Minutes of the Special Meeting of
the Sha Tin District Council in 2020

Date : 14 May 2020 (Thursday)
Time : 2:30 pm
Venue : Sha Tin District Council Conference Room
4/F, Sha Tin Government Offices

Present		**Time of joining the meeting**	**Time of leaving the meeting**
Chairman :	Mr CHING Cheung-ying, MH	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
Vice-Chairman :	Mr WONG Hok-lai, George	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
Members :	Mr CHAN Billy Shiu-yeung	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr CHAN Nok-hang	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr CHAN Pui-ming	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr CHAN Wan-tung	2:50 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr CHENG Chung-hang	2:50 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr CHEUNG Hing-wa	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr CHIU Chu-pong	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr CHOW Hiu-laam, Felix	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr CHUNG Lai-him, Johnny	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr HUI Lap-san	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr HUI Yui-yu	2:30 pm	4:57 pm
	Mr LAI Tsz-yan	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr LI Chi-wang, Raymond	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr LI Sai-hung	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr LI Wing-shing, Wilson	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr LIAO Pak-hong, Ricardo	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr LO Tak-ming	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr LO Yuet-chau	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr LUI Kai-wing	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Ms LUK Tsz-tung	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr MAK Tsz-kin	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr MAK Yun-pui, Chris	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr NG Kam-hung	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr SHAM Tsz-kit, Jimmy	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr SHEK William	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr SIN Cheuk-nam	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr TING Tsz-yuen	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr TSANG Kit	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr WAI Hing-cheung	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr WONG Ho-fung	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Ms WONG Man-huen	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr YAU Man-chun	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr YEUNG Sze-kin	5:41 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr YIP Wing	2:30 pm	6:29 pm
	Mr YUNG Ming-chau, Michael	2:30 pm	6:29 pm

Present		**Time of joining the meeting**	**Time of leaving the meeting**
Secretary :	Mr YUEN Chun-kit, Derek	Senior Executive Officer (District Council) / Sha Tin District Office	

In Attendance by Invitation	**Title**
Mr TSANG Kin-fung	Member of the Public
Mr LUK Yiu-fai	Lawyer
Mr MUI Chiu-yin	Community U media
Mr CHOW Tsz-kin	HKGolden Reporter
Mr LUK Wai-ho	PSHK Reporter
Ms LAM Chi-wai	Member of the Public
Tommy WONG	White Night Reporter
Mr LAU Wing-hong	Member of the Public

Absent	
Dr LAM Kong-kwan	(Application for leave of absence received)
Mr MOK Kam-kwai, BBS	(”)
Ms NG Ting-lam	(”)
Ms TSANG So-lai	(”)
Mr CHENG Tsuk-man	(No application for leave of absence received)

Action

The Chairman welcomed all Members and guests to the special meeting.

2. The Chairman informed all attendees that some members of the public, being present as observers, were taking photographs, making video and audio recordings.

3. The Chairman asked all attendees to wear face masks in the conference room in view of the epidemic situation.

Applications for Leave of Absence

4. The Chairman said that the Secretariat received the applications for leave of absence in writing from the following Members:

Dr LAM Kong-kwan	Official commitment
Mr MOK Kam-kwai	”
Ms NG Ting-lam	”
Ms TSANG So-lai	Sickness

5. The Council unanimously approved the applications for leave of absence submitted by the Members above.

Action

Discussion Item

Matters in Relation to the Incident at the New Town Plaza in Sha Tin on 1 May

6. The views of the Chairman were summarised below:

(a) the aim of this meeting was to listen to the views of different stakeholders, in a comprehensive manner, about the situation they faced and how they handled it during the public order event at the New Town Plaza on 1 May;

(b) he said Members could take follow-up action and have a review with the departments concerned at the upcoming Sha Tin District Council (STDC) meeting after hearing the statements; and

(c) the STDC invited 8 guests to the special meeting and they would be arranged to speak one by one. They would each have 4 minutes to speak and after they finished their speech, Members present would each have a maximum of 4 minutes to ask the speaker questions. Guests could leave the conference room after they finished their response; they could observe the meeting at the public gallery if they would like to observe the remaining course of the meeting.

7. Mr Chris MAK would like to know why the Police did not send any representative to the meeting to listen to the views of representatives of the public or Members.

8. The Chairman conveyed that the Police was pleased to attend the full council meetings of the STDC to answer Members' questions. However, for meetings convened by the STDC with other parties, the Police believed that it might not be appropriate for them to send representatives.

