



DM8 | SINGAPORE CONSTRUCTION INCIDENTS — WSH ACT RISK LESSONS

MONTHLY STRATEGIC RISK DIGEST

Construction Incidents & Accidents in Asia

Edition: 1 September 2026 | Published by: RXM Advisory Pte Ltd | 8th Edition

Three Singapore construction fatalities in 2026: what they reveal about WSH Act duties, multi-tier contracting risk, and pre-signing blind spots

ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION

This publication is a monthly strategic risk digest prepared by RXM Advisory for construction and engineering companies operating in Singapore. Each edition reviews recent incidents, identifies recurring pre-signing legal risks under the Workplace Safety and Health Act 2006, and provides practical strategies to protect companies from unnecessary liability before and after project agreements are signed.

WHAT'S INSIDE THIS EDITION

- Executive Summary
- Monthly Risk Snapshot
- Notable Incidents — Singapore
- Recurring Risk Themes
- Lessons Learned & Strategies
- Asserting Your Rights
- Recommended Actions

KEY RISK THEMES — AUGUST 2026

- Multi-tier subcontracting interface risk
- Supervisor self-instruction and liability
- Formwork design vs execution gaps
- WSH Act duties of occupiers and principals
- BCA permit revocation and stop-work exposure

Website
www.rxmadvisory.com

Email
michael@rxmadvisory.com

Phone
+65 9616 9848

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

→ [跳转至简体中文版本 \(Jump to Chinese Edition\)](#)

01

Three Singapore construction fatalities in May and August 2026 illustrate how duties under the Workplace Safety and Health Act 2006 can expose every party in the contracting chain — principal, main contractor, subcontractor, and occupier — to investigation, stop-work orders, and potential liability.

02

This edition reviews three 2026 incidents: a banksman struck by a concrete section at the Cross Island Line Turf City worksite, a site supervisor killed by a canopy collapse at a landed house near Upper Paya Lebar, and a worker fatally crushed by formwork at the Jurong Port Integrated Construction and Prefabrication Hub.

03

Three recurring pre-signing risks are identified: failing to map WSH Act duties across the contracting chain, accepting interface or exclusion-zone responsibilities without verifying the method statement, and ignoring structural and load-bearing assumptions before authorising work.

04

Three strategies are recommended: map WSH Act duties (occupier, employer, principal) before signing, require method-statement sharing and exclusion-zone verification for all high-risk work, and ensure contractual rights to halt work when structural or load-bearing assumptions are unverified.

05

When reasonable claims are refused, a structured three-step response protocol is recommended: anchor the claim to the specific WSH Act duty breached, demand written reasons for refusal, and escalate promptly through the contractual hierarchy before notice periods expire.

MONTHLY RISK SNAPSHOT — SEPTEMBER 2026

INCIDENTS REVIEWED

3

All in Singapore

FATALITIES REPORTED

3

Across the three cases

JURISDICTIONS

1

Singapore

NOTABLE INCIDENTS — SINGAPORE | 2026

The following three incidents were reviewed for this edition, all occurring in Singapore between May and August 2026. Each case illustrates a distinct pre-signing blind spot under the Workplace Safety and Health Act 2006 that became a liability driver after the event.

01

Turf City MRT Station (Cross Island Line) — Banksman Struck by Temporary Concrete Section

Jurisdiction: Singapore | 14 May 2026 | MOM stop-work order; investigation ongoing

INCIDENT SUMMARY

On 14 May 2026, at approximately 1:30 pm, a 23-year-old construction worker died after being struck by a temporary concrete section during hacking works at the future Turf City MRT station worksite at 250A Turf Club Road, Bukit Timah, part of the Cross Island Line project. The worker was assigned as a banksman — guiding an excavator operator and keeping others out of the work zone while the excavator removed concrete from beneath a concrete deck. He was found motionless by police and pronounced dead at the scene by SCDF paramedics.

