MATERIAL LITIGATION

Save as disclosed below, DutaLand Berhad ("DutaLand") and its subsidiary companies are not engaged in any material litigation, claims or arbitration, either as plaintiff or defendant and the Directors of DutaLand have no knowledge of any proceedings pending or threatened against DutaLand and its subsidiary companies or of any fact likely to give rise to any proceeding which may materially affect the position or business of DutaLand and its subsidiary companies:

1. On 10 May 2013, Lin Wen-Chih and Lin Wen-Chuan ("Plaintiffs") commenced legal action at the High Court in Tawau, Sabah, against Pacific Forest Industries Sdn Bhd and DutaLand ("Defendants") for the recovery of the sum of RM6,223,241.00 plus RM10,635,945.65 interest as at 10 May 2013 being the alleged debt owing by Pacific Forest Industries Sdn Bhd to the Plaintiffs, to which DutaLand stood as a guarantor. The High Court dismissed the Plaintiffs' claim on 11 June 2018. The Plaintiffs filed an appeal to the Court of Appeal on 5 July 2018, and the Defendants filed a cross-appeal in the Court of Appeal on the issues of *res judicata* and limitation. The appeal and cross-appeal scheduled for hearing before the Court of Appeal on 26 August 2020 were postponed to 23 October 2020. On 23 October 2020, the Court of Appeal dismissed the Plaintiffs' appeal and allowed Defendants' cross-appeal with costs of RM20,000.00. Essentially, the Court of Appeal found that the Plaintiffs' claim is caught by limitation and *res judicata*. The Plaintiffs being dissatisfied with the decision of the Court of Appeal had since filed a Notice of Motion for leave to appeal to the Federal Court on 18 November 2020. The Federal Court had on 21 December 2020 given its directions for the parties to file their respective written submissions, bundle of authorities, common core bundle and case executive summary on or before 15 February 2021. However due to the Movement Control Order, the Court has extended the deadline to 15 March 2021. The Federal Court is expected to fix a hearing date for the application for leave to appeal after the required documents have been filed by the parties.

2. On 13 December 2006, Rinota Construction Sdn Bhd ("Petitioner") filed an action against Mascon Rinota Sdn Bhd ("MRSB"), Mascon Sdn Bhd ("MSB"), Olympia Industries Berhad ("OIB") and others at the Kuala Lumpur High Court ("KLHC") by virtue of an alleged oppression under Section 181 of the then Companies Act 1965 ("Original Petition"). The Petitioner sought damages of approximately RM8.0 million. On 21 October 2007, the Petitioner filed an application to amend the Original Petition by adding Mascon Construction Sdn Bhd ("MCSB"), a subsidiary of DutaLand, as another respondent and such application was subsequently allowed by KLHC. MSB, a subsidiary of OIB, was wound up on 25 March 2008. On 29 August 2012, KLHC ruled in favour of the Petitioner with an order for MCSB and others to buy out the Petitioner's shareholding in MRSB which is a subsidiary of MSB. On 27 September 2012, MCSB and the others appealed against this decision, which appeal was allowed by the Court of Appeal with costs of RM100,000.00. The Petitioner filed an application for leave to appeal to the Federal Court ("the Court") which was granted on 21 June 2016.

   The appeal proper was heard on 22 May 2017 and dismissed with cost of RM100,000. The Federal Court reinstated the order of the High Court which ordered that all the respondents purchase the shares owned by the Petitioner in MRSB and that a certified public accountant be appointed to inspect the accounts of MRSB and file a report to the High Court of the results of the inspection to determine the value of the shares, together with payment of RM100,000 being costs to the Petitioner for the hearing in the Federal Court and the Court of Appeal. The High Court had fixed the case for further case management before the judge on 3 May 2018 for the appointment of the certified public accountant. The Court had allowed the Petitioner's application for extension to re-appoint BDO Governance Advisory Sdn Bhd ("BDO") as the Court appointer auditor. Pursuant to the court order dated 26 June 2018, BDO had 6 months from 26 June 2018 to prepare the accountant's report.

MATERIAL LITIGATION

On 17 January 2019, the Court was informed by the Petitioner that they would file a notice to appoint a new Auditor as the earlier Auditor failed to complete the accounts within the given time frame. The Court had directed for the Petitioner to file the notice on or before 31 January 2019. On 31 January 2019, the Petitioner informed the Court that they have appoint a new Auditor, Ferrier Hodgson MH Sdn Bhd ("FHMH"), and the Court had fixed the matter for decision on 22 April 2019. On 23 July 2019, the Court dismissed the order sought by the Petitioner to appoint FHMH to prepare an accountant's report to advise the Court on the fair price of the shares. On 6 August 2019, the Petitioner filed an appeal against the High Court's decision to dismiss the order sought by the Petitioner. The ground of High Court's judgement was published on 15 November 2019. The Court of Appeal fixed the appeal for case management on 10 March 2020.

