

**Independent Committee in relation to the
Fire at Wang Fuk Court in Tai Po**

2ND WITNESS STATEMENT OF LAM Sau-ching

I, LAM Sau-ching, Divisional Occupational Safety Officer (Legal Services Division) of the Labour Department, 13/F, Harbour Building, 38 Pier Road, Central, Hong Kong, do say as follows:-

1. I am a Divisional Occupational Safety Officer of the Labour Department (“LD”) of the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. I am the same LAM Sau-ching who made a Witness Statement dated 16 January 2026 to the Committee.
2. I make this 2nd Witness Statement pursuant to Request 2 of the Committee as set out in the letter from Messrs. Lo & Lo, Solicitors for the Committee, to the Department of Justice dated 30 March 2026 (“**30 March Letter**”) in which specific questions were raised in paragraphs 1 to 4 (“**Questions**”). Save where otherwise appears, the facts deposed hereto are within my personal knowledge or are derived from office files and records and sources to which I have access and which are true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. Save as otherwise specified, this 2nd Witness Statement adopts the same abbreviations and nomenclature as in my previous Witness Statement.
3. In this 2nd Witness Statement, I shall address **Questions 1a, 1c and 2**. Other Questions which are within LD’s purview will be addressed in the 3rd witness statement of LI Man-pong. In this 2nd Witness Statement, I shall refer to the documents already included in the hearing bundles compiled by the Committee’s solicitors by

their respective bundle references (for example, [D1/A1/1] means Item 1 in Part A of Hearing Bundle D1, at p.1). Apart from these documents, I understand that LD will produce to the Committee a 2nd List of Document (“2nd LoD”), a draft of which I have read, indexing some further relevant documents in its possession. I shall refer to them by their designation in the 2nd LoD (for example, [LD 2nd LoD/A/1] means Item 1 in Part A of the 2nd LoD) without annexing them hereto for the avoidance of duplication.

4. This 2nd Witness Statement is divided into the following parts:
 - (1) **Part A** provides the requested information in answer to Questions 1a, 1c and 2; and
 - (2) **Part B** provides further information on a surveillance visit to WFC on 26 September 2024.

Part A – Answer to Questions 1a, 1c and 2

5. In Part A1 of my 1st Witness Statement [WS1/29/356-377], I explained that 16 inspections, including “initial inspection”, “normal inspection”, “complaint investigation”, “Improvement Notice follow-up inspection”, “Special Enforcement Operation” and “pre-court inspection¹”, were carried out by Occupational Safety Officers (“OSOs”) of LD at WFC between 1 July 2024 and 26 November 2025. I confirm that all of these inspections were conducted on a surprise basis, i.e. no prior notice was given to the relevant parties including renovation contractors, registered inspectors, or building management, before conducting the inspections.

¹ As mentioned in footnote 11 of my 1st Witness Statement [WS1/29/372], a pre-court inspection is a visit by OSOs after detecting a violation of Occupational Safety and Health legislation at a workplace with prosecution instigated and prior to the legal proceedings to be held in court.

6. Given that our inspections are carried out for law enforcement purposes, OSOs of LD are fully aware of and would strictly adhere to this departmental practice (of conducting such inspections for law enforcement purposes on a surprise basis). This has long been a well-established practice since I joined the department, although it is neither set out in any documented policy, standing order, practice or guideline, nor is it traceable as to who introduced this practice in the first place. Despite the above, OSOs would also receive reminders from the Operations Division (Headquarters) of LD via various means that occupational safety inspections shall be carried out in a surprise manner.

Part B – Surveillance visit to WFC site on 26 September 2024

7. Apart from the 16 site inspections mentioned in my 1st Witness Statement, a step-up surprise surveillance visit was also made to the WFC site on 26 September 2024, given that a number of complaints had been received in the preceding two months. The surprise surveillance visit was conducted by a team of five officers including myself, the focus of which was on unsafe work-at-height, unsafe lifting operation and smoking issue. Upon arrival at WFC, we spotted that bamboo scaffolding erection work was being carried out at lower floors of Wang Tai House. Given the high risk of the work, we dispersed to several locations on the ground floor of Wang Shing House to observe the scaffolding erection work being carried out at Wang Tai House for a better view, leaving a colleague at the covered playground behind the Tai Po Baptist Public School where we left our belongings. Around half an hour later, we gathered and concluded that no unsafe work activities such as unsafe work-at-height and unsafe lifting operation had been detected. Also, no worker was found smoking at the site. As there were no irregularities spotted, we left the site and did not inform the contractor of this surprise surveillance visit. For

recording purposes, the aforementioned visit was recorded in a minute (M-45) at [LD 2nd LoD/E/3] in the file “Area Patrol Operation”. [LD 2nd LoD/E/3]

8. I confirm that the contents of this Witness Statement are true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Dated this 15th day of April 2026.



LAM Sau-ching

#2139459