The worker was employed by Koh Kock Leong Construction, a subcontractor working under the main contractor, Shanghai Tunnel Engineering Co (Singapore) – Obayashi Corporation Joint Venture (STECS-Obayashi CR203 JV). The Land Transport Authority (LTA), as project developer, confirmed it was supporting MOM and police investigations. MOM instructed the site occupier, STECS-Obayashi CR203 Joint Venture, to cease all excavation work at the location pending investigation. MOM reiterated that hacking and removal of temporary concrete sections must be carried out in a controlled manner, that exclusion zones must be strictly enforced, and that banksmen must not position themselves within potential danger zones.

KEY LEGAL LESSON

Under section 11 of the Workplace Safety and Health Act 2006, the site occupier has a duty to ensure, so far as is reasonably practicable, that the workplace is safe for every person within it, whether or not that person is an employee of the occupier. A subcontract that assigns banksman and exclusion-zone duties without requiring the main contractor to share the underlying method statement, sequencing logic, and structural assumptions leaves the subcontractor managing a risk it did not fully design and cannot fully verify — while the occupier's statutory duty to ensure a safe workplace remains non-delegable.

02

Landed House near Upper Paya Lebar Road (Jalan Usaha) — Canopy Collapse Under Brick Load

Jurisdiction: Singapore | 16 May 2026 | MOM and BCA stop-work; investigation ongoing

INCIDENT SUMMARY

On 16 May 2026, at approximately 10:30 am, a 30-year-old Bangladeshi site supervisor died after a newly constructed cast concrete canopy collapsed and fell on him at a house construction site at Jalan Usaha, near Upper Paya Lebar Road. The supervisor was suspected to have supervised the placement of approximately six tonnes of bricks on the canopy — reportedly to shelter them from rain — despite being told not to. The canopy collapsed less than five minutes after a lorry crane placed the pallets of bricks on it. The supervisor was unconscious when taken to Tan Tock Seng Hospital and later died.

The site occupier and the man's employer, LCN, were instructed by MOM to stop all work at the worksite. MOM stated that, as a general safety measure, construction materials should not be placed on structures not designed to bear the load of those materials. The Building and Construction Authority (BCA) said it would revoke the permit for building work and issue a stop-work order, and required a qualified person to submit an investigation report and rectification proposals before work could resume. Police said foul play was not suspected based on preliminary investigations.

KEY LEGAL LESSON

Under section 12 of the WSH Act 2006, an employer must take, so far as is reasonably practicable, measures to ensure the safety and health of its employees at work. Where a supervisor's own instruction contributes to the accident, the employer's duty to provide adequate instruction, training, and supervision under section 12 remains engaged — the fact that the supervisor may have acted against prior instructions does not automatically absolve the employer of its statutory duty. Contracts that assume a subcontractor or supervisor bears sole responsibility for on-site safety decisions, without reserving the principal's right to verify load-bearing assumptions and method compliance before high-risk work proceeds, leave all parties exposed.

03

Jurong Port Road (Integrated Construction and Prefabrication Hub) — Formwork Collapse onto Lorry

Jurisdiction: Singapore | 3 August 2026 | MOM stop-work order; investigation ongoing

INCIDENT SUMMARY

On 3 August 2026, at approximately 9:50 am, a 23-year-old construction worker died after a formwork structure collapsed onto a lorry at a worksite along Jurong Port Road, where construction of the Jurong Port Integrated Construction and Prefabrication Hub was underway. The formwork fell from the fifth storey of a building under construction while being repositioned, crushing the lorry cabin and trapping the worker. SCDF rescue specialists from the Disaster Assistance and Rescue Team used hydraulic rescue equipment to free him, but he was pronounced dead at the scene by an SCDF paramedic.

The site is occupied by HPC Builders Pte Ltd (main contractor), a subsidiary of Hong Kong-listed HPC Holdings, while the employer of the deceased worker is Keehans Pte Ltd, a general contractor listed with secondary activities in steel structural components. The project developer is Jurong Port. MOM instructed HPC Builders to stop all formwork activities at the worksite while the cause is investigated. MOM stated that risks of formwork structures toppling must be identified and addressed, including ensuring formwork is erected and repositioned according to the approved design and that only approved equipment is used for the formwork system. Police said foul play was not suspected based on preliminary investigations.

