Consultancy initiated a claim in the Admiralty Court at Kuala Lumpur against the Promisor.

The Court Applications

The Promisor applied for a stay of the Malaysian court proceedings in favour of arbitration in Singapore and to strike out GJ Consultancy's claim at the Admiralty Court.⁹

The Promisor alleged that:

- (a) The claim against him had to be heard together with the claim against Detik Timur in the arbitration in Singapore; and
- (b) The claim against him was contingent upon a successful claim proving Detik Timur's liability in the Singapore arbitration.¹⁰

The Promisor's stand was premised on the argument that the Letter was a guarantee and not an indemnity and, therefore, Detik Timur's liability against GJ Consultancy must first be established before any claim could be made against the Promisor.¹¹

GJ Consultancy contended (and as ultimately held by the Court) that the Promisor's liability under the Letter was in the nature of an indemnity. Thus, the obligations in the Letter could be enforced separately and independently from the underlying liabilities of Detik Timur under the Principal Contract. In other words, there would be no need for Detik Timur's liability against GJ Consultancy to be established before a claim could be made against the Promisor.¹²

⁵ Para 11.

⁶ Para 22(a).

⁷ Para 7.

⁸ Para 21 (c).

⁹ Para 1.

¹⁰ Para 23.

¹¹ Para 20.

¹² Para 26.

Contract Law

The Admiralty Judge's Reasoning & Decision

The Judge dismissed the Promisor's application by deducing the parties' intention based on the wording of the Letter.

The three main points of the Judge's reasoning were:

- The word "*indemnify*" in Clause 1 of the Letter: "*The Charterer (Defendant) [Detik Timur] hereby agrees to indemnify the Disponent Owner in respect of any loss or damage suffered by the Disponent Owner...*" reflected the intention of the parties that the Letter was in the nature of an indemnity, and not a guarantee.¹³
- Clause 2 of the Letter, "*he [i.e the Promisor] shall be personally liable for any... demurrage imposed*" showed that the Promisor's liability to pay GJ Consultancy arose at the instance of demurrage charges being imposed because the Promisor put himself in the position of Detik Timur, as the person principally liable for the losses (as distinct from being a mere guarantor).¹⁴
- The Letter provided that any variation of the Principal Contract shall not discharge the Promisor's obligation to indemnify GJ Consultancy. The Judge held that this clause was indicative of an indemnity (as distinct from a guarantee) because under Malaysian law a variation of the principal contract without the guarantor's consent discharges the guarantor of its obligation. Therefore, the Judge reasoned, relying on speeches in the House of Lords,¹⁵ that the inclusion of this clause must mean that parties perceived the Letter to be in the nature of an indemnity.¹⁶

Conclusion

The Judgment emphasised the need for parties to pay attention to the words used in a contract due to their wide-ranging implications.

It is also a useful reminder that Malaysian courts will look to the contents of the contract to determine its impact and meaning and will not be swayed merely by the heading of contracts.

¹³ Para 37.

¹⁴ Para 38.

¹⁵ *Trade Indemnity Company, Limited Appellants; v. Workington Harbour and Dock Board Respondents* [1937] AC 1.

¹⁶ Paras 39-41.

Contact



Clive Navin Selvapandian
Partner

D +60 3 2273 1919

F +60 3 2273 8310

clive.selvapandian@christopherleeong.com

Contribution Notes

This update is contributed by the Contact Partner listed above with the assistance of **Soh Lip Shan** (Pupil, Christopher & Lee Ong).

Our Regional Contacts

RAJAH & TANN | *Singapore*

Rajah & Tann Singapore LLP

T +65 6535 3600
sg.rajahtannasia.com

R&T SOK & HENG | *Cambodia*

R&T Sok & Heng Law Office

T +855 23 963 112 / 113
F +855 23 963 116
kh.rajahtannasia.com

RAJAH & TANN 立杰上海

SHANGHAI REPRESENTATIVE OFFICE | *China*

Rajah & Tann Singapore LLP Shanghai Representative Office

T +86 21 6120 8818
F +86 21 6120 8820
cn.rajahtannasia.com

ASSEGAF HAMZAH & PARTNERS | *Indonesia*

Assegaf Hamzah & Partners

Jakarta Office

T +62 21 2555 7800
F +62 21 2555 7899

Surabaya Office

T +62 31 5116 4550
F +62 31 5116 4560
www.ahp.co.id

RAJAH & TANN | *Lao PDR*

Rajah & Tann (Laos) Co., Ltd.

T +856 21 454 239
F +856 21 285 261
la.rajahtannasia.com

CHRISTOPHER & LEE ONG | *Malaysia*

Christopher & Lee Ong

T +60 3 2273 1919
F +60 3 2273 8310
www.christopherleeong.com

RAJAH & TANN | *Myanmar*

Rajah & Tann Myanmar Company Limited

T +95 1 9345 343 / +95 1 9345 346
F +95 1 9345 348
mm.rajahtannasia.com

GATMAYTAN YAP PATACSIL

GUTIERREZ & PROTACIO (C&G LAW) | *Philippines*

Gatmaytan Yap Patacsil Gutierrez & Protacio (C&G Law)

T +632 8894 0377 to 79 / +632 8894 4931 to 32
F +632 8552 1977 to 78
www.cagatlaw.com

RAJAH & TANN | *Thailand*

R&T Asia (Thailand) Limited

T +66 2 656 1991
F +66 2 656 0833
th.rajahtannasia.com

RAJAH & TANN LCT LAWYERS | *Vietnam*

Rajah & Tann LCT Lawyers

Ho Chi Minh City Office

T +84 28 3821 2382 / +84 28 3821 2673
F +84 28 3520 8206

Hanoi Office

T +84 24 3267 6127
F +84 24 3267 6128
www.rajahtannlct.com

Rajah & Tann Asia is a network of legal practices based in Asia.

Member firms are independently constituted and regulated in accordance with relevant local legal requirements. Services provided by a member firm are governed by the terms of engagement between the member firm and the client.

This Update is solely intended to provide general information and does not provide any advice or create any relationship, whether legally binding or otherwise. Rajah & Tann Asia and its member firms do not accept, and fully disclaim, responsibility for any loss or damage which may result from accessing or relying on this update.

Our Regional Presence



Christopher & Lee Ong is a full service Malaysian law firm with offices in Kuala Lumpur. It is strategically positioned to service clients in a range of contentious and non-contentious practice areas. The partners of Christopher & Lee Ong, who are Malaysian-qualified, have accumulated considerable experience over the years in the Malaysian market. They have a profound understanding of the local business culture and the legal system and are able to provide clients with an insightful and dynamic brand of legal advice.

Christopher & Lee Ong is part of Rajah & Tann Asia, a network of local law firms in Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam. Our Asian network also includes regional desks focused on Brunei, Japan and South Asia.

The contents of this Update are owned by Christopher & Lee Ong and subject to copyright protection under the laws of Malaysia and, through international treaties, other countries. No part of this Update may be reproduced, licensed, sold, published, transmitted, modified, adapted, publicly displayed, broadcast (including storage in any medium by electronic means whether or not transiently for any purpose save as permitted herein) without the prior written permission of Christopher & Lee Ong.

Please note also that whilst the information in this Update is correct to the best of our knowledge and belief at the time of writing, it is only intended to provide a general guide to the subject matter and should not be treated as a substitute for specific professional advice for any particular course of action as such information may not suit your specific business or operational requirements. It is to your advantage to seek legal advice for your specific situation. In this regard, you may call the lawyer you normally deal with in Christopher & Lee Ong.