9. The views of Mr Michael YUNG were summarised below:

(a) regarding the Chairman's invitation of 8 guests to give an account of the incident on 1 May, he asked whether they would be allowed to talk about what they experienced at the New Town Plaza yesterday;

(b) Members could not exchange with the Police at the meeting since they did not send any representatives to the meeting. He asked the Secretariat to prepare a summary of the speeches by the guests and the contents that required Members' follow-up actions before the next full council meeting; and

(c) to make the meeting smoother and to facilitate Members' understanding of the contents, he suggested that all guests be allowed to speak first, and the question and answer section would commence afterwards.

10. The views of the Chairman were summarised below:

(a) he hoped that guests could focus on the incident of 1 May when they spoke, but he also allowed them to mention their experience at the New Town Plaza yesterday during their speech if they needed to do so, with a view to improving the people

flow and venue arrangement in the future;

(b) since the next full council meeting was only a week away and it would cover some very serious topics, he asked the Secretariat to reply whether they could prepare a speech summary before the meeting; and

(c) regarding the proposal to let all guests speak first, he suggested that the meeting should run in the original way to avoid a prolonged meeting, and guests could also give responses more easily and clearly in this way.

11. Mr Derek YUEN, Senior Executive Officer (District Council) of the Sha Tin District Office (STDO) said the next full council meeting was only 4 working days away and the schedule was tight. Members might not be able to have a good grasp of the content if the information was too brief. However, the time and workload would be a concern if detailed information had to be prepared in a short period time. He said the Secretariat could provide an audio recording to facilitate Members' full understanding of the contents.

12. The Chairman said whether the Secretariat could prepare a summary in a short period of time depended on the length of the speeches at today's meeting.

13. The views of Mr Ricardo LIAO were summarised below:

(a) he opined that the shopping activity at the New Town Plaza on 1 May was closely related to the Sha Tin District. He regretted that the District Officer and the 2 Assistant District Officers were absent from the meeting; and

(b) he said some villagers and residents of Castello expressed discontent with the incident at the New Town Plaza on 1 May and hoped that he could reflect their opinions. He would like to condemn the 2 Members who were absent from the meeting due to official commitment and expressed regret for that.

14. The Chairman noted Mr Ricardo LIAO's views and said he could convey to the District Officer and Assistant District Officers his views regarding their attendance of the meeting, but he could not give any explanation on behalf of them.

15. The views of Mr Chris MAK were summarised below:

(a) he understood that detailed minutes of the meeting might not be available in such a short period of time. In view of the Police's absence from the meeting, he asked the Secretariat to prepare a summary or an outline before the full council meeting on 21 May, so that the Police could give responses at the next meeting;

(b) he asked whether the absence of the District Officer and the 2 Assistant District Officers from the meeting had "bypassed the STDC". He opined that the agenda of the special meeting was about the police-community relations in the Sha Tin District, and he was dissatisfied with their absence; and

(c) he asked the Chairman to let the Police know the contents of this meeting as soon as possible, and to think how to ensure that the Police would not walk out of the next meeting.

16. The Chairman said the Secretariat could give the audio recording to the Police after the meeting as soon as possible so that they would be aware of the contents of this meeting. Regarding the summary of the meeting, he asked the Secretariat to try their best. He also told the guests that they could supplement the content of their speech in writing after the meeting.

17. Mr Chris MAK asked the Secretariat to prepare an excerpt before the next meeting.

18. Mr Derek YUEN said he would have a separate discussion on the arrangement of the contents and details of the excerpt with the Chairman.

19. The Chairman suggested that comments on the post-meeting handling or arrangement could be made after the guests' speeches.

20. The views of Mr YIP Wing were summarised below:

(a) he asked the Secretariat to try their best to prepare an excerpt and convey the related questions or information to the Police before the full council meeting on 21 May. He wished that the Police would not avoid questions from Members or the public again; and

(b) he would like to know what follow-up actions the Chairman would take if the Police were absent from or walked out of the next meeting.

21. The Chairman said he could not predict the future reaction of the Police at the moment, but he noted Mr YIP Wing's views. He stressed that the Secretariat would definitely convey the audio recording of the meeting to the Police and would try to summarise the views of Members and guests, allowing the departments concerned to give responses at the next meeting by making reference to the concrete information.

22. Mr CHAN Wan-tung said he understood that the Chairman would like to chair the meeting impartially. However, he opined that the Chairman did not need to speak for the Secretariat and the Secretariat could respond to Members' questions regarding the excerpt itself. He asked the Chairman to request the Secretariat to provide the excerpt of this meeting at the next meeting.