KEY LEGAL LESSON

Under section 14A of the WSH Act 2006, a principal who engages a contractor has additional duties to take, so far as is reasonably practicable, measures to ensure the safety and health of the contractor's employees. Where the principal directs how work is to be carried out, its duties extend to those of an employer under section 12. A contract that assigns formwork repositioning to a subcontractor without verifying that the approved design, equipment, and method statement are being followed — and without reserving the principal's right to halt work when they are not — leaves the principal exposed to the full scope of its statutory duties, regardless of how responsibility was allocated commercially.

Sources: see References section. Key reports:

- Yahoo News Singapore / The Online Citizen (Turf City MRT Cross Island Line fatality)
- AsiaOne / The Independent (Upper Paya Lebar canopy collapse fatality)
- AsiaOne / Splash247 (Jurong Port formwork collapse fatality)

RECURRING RISK THEMES | PRE-SIGNING BLIND SPOTS

Three legal risks recur across these incidents and warrant leadership attention before any agreement is signed. Each risk arises from a failure to align contractual responsibility with the statutory duties imposed by the WSH Act 2006.

R1

Failing to Map WSH Act Duties Across the Contracting Chain Before Signing

Many companies sign subcontracts and joint-venture agreements without mapping who bears the statutory duties of occupier (section 11), employer (section 12), and principal (section 14A) under the WSH Act 2006. The Turf City and Jurong Port cases show that MOM will direct stop-work orders at the site occupier regardless of how risk was allocated commercially. If the contract does not align responsibility with the party that has actual control over the relevant hazard, the party named as occupier or principal may face regulatory action for risks it did not directly manage.

R2

Accepting Interface or Exclusion-Zone Duties Without Verifying the Method Statement

Subcontractors routinely accept banksman, exclusion-zone, or formwork-repositioning duties without receiving the full method statement, structural calculations, or load-bearing assumptions behind the work they are policing. The Turf City case shows that a banksman can be positioned within a danger zone designed by others, and the Jurong Port case shows that formwork repositioning can fail when the approved design is not followed. Contracts that assign these duties without a matching right to receive and verify the underlying method statement leave the subcontractor exposed.

R3

Ignoring Structural and Load-Bearing Assumptions Before Authorising Work

The Paya Lebar case illustrates a risk that is often commercially ignored: a structure's design load may not be verified before materials are placed on it. BCA's response — revoking the building work permit and requiring a qualified person's report — shows that regulatory consequences can extend beyond MOM's stop-work order. Contracts that do not require verification of load-bearing capacity before authorising storage or placement of materials on temporary or newly constructed structures leave all parties exposed to both WSH Act and Building Control Act liability.

LESSONS LEARNED & STRATEGIES

Three strategies that could have avoided unnecessary liability in the cases reviewed above. Each strategy addresses a specific WSH Act duty or control failure that was commercially ignored before signing.

S1

Strategy 1 — Map WSH Act Duties (Occupier, Employer, Principal) Before Signing

Before signing any subcontract or joint-venture agreement, identify which party will be the occupier, employer, and principal under the WSH Act 2006, and ensure the contract's risk allocation aligns with those statutory duties. Include a right to renegotiate or terminate if the party designated as occupier or principal loses actual control over the relevant hazard during project execution.

S2

Strategy 2 — Require Method-Statement Sharing and Exclusion-Zone Verification for All High-Risk Work

Any clause assigning banksman, exclusion-zone, or formwork-repositioning duties should be matched with an express right to receive the full method statement, sequencing plan, and structural or load-bearing assumptions before work begins, and the right to pause work if that information is incomplete, inconsistent with site conditions, or not being followed.

S3

Strategy 3 — Ensure Contractual Rights to Halt Work When Structural Assumptions Are Unverified

Where work involves temporary structures, formwork, canopies, or load-bearing elements, the contract should reserve an express right to halt work when the approved design, equipment, or method is not being followed, and to require verification of load-bearing capacity before materials are placed on any structure. This right should be backed by a notice and cost-recovery mechanism.