On 10 March 2020, the Court of Appeal fixed the appeal for hearing on 7 July 2020. On 7 July 2020, the Court of Appeal allowed the Petitioner's appeal to appoint FHMH in replacement of BDO, with costs of RM15,000.00 payable to the Petitioner ("COA Order dated 7 July 2020"). Case management was fixed on 17 August 2020 before the High Court for further directions on the appointment of FHMH. On 5 August 2020, the Respondents filed for leave to appeal against the COA Order dated 7 July 2020 to the Federal Court ("FC Leave Application"). The FC Leave Application was fixed for case management on 7 September 2020.

On 17 August 2020, the Petitioner informed the Court that FHMH has been appointed pursuant to the COA Order dated 7 July 2020 to prepare an accountant's report to advise the High Court on the fair buy-out price of the Petitioner's shares in Mascon Rinota Sdn Bhd. The Petitioner is required to produce the said report within 4 months from the COA Order dated 7 July 2020 i.e. by 7 November 2020. The Learned Judge directed both parties to submit their accountant's reports by 30 September 2020 and has fixed case management on 1 October 2020**.**

On 1 October 2020, the matter was called up for case management before the High Court. Parties informed the High Court that they have nominated their respective Auditor. Meanwhile, parties jointly applied for an extension of time to file and exchange accountant's reports given that parties in the midst of retrieving the requisite documents to enable their Auditor to finalise their accountant's reports. The High Court took note of the same and fixed the matter for further case management on 30 November 2020 for parties to update the High Court on the status of the parties' accountant reports. However, due to the extension of the Conditional Movement Control Order till 9 December 2020, the High Court rescheduled the matter for case management to 11 February 2021.

On 11 November 2020, the FC Leave Application was called up for case management. In light of the extension of the Conditional Movement Control Order till 9 December 2020, parties have agreed to proceed with FC Leave Application by way of an online hearing on 25 November 2020. On 25 November 2020, the Federal Court allowed the FC Leave Application for leave to appeal ("FC Leave Order").

On 8 December 2020, the Petitioner filed a motion to discharge the FC Leave Order. At the hearing of motion on 8 February 2021, the Federal Court allowed the Petitioner's Motion to Discharge the FC Leave Order with costs of RM 40,000.00.

At the case management before the High Court on 9 February 2021, the Court directed both parties to file and exchange their respective accountant's reports on or before 10 May 2021 and respective rebuttal reports on or before 10 June 2021. The matter is now fixed for case management on 18 June 2021 for parties to update the status of accountant's reports.

MATERIAL LITIGATION

3. On 28 April 2000, Lin Wen-Chih & Lin Wen-Chuan ("Plaintiffs") filed a suit in Kuala Lumpur High Court ("First Suit") against DutaLand Berhad (which was then known as Mycom Berhad). The First Suit was for alleged breach of contract by DutaLand, namely DutaLand had breached the Share Sale Agreement (for the purchase of shares in Veramax Sdn Bhd) as DutaLand had failed to make payment for the RM55 million consideration. The First Suit was heard on the merits and the Plaintiffs' claim was dismissed by the Kuala Lumpur High Court on 11 October 2010. The Plaintiffs' appeal to the Court of Appeal was also dismissed on 20 November 2013. Leave to appeal to the Federal Court was also dismissed on 20 October 2014.

   The Plaintiffs filed anew for an order on 5 October 2018 ("Plaintiffs' Suit") to set aside the earlier judgement in favour of DutaLand Berhad (which was then known as Mycom Berhad) and affirmed by the Federal Court.

   On 19 December 2018, DutaLand filed a formal application to strike out the Plaintiffs' Suit on the ground that the Kota Kinabalu High Court has no territorial jurisdiction to hear the matter as the events complaint of occurred in Kuala Lumpur. On 26 February 2019, the Kota Kinabalu High Court allowed DutaLand's application and struck the Plaintiffs' Suit. Being dissatisfied, on 21 March 2019, the Plaintiffs filed an appeal to the Court of Appeal against the decision dated 26 February 2019. The appeal to the Court of Appeal was initially fixed on 15 December 2020 and 25 February 2021 had been postponed and yet to be fixed by the Court.