23. The views of Mr CHENG Chung-hang were summarised below:

(a) he opined that if the minutes of the meeting could not be provided at the next meeting for the follow-up with the Police, the meeting today would be held in vain. He asked the Chairman to request the Secretariat to provide the excerpt or minutes of this meeting at the next meeting; and

(b) he agreed with Mr Michael YUNG's proposal to let all guests speak first, so that Members could have the whole picture before raising questions and avoid repeating questions.

Action

24. Mr CHIU Chu-pong said when he met the new Commander at the Police Station on 4 May, he had mentioned that there would be a public hearing on 8 May and Mr LEUNG Tsz-kin, Percy promised that he would come. He said he requested the STDO to convene a meeting on 8 May through the Chairman, but he did not know why the venue was arranged on 14 May instead. He asked the Secretariat why the Police were absent from this meeting and why the meeting was not convened on 8 May.

25. The Chairman said it was not the Secretariat's decision not to convene the meeting on 8 May. He said the Commander told him on 6 May that it was not appropriate for him to attend the meeting on 8 May or 14 May, but the Police were pleased to communicate with Members at the full council meeting on 21 May. He had already told Members that no matter how he presented, the Police did not change anyway. Therefore, he said that a meeting would be convened on 8 May the earliest, but then it was discovered later that the meeting could not be convened on 8 May and thus the special meeting was convened today.

26. Mr Jimmy SHAM said the Chairman had repeatedly communicated with different parties, including the Secretariat, in order to successfully convene this meeting. He said it was Members' initial idea that if the STDO did not agree to convene the meeting, they would rather hold the meeting at the New Town Plaza, even without the Secretariat, audio recording or minutes of the meeting, to let members of the public voice their opinions. Regarding Members' saying that the meeting would be held in vain if there were no minutes of the meeting, he opined that it was in conflict with the original intent. He suggested allowing guests who spared the time to attend the meeting to speak first, and handling the matters concerning why the meeting was convened today instead of on 8 May later.

27. The Chairman said he could not handle the meeting on 8 May last week in such a short period of time, and therefore he decided to convene the meeting on 14 May.

28. The views of Mr CHAN Pui-ming were summarised below:

(a) he agreed with Mr Michael YUNG's proposal to let all 8 guests give their speeches on similar experiences or the law enforcement of the prohibition on group gathering first, and then Members would ask questions afterwards; and

(b) he said representatives of the public who were invited to speak in the Legislative Council had prepared speaking notes. He suggested that the Secretariat could make reference to the relevant practice, obtain the speaking notes from the attendees after the meeting, or make reference to the news report or summary of this meeting prepared by the media present, with a view to expediting the administrative work and providing the papers of this meeting for Members' discussion at the meeting on 21 May.

29. Mr Johnny CHUNG asked the Chairman to reconsider Mr Michael YUNG's suggestion on the speaking arrangement. He said this was the first ever STDC meeting that allowed members of the public to give speeches. He believed that such a speaking arrangement could serve as a reference for the other 17 districts.

Action

30. Mr Wilson LI thanked the guests for attending the meeting today. He said he was aware that the workload of the Secretariat was heavy but he still asked the Secretariat to prepare a summary of the meeting, so that Members could seize the time to take follow-up actions and make comments at the next meeting. He also agreed with Mr CHAN Pui-ming and Mr Michael YUNG's proposal to let all 8 guests to give their speeches first. This could save time and allow Members to fully grasp the key points.

31. The views of Mr Michael YUNG were summarised below:

(a) he suggested that the Secretariat could make reference to the Legislative Council's arrangement for public hearing and collect the speaking notes from the representatives of the public after the meeting;

(b) he opined that the guests present might be disappointed that the Police did not send representatives to the meeting;

(c) he said the preparation work of the speech summary of the 8 guests could be shared by various Executive Officers, so that Members could have information papers and take follow-up actions at the next full council meeting; and

(d) he suggested listening to the guests' speeches as early as possible and asking questions afterwards, so as to make the meeting more useful and practical.