ASSERTING YOUR RIGHTS | RESPONSE PROTOCOL

Three steps to demand your rights when a reasonable claim is refused or a stop-work order creates uncompensated loss. Each step is designed to create a contemporaneous record anchored to the specific WSH Act duty at issue.

01

Step 1 — Anchor the Claim to the Specific WSH Act Duty Breached

Where a claim arises from an accident or stop-work order, tie it precisely to the WSH Act duty that was breached — whether the occupier's duty under section 11, the employer's duty under section 12, or the principal's duty under section 14A — and to the specific control failure that caused or contributed to the event.

02

Step 2 — Demand Written Reasons for Refusal or Stop-Work Direction

If a principal, main contractor, or approving authority refuses a reasonable request for information, method-statement verification, or compensation following a stop-work order, ask for written reasons immediately and, failing that, issue the company's own written record of what was requested, what was refused, and when.

03

Step 3 — Escalate Promptly Through the Contractual Hierarchy

If the refusal stands, move quickly to the next available forum — senior management review, dispute board, statutory adjudication under the Building and Construction Industry Security of Payment Act, arbitration, or litigation — while carefully tracking notice periods and condition precedents, since delay is one of the most common reasons an otherwise valid claim is later defeated.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS | LEADERSHIP DISTRIBUTION

The following actions are recommended for immediate communication to project teams, contract managers, and commercial leadership. Each action can be implemented without disrupting existing business relationships.

ACTION 1 Map WSH Act duties before signing

Before signing any subcontract or joint-venture agreement, identify which party bears the statutory duties of occupier, employer, and principal under the WSH Act 2006, and align the contract's risk allocation with those duties.

ACTION 2 Require method-statement sharing for high-risk work

Any clause assigning banksman, exclusion-zone, or formwork duties must include a right to receive the full method statement and structural assumptions before work begins, and the right to pause if they are missing or not followed.

ACTION 3 Secure halt-work rights for unverified structural assumptions

Where work involves temporary structures, formwork, or load-bearing elements, reserve an express right to halt work when the approved design or method is not being followed, backed by a notice and cost-recovery mechanism.

HOW RXM ADVISORY CAN ASSIST

BEFORE EXECUTION

Map WSH Act 2006 duties (occupier, employer, principal) across the contracting chain before signature, and align the contract's risk allocation with those statutory duties so that responsibility follows actual control.

DURING DELIVERY

Structure method-statement sharing, exclusion-zone verification, and halt-work rights for high-risk work, and assist in drafting notices when a principal or main contractor refuses reasonable safety-related requests.

AFTER AN INCIDENT

Analyse the contractual chain against WSH Act duties, assess exposure to MOM stop-work orders and BCA permit revocation, and structure claims against parties whose failure to share information or follow approved methods contributed to the loss.

To arrange a consultation or a contract risk review, contact RXM Advisory Pte Ltd at michael@rxmadvisory.com or +65 9616 9848.

[← Return to English Edition](#)

建筑事故与意外 — 新加坡

2026年三宗新加坡建筑致命事故：安全与健康法下的多层分包风险与签约前盲点

一. 现实案例：三宗事故说明签约前的盲点如何在事故后转化为责任

01

车城地铁站（跨岛线）—指挥员被临时混凝土构件击中致死

司法管辖区：新加坡 | 2026年5月14日 | MOM发出停工令；调查进行中

事故概要

2026年5月14日约下午1时30分，一名23岁建筑工人在跨岛线（Cross Island Line）武吉知马段拟建的车城地铁站工地（250A Turf Club Road, 武吉知马），于凿除混凝土工序中被一块临时混凝土构件击中身亡。该工人受雇于总承包联营体旗下的分包商高国龙建筑（Koh Kock Leong Construction），当时担任指挥员，负责引导挖掘机操作员并阻止他人进入工作区；挖掘机正在混凝土板下方凿除混凝土时，构件击中他后，警方发现他已无反应，民防部队人员在现场宣布其死亡。

