AMP+[1] Mediation Success

Million Lighting Co Pte Ltd
&
Light Collab LLP
[2026] AMP+ MED 3

	Initiating Party	Responding Party
Name	Million Lighting Co Pte Ltd	Light Collab LLP
Nationality / Country of Incorporation	Singapore	Singapore
Representation	Eldan Law LLP	Central Chambers Law Corporation
Lawyers	Wendy Low	Justin Low Rajendran Kumaresan

Mediation Institution	WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center ("WIPO Center")
Mediator	Justice Lee Seiu Kin ("Justice Lee")
Shadow Mediator[2]	Ong Sheng Li, Gabriel
Date of Mediation	15 April 2026
Mode of Mediation	In person

Background

This dispute was linked to *Million Lighting Co Pte Ltd and Maerich Pte Ltd* [2026] AMP+ MED 2 (*Related Mediation*). The two cases were part of the same legal proceedings in court and arose from related circumstances. A key issue which arose in this case (but not the first) related to possession over a physical sample of the technological module. For information on the background facts, please see the *Related Mediation* case report.

The mediator for both cases was Justice Lee, who also sits as a Senior Judge in the High Court of Singapore. This case was scheduled to be mediated one day after the *Related Mediation*.

Under AMP+, the parties in a mediation case with a Singapore-based mediator can receive reimbursement of mediation costs, up to S$7,000.[3]

Mediation Process

The mediation started at 9.30am. After a short introduction, the Mediator mostly employed the use of shuttle mediation. This mode of mediation—where each party's representative and their lawyers met with the Mediator without the counterparty's presence—allowed for a frank exchange of views.

[1] The WIPO-ASEAN Mediation Programme (AMP+) offers funding for mediation under certain conditions.
[2] Under AMP+, a "shadow" mediator may be appointed to observe the mediation.
[3] It is a condition of funding under AMP+ that parties agree to named publicity, without the need to disclose specific details of the settlement agreement; hence this article.

The total time spent actively shuttling back and forth was around 4 hours. With the Mediator's skilful assistance, the parties ultimately signed a settlement agreement at around 6.30pm.

Challenges

Like many other commercial disputes, the parties' strict legal positions were not the only issues at play. Both sides felt that they had been unfairly treated by the other. The Mediator helped overcome this challenge by encouraging parties to focus on the alternatives to settlement bearing in mind the risks of litigation. This aspect of the Mediator's approach was also noted by the Responding Party's lawyers, who commented that "[i]n speaking with parties directly, the Mediator demonstrated a clear grasp of parties' concerns and was able to help parties weigh their expectations against litigation and commercial realities".

Reflections

In the write-up for the *Related Mediation*, the shadow mediator marvelled at Justice Lee's ability to faithfully communicate an offer made by one party to the other whilst keeping track of which parts of the information should not be relayed to the other. I was struck by that same thought as well when observing the mediation.

Conclusion

It was fulfilling to see the mediation end in a settlement agreement. The value of the mediation process was captured in the following feedback from the Responding Party:

> The mediation experience provided practical insight into alternative dispute resolution and the importance of resolving conflicts through communication and negotiation rather than litigation. It demonstrated how a neutral mediator facilitates constructive discussions, helping parties identify common interests and reach mutually acceptable agreements. Overall, the experience deepened [our] understanding of the legal mediation process and the value of collaborative problem-solving in dispute resolution.

Written by Ong Sheng Li, Gabriel
22 October 2026