32. The views of the Chairman were summarised below:

(a) he said he would actively follow up the concerned meeting summary with the Secretariat after the meeting, which would be the reference for the next meeting;

(b) he said if the guests present did not have any objection, he accepted the proposal to let all guests to speak first;

(c) he welcomed Mr TSANG Kin-fung, Mr LUK Yiu-fai, Mr MUI Chiu-yin of the Community U media, Mr CHOW Tsz-kin of the HKGolden Reporter, Mr LUK Wai-ho of the PSHK Reporter, Ms LAM Chi-wai, Tommy WONG of the White Night Reporter and Mr LAU Wing-hong to the meeting;

(d) he said the STDC had no exemption clauses, and speakers were liable for their own speech; and

(e) he said speakers would speak according to the order already introduced, and each would have 4 minutes to speak, which would be followed by a 40-minute question and answer session. After the question and answer session, guests might either observe the meeting at the public gallery or leave.

(The Special Meeting of the STDC on 14 May 2020
For the summary of the speeches and responses to Members' questions by the guests, please refer to the appendix.)

Action

33. The Chairman asked the guests to leave first after they had finished their speeches and giving responses, and he adjourned the meeting for 10 minutes before the discussion continued. He also thanked the guests for attending the meeting, which provided sufficient information for Members to raise questions at the meeting on 21 May.

(After the adjournment)

34. The Chairman asked Members whether they agreed to address the provisional motion proposed by Mr YAU Man-chun.

35. Members agreed to address the provisional motion proposed by Mr YAU Man-chun.

36. Mr YAU Man-chun proposed the provisional motion as follows:

> "The Council expresses regret to the Police and the District Officer (Sha Tin) for their absence from the special meeting today.
>
> This full council meeting is convened in response to the entry of the Police into the New Town Plaza to disperse members of the public on 1 May, and several members of the public who were at the scene that day are invited to this meeting to give testimonies, with the aim of restoring black and white, truth and falsity. The Police, by declining the Council's invitation and being absent from the meeting today, avoids public questioning and the Council's demand for accountability once again, which is an act of serious misconduct and a breach of professionalism; while the District Officer (Sha Tin), being absent from the meeting, is clearly absent from duty without permission. In respect of this, the Council expresses regret and demands that the Police and the District Officer (Sha Tin) give an explanation for their absence from today's meeting at the next full council meeting."

Mr WONG Ho-fung, Mr TSANG Kit, Mr TING Tsz-yuen, Mr Billy CHAN, Mr CHIU Chu-pong, Mr SHEK William, Mr Jimmy SHAM, Mr HUI Yui-yu, Mr LAI Tsz-yan, Mr NG Kam-hung, Mr Wilson LI, Mr LO Tak-ming, Mr LO Yuet-chau, Mr CHEUNG Hing-wa, Mr LI Sai-hung, Mr YEUNG Sze-kin, Mr CHAN Wan-tung, Mr Ricardo LIAO, Mr WAI Hing-cheung, Mr CHENG Chung-hang, Mr Chris MAK, Mr Johnny CHUNG, Mr HUI Lap-san, Mr SIN Cheuk-nam, Mr CHAN Pui-ming, Mr Felix CHOW, Ms LUK Tsz-tung, Mr CHAN Nok-hang, Ms WONG Man-huen, Mr MAK Tsz-kin, Mr Michael YUNG, Mr LUI Kai-wing, Mr George WONG and Mr Raymond LI seconded the motion.

37. Mr LO Yuet-chau asked why the name of the Chairman was deleted amongst the seconders. He said if the Vice-Chairman seconded the motion, whether it would mislead the public that the Chairman did not support the motion and acquiesced to the District Officer's absence from the STDC meetings.

38. The Chairman said he supported the motion but he wanted to sign it in person. He also pointed out that some Members had complained to him after the first meeting that their names were added to the lists of seconders without their knowledge and he asked Members to reconsider the arrangement for seconding motions.

39. Mr Jimmy SHAM believed that the Chairman had already indicated his stance through his approval of the discussion of the provisional motion. He asked Members not to question the stance of the Chairman for procedural issues. He asked the Chairman to continue to let the STDC speak for the public and protect the well-being and rights of the residents of Sha Tin.

40. Mr YAU Man-chun said he had consulted about the arrangement for seconding motions in the Whatsapp group and no one raised any objections. He said he could delete Members' names in time if they did not agree to be seconders.

41. Mr Wilson LI supported the motion. He respected that the Chairman explained his reasons and signed the motion in person. He also hoped that Members could be united and continue to convey residents' views.

42. Mr CHIU Chu-pong said Mr YAU Man-chun had asked other Members whether they agreed to second the motion at the meeting and pointed out that there might not be enough time for everyone to sign it in person by circulation. He opined that the Chairman's remarks were unfair to Mr YAU Man-chun and said the Chairman could amend the Sha Tin District Council Standing Orders if he would like to stipulate that seconders could not ask other Members to sign on their behalf or simply leave their names.