陆路交通管理局（LTA）作为项目发展商，确认正在支持人力部及警方的调查。人力部下令工地占用方STECS-Obayashi CR203联营体暂停该工地所有凿除工程，以待调查。人力部重申，凿除及移除临时混凝土构件必须以受控方式进行，隔离区必须严格执行，指挥员不得将自己置于潜在危险区域内。

关键法律教训

根据2006年《工作场所安全与健康法》第11条，工地占用方有义务在合理可行范围内确保工地对所有人员安全，无论该人员是否为其雇员。若分包合同只赋予指挥员及隔离区职责，却没有同时要求总承包商提供相关的方法说明书、工序排序逻辑及结构假设，分包商实际上是在管理一项自己无法完全设计、也无法完全核实的风险——而占用方确保工地安全的法定义务是不可委托的。

02

上旧班利巴路附近宅宅（Jalan Usaha）—雨篷在砖块载荷下坍塌致死

司法管辖区：新加坡 | 2026年5月16日 | MOM及BCA发出停工令；调查进行中

事故概要

2026年5月16日约上午10时30分，一名30岁孟加拉国籍现场监工在上旧班利巴路附近的Jalan Usaha一处住宅工地，被新建的混凝土雨篷坍塌后压中身亡。该监工疑似指挥将约六吨砖块放置于雨篷上——据报道是为了遮雨——尽管之前已被告知不可如此。卡车将砖块托盘吊放于雨篷上不到五分钟，雨篷却坍塌。该监工被送往陈笃生医院时已昏迷，后来不治身亡。

人力部指示工地占用方及该监工的雇主LCN暂停所有工程。人力部表示，作为一般安全措施，建筑材料不应放置于未经设计承载该载荷的结构上。建筑管理局（BCA）表示将撤销建筑工程许可证并发出停工令，要求资格人员提交调查报告及矫正方案后方可复工。警方表示初步调查未发现如何犯罪嫌疑。

关键法律教训

根据2006年《工作场所安全与健康法》第12条，雇主有义务在合理可行范围内采取措施确保雇员的安全与健康。当监工自身的指挥与事故发生有关时，雇主提供充分指导、培训及监督的义务仍然存在——监工可能违反了之前的指示这一事实，并不自动免除雇主的法定义务。合同若假定分包商或监工单独承担现场安全决策责任，却未保留主体在高风险工序开始前核实载重假设及方法合规性的权利，则所有各方都会暴露于责任之下。

03**裕廊港路（综合建筑与预制构件中心）—模板坍塌压中货车致死**

司法管辖区：新加坡 | 2026年8月3日 | MOM发出停工令；调查进行中

事故概要

2026年8月3日约上午9时50分，一名23岁建筑工人在裕廊港路沿线的一处工地（裕廊港综合建筑与预制构件中心）被坍塌的模板结构压中货车后身亡。模板在建筑中的五层楼被重新定位时从建筑物坠落，压碎货车驾驶室并将该工人困住。新加坡民防部（SCDF）特勤队使用液压救援设备将其救出，但在现场宣布其死亡。

该工地占用方为HPC Builders Pte Ltd（总承包商，香港上市公司HPC Holdings的子公司），死者的雇主为Keehans Pte Ltd（一般承包商），项目发展商为裕廊港。人力部指示HPC Builders暂停所有模板作业，待调查原因。人力部表示，模板结构倒塌的风险必须被识别及处理，包括确保模板按批准设计建造及重新定位，且只使用批准设备。警方表示初步调查未发现如何犯罪嫌疑。

关键法律教训

根据2006年《工作场所安全与健康法》第14A条，委托承包商的主体有额外义务在合理可行范围内采取措施确保承包商雇员的安全与健康。若主体指挥工作方式，其义务扩展至第12条下雇主的义务。合同若将模板重新定位交给分包商，却未核实批准设计、设备及方法说明书是否被遵守，也未保留主体在未遵守时叫停的权利，则主体将暴露于其法定义务的全部范围内，无论商业上如何分配责任。

