

THE LAW OF NUISANCE IN MALAYSIA-THE PROBLEM AND POSSIBILITY

by

AZURIAH BT MOHAMMAD

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement
for the Diploma In Law
At the School of Law, MARA Institute of Technology,
SHAH ALAM, SELANGOR.

Author's Signature : (.....)

Certified by : (.....)

Mr. Jaginder Singh

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE		i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT		iii
TABLE OF CASES		iv
INTRODUCTION		ix
CHAPTER I	NATURE AND TYPES OF PRIVATE NUISANCE	1
CHAPTER II	THE ESSENTIALS OF COMMON LAW NUISANCE	14
	I. Introduction	
	II. The Unlawful Act	
	(a) Unreasonableness	
	(b) Duration Of An Interference	
	(c) Malice	
	(e) Abnormal Sensitivity	
	III. Damage, Actual, Prospective or Presumed	
	IV. Conclusion	
CHAPTER III	ACTION FOR PRIVATE NUISANCE	23
	I. Who Can Sue	
	(a) Occupiers	
	(b) Licensee	
	(c) Reversioners	
	II. Who Can Be Sued	
	(a) The Creator Of The Nuisance	
	(b) The Occupier	
	(c) Independent Contractor	
	(d) Servant Or Agent	
	III. Conclusion	

PREFACE

NUISANCE is one branch of TORTS which is existed and happened in our every day life. Thus, when the word 'Nuisance' appears, it rings a bell on the writer's mind, of a mischief kind of activity. This led to the writer memory of an irritating incident that had happened in her hometown. Every Saturday nights, the writer's family and the neighbourhood will be haunted by the sound of heavy machine motors which caused disturbance in the enjoyment of watching T.V. for a quiet and peaceful evening.

Such irritating and anguishing memory led the writer to pick a topic on this subject for new project paper. It also led the writer to make a research and widen her knowledge on this topic. In preparing this paper, the writer has come to the legal standing of private nuisance in Malaysia. In such case, a distinguishment between the Common Law and Law of Nuisance in Malaysia has been made and has come to a result that our law of nuisance in Malaysia is still lacking. This is because our Malaysians attitude of 'couldn't care less' and take things as easily. There aren't many reported cases as compared to the English cases.

In completing this project paper, the writer wishes to state her gratitude and appreciation to her supervisor, Mr. Jaginder Singh for his patience in guiding and supervising her work

I

Ilford U.D.C. v. Real [1952] 1 K.B. 671

J

Job Edwards Ltd. v. Birmingham Navigations [1924] 1 K.B. 341

K

Kennaway v. Thompson [1980] 3 W.L.R. 366

Kok Seok Choo v. Sim Chiow Moh (1952) 18 M.L.J. 32

L

Liow Sang & Anor v. Hang Chiap Yam, Kolam Air (1984) 2 C.L.J. Vol. 1 & 2, 177

Lim Kar Bee v. Abdul Latif b. Ismail (1978) M.L.J. 119.

Len Omnibus Co. Bhd. North South Transport Sdn. Bhd & Anor and Another Appeal (1978) 2 M.L.J. 247.

Leong Bee & Co. v. Ling Nam Rubber Works (1970) 2 M.L.J. 16

M

Mc Combe v. Read [1955] W.L.R. 635

Milner v. Spencer (1976) 239 Estates Gazette 573.

Mohamed Said v. Fatimah (1962) 28 M.L.J. 328

N

Noble v. Harrison [1926] K.B. 332

Nichols v. Ely Beet Sugar Factory Ltd [1936] Ch. 343

P

Pacific Engineering Ltd. v. Hj. Ahmad Rice Miller Ltd (1966) 2 M.L.J. 142

R

Rapier v. London Tramway Co. [1893] 2 Ch. 588

Read v. J. Lyons & Co. Ltd. [1945] K.B. 216, 236

Reed v. Smith (1914) 19B.L.R. 139, 140

Rylande v. Fletcher (1868) L.R 3 H.L. 330

S

Southpart Corporation v. Esso Petroleum Co. Ltd [1953] 2 All .E.R. 1207

Shelfer v. City of London Electric Lighting Co. [1895] 2 Ch 287.

Sedleigh - Denfield v. O'Callaghan [1940] A.C. 880,903.

Seong Fatt Sawmills Sdn. Bhd. v. Dunlop Malaysia Industries Sdn. Bhd. (1984) 2 C.L.J. 233.

St. Helen's Smelting Co. v. Tipping [1865] 11 H.L.C 642

Syarikat Perniagaan Selangor Sdn. Bhd. v. Fahro Rozi Mohdi & Ors (1981) 2 M.L.J. 16.

Spicer v. Smee [1946] All.E.R. 489.

T

Thompson - Schwab v. Costaki [1956] W.L.R. 335, 338

The Wagon Mound (No.2) [1967] 1 A.C. 617.

Thean Chew v. The Seaport (Selangor) Rubber Estate Ltd. (1966) 26 M.L.J. 166.

Toyo Textiles Industries Sdn. Bhd. & Anor v. Lian Foong Housing Dev. (M) Sdn. Bhd. (1986) M.L.J. 412

Thompson - Schwab v. Costaki [1956] 1 A.E.R. 652

W

Wong See Kui v. Hong Hin Tin Mining Co. (1969) 2 M.L.J. 934

Wringe v. Cohen [1940] 1 K.B. 229

Walter v. Selfe (1851) 20L.J. Ch. 433