

In the case of **BUE and another v TZQ and another [2018] SGHC 276**, the matrimonial property in question was co-owned by the father and his two sons from his previous marriage. Prior to the conclusion of the divorce, the two sons had utilised their CPF monies to fully redeem the matrimonial property's outstanding loan and as such, argued for their rightful share in the said property.

However, the step-mother contended that the addition of the 2 sons' names to the property was done to purposefully dilute her share in the matrimonial assets to be divided. In any case, as she had paid for renovation expenses, she therefore held a beneficial interest in the matrimonial property.

On the other hand, the father's case was that his two sons' names was added in view of his ailing health and wanted to give his two sons a sense of ownership over the said property. It was argued that a resulting trust arose in their favour, based on the case of **Chan Yuen Lan v See Fong Mun [2014] 3 SLR 1048**. Further, the step's mother's alleged renovation expenses, which were disputed, should not entitle her to a beneficial interest in the property, based on **Tan Chui Lian v Neo Liew Eng [2007] 1 SLR (R) 265** .

The case was decided in the father's favour and it was found that the said property was held on a resulting trust according to each party's financial contributions in their respective proportions of 87.80% to the father, 5.18% and 7.02 % to each of the sons. Additionally, the Court rejected the mother's argument and agreed with the father's arguments that the renovation expenses which were disputed in nature did not accord the step-mother any beneficial interest in the said property under property law.