二. 许多公司在签约前仍会忽略的三类法律风险**签约前未梳理安全与健康法下各层级的法定义务****R1**

许多公司在签署分包合同及联营协议时，未梳理谁承担安全与健康法下占用方（第11条）、雇主（第12条）及主体（第14A条）的法定义务。车城及裕廊港案例显示，人力部会向工地占用方发出停工令，无论商业上如何分配风险。若合同未将责任与实际控制相应的方对齐，被列为占用方或主体的一方可能面临为其未直接管理的风险承担监管责任。

R2

接受接口或隔离区职责，却未核实方法说明书

分包商经常在未获得完整方法说明书、结构计算或载重假设的情况下，就接受指挥员、隔离区或模板重新定位等职责。车城案例显示指挥员可能被置于由他人设计的危险区域内，裕廊港案例显示模板重新定位在未遵守批准设计时可能失败。合同若未赋予核实方法说明书的权利，分包商将暴露于无法验证的风险之下。

授权工作前忽视结构及载重假设

R3

上旧班利巴案例说明了一个经常被忽视的风险：结构的设计载荷可能在材料放置前未经核实。BCA的回应——撤销建筑工程许可证并要求资格人员报告——显示监管后果可超越人力部的停工令。合同若未要求在临时或新建结构上放置材料前核实载重承载能力，所有各方都将暴露于安全与健康法及建筑控制法下的责任。

三. 三项本可避免不必要责任的策略

策略一 — 签约前梳理安全与健康法下的法定义务（占用方、雇主、主体）

S1

在签署任何分包合同或联营协议前，识别哪方将承担安全与健康法下的占用方、雇主及主体义务，并确保合同的风险分配与法定义务对齐。纳入一项权利：若被指定为占用方或主体的一方在项目执行中失去对相关危险的实际控制，可重新谈判或终止合同。

策略二 — 所有高风险工作必须要求共享方法说明书并核实隔离区

S2

任何赋予指挥员、隔离区或模板重新定位职责的条款，应同时配备明确权利，要求在工作开始前获得完整方法说明书、工序排序计划及结构或载重假设，并在信息不完整、与现场不符或未被遵守时暂停工作。

策略三 — 结构假设未核实时确保合同中的停工权利

S3

当工作涉及临时结构、模板、雨篷或载重元件时，合同应预留明确的停工权利：当批准设计、设备或方法未被遵守时，可叫停工作，并要求在材料放置于任何结构上之前核实载重承载能力。该权利应伴有通知及费用恢复机制。

四. 当合理索赔不被允许时，可采取的三项主张措施

步骤一 — 将索赔与安全与健康法下被违反的具体义务直接挂钩

01

若索赔源于事故或停工令，应将其精确地与违反的安全与健康法义务挂钩——包括占用方第11条、雇主第12条或主体第14A条的义务——以及导致或促成该事件的具体控制失败。

步骤二 — 要求对方书面说明拒绝或停工原因

02

若主体、总承包商或批准机构拒绝合理请求，应立即要求对方书面说明理由；若对方不愿提供，也应自行发出书面记录，载明所请求内容、被拒绝内容及日期。

步骤三 — 及时按合同层级升级处理

03

若拒绝维持，应尽快转向下一个可用的争议解决途径——管理层复核、争议审查、建筑与施工行业保障支付法下的法定裁决、仲裁或诉讼，同时仔细追踪通知期限及先决条件。

五. 可广泛分发给客户的三项实务建议

建议 1 签约前梳理安全与健康法义务

在签署任何分包合同或联营协议前，识别哪方承担安全与健康法下的占用方、雇主及主体义务，并将合同的风险分配与法定义务对齐。

建议 2 高风险工作必须共享方法说明书

任何赋予指挥员、隔离区或模板聘责的条款，必须包括在工作开始前获取完整方法说明书及结构假设的权利，以及在缺失或未被遵守时暂停的权利。

建议 3 为未核实结构假设争取停工权利

当工作涉及临时结构、模板或载重元件时，预留明确的停工权利：当批准设计或方法未被遵守时叫停，并伴有通知及费用恢复机制。

六. RXM 如何协助

签署前

梳理安全与健康法下的占用方、雇主及主体义务，并将合同的风险分配与法定义务对齐，使责任与实际控制相应。

执行阶段

设计方法说明书共享、隔离区核实及高风险工作的停工权利，并在主体或总承包商拒绝合理安全请求时协助起草通知。

事故发生后

将合同链与安全与健康法义务对比分析，评估人力部停工令及BCA撤销许可证的暴露，并组织对未共享信息或未遵守批准方法的方的索赔。

联系方式: michael@rxmadvisory.com | +65 9616 9848

REFERENCES | 参考文献

- [1] Yahoo News Singapore. (2026, May 17). MRT construction worker dies after being hit by concrete slab at Cross Island Line work site. <https://sg.news.yahoo.com/construction-worker-dies-being-struck-131100813.html> | The Online Citizen. (2026, May 18). Construction worker dies after being struck by concrete slab at Cross Island Line worksite. <https://theonlinecitizen.com/2026/05/18/construction-worker-dies-after-being-struck-by-concrete-slab-at-cross-island-line-worksite> | Mothership.SG. (2026, May 18). <https://mothership.sg/2026/05/cross-island-line-mrt-worker-die/>
- [2] AsiaOne. (2026, May 18). Site supervisor dies after bricks, canopy collapse on him at house near Upper Paya Lebar. <https://www.asiaone.com/singapore/site-supervisor-dies-after-bricks-canopy-collapse-him-house-near-upper-paya-lebar> |

MustShareNews. (2026). <https://mustsharenews.com/worker-house-paya-lebar/> | The Independent. (2026). <https://theindependent.sg/site-supervisor-30-dies-after-the-load-of-brick-pallets-collapses-on-canopy-at-paya-lebar-construction-site/>

[3] AsiaOne. (2026, August 3). Man dies after being trapped in lorry by collapsed scaffolding at Jurong Port construction site. <https://www.asiaone.com/singapore/jurong-port-scaffolding-collapse-man-dies-lorry-crushed> | Singapore Uncensored. (2026, August 3). <https://singaporeuncensored.com/worker-23-killed-after-formwork-structure-collapses-onto-lorry-at-jurong-construction-site/> | Splash247. (2026, August 3). <https://splash247.com/worker-killed-in-jurong-port-construction-accident/>

LEGAL DISCLAIMER 法律免责声明

English

This document is provided for general informational purposes only and does not constitute legal advice, legal opinion, or a comprehensive statement of the law on any specific matter. The materials may not be complete, current, independently verified, or applicable to any particular situation, and no representation or warranty is given as to their accuracy, completeness, reliability, or suitability. No person should act or refrain from acting based on this document without obtaining specific legal or other professional advice based on the relevant facts and applicable law. Distribution, receipt, or review of this document does not create any solicitor-client, attorney-client, advisory, or other professional relationship with RXM Advisory Pte Ltd. To the fullest extent permitted by law, RXM Advisory Pte Ltd disclaims liability for any loss, damage, cost, or consequence arising from reliance on this document or any part of it.

简体中文

本文件仅供一般信息参考之用，不构成任何具体事项的法律意见、法律建议，亦不构成对任何法律问题的完整陈述。本文件所载材料可能并不完整、并非最新、未经独立核实，亦未必适用于任何特定情况；对于其准确性、完整性、可靠性或适用性，RXM Advisory Pte Ltd 不作任何明示或默示的陈述或保证。任何人士在未根据具体事实及适用法律取得针对性的法律意见或其他专业意见前，不应仅依赖本文件而作出或不作出任何决定或行动。本文件的发送、分发、接收或阅读，均不构成与 RXM Advisory Pte Ltd 之间的律师—当事人关系、顾问关系或任何其他专业服务关系。在适用法律允许的最大范围内，RXM Advisory Pte Ltd 对任何人士因依赖本文件全部或部分内容而导致的任何损失、损害、费用或后果，不承担任何责任。

The End