43. Mr Michael YUNG said Mr YAU Man-chun did ask him whether he would like to second the motion, and he asked Mr YAU to sign on his behalf since he was busy. He believed that the Chairman only intended to remind Members. Moreover, as the motion had already been signed for seconding it, he asked Members to stop responding with tit for tat.

44. Mr Ricardo LIAO thanked the Chairman for seconding the motion and said Members' remarks were unfair to the Chairman. As the Chairman might not check his mobile phone for text messages all the time, he suggested informing the Chairman before proposing motions in future, and Members could still ask him whether he would second the motion by Whatsapp.

45. Mr Chris MAK said not all Members got Whatsapp messages and he believed that it would be better if the mover asked in person. Besides, he would like to condemn Mr Ricardo LIAO for age discrimination. He also expressed his respect for the Chairman's judgement and his understanding of the difficulty in convening today's meeting. In addition, he asked the Chairman whether every seconder was required to sign the motion in person.

46. The Chairman said he had been chairing the meeting and could not pay attention to the mobile phone all the time. He personally wished to sign the motion in person, and would not make any decision on the arrangement for seconding motions for other Members.

47. Mr Ricardo LIAO said he did not mean to age-discriminate and hoped that Mr Chris MAK could consider withdrawing the condemnation against him.

48. Mr Chris MAK agreed to withdraw his condemnation.

49. Mr YAU Man-chun amended his provisional motion as follows:

> "The Council strongly condemns the Police and the District Officer (Sha Tin) for their absence from the special meeting today.

This full council meeting is convened in response to the entry of the Police into the New Town Plaza to disperse members of the public on 1 May, and several members of the public who were at the scene that day are invited to this meeting to give testimonies, with the aim of restoring black and white, truth and falsity. The Police, by declining the Council's invitation and being absent from the meeting today, avoids public questioning and the Council's demand for accountability once again, which is an act of serious misconduct and a breach of professionalism; while the District Officer (Sha Tin), being absent from the meeting, is clearly absent from duty without permission. In respect of this, the Council expresses strong condemnation and demands that the Police and the District Officer (Sha Tin) give an explanation for their absence from today's meeting at the next full council meeting."

Mr WONG Ho-fung, Mr TSANG Kit, Mr TING Tsz-yuen, Mr Billy CHAN, Mr CHIU Chu-pong, Mr SHEK William, Mr Jimmy SHAM, Mr HUI Yui-yu, Mr LAI Tsz-yan, Mr NG Kam-hung, Mr Wilson LI, Mr LO Tak-ming, Mr LO Yuet-chau, Mr CHEUNG Hing-wa, Mr LI Sai-hung, Mr YEUNG Sze-kin, Mr CHAN Wan-tung, Mr Ricardo LIAO, Mr WAI Hing-cheung, Mr CHENG Chung-hang, Mr Chris MAK, Mr Johnny CHUNG, Mr HUI Lap-san, Mr SIN Cheuk-nam, Mr CHAN Pui-ming, Mr Felix CHOW, Ms LUK Tsz-tung, Mr CHAN Nok-hang, Ms WONG Man-huen, Mr MAK Tsz-kin, Mr Michael YUNG, Mr LUI Kai-wing, Mr George WONG, Mr Raymond LI and Mr CHING Cheung-ying seconded the motion.

50. The Members unanimously endorsed the provisional motion in paragraph 49.

Date and Time of Next Meeting

51. The next meeting was scheduled to be held at 2:30 pm on 21 May 2020 (Thursday).

52. The meeting was adjourned at 6:29 pm.

Sha Tin District Council Secretariat
STDC 13/15/15/1

July 2020

.

Appendix

Minutes of the Special Meeting of
the Sha Tin District Council Dated 14 May 2020
on Guests' Opinions and Responses to District Councillors' Questions

Date : 14 May 2020 (Thursday)
Time : 2:30 pm
Venue : Sha Tin District Council Conference Room
4/F, Sha Tin Government Offices

Matters in Relation to the Incident at the New Town Plaza in Sha Tin on 1 May

1. The views of Mr TSANG Kin-fung were summarised below:

   (a) he was issued a fixed penalty notice on "prohibition on group gathering" twice on the same day on the same occasion, which he considered unreasonable;

   (b) he found that members of the public could easily be charged with violation of "prohibition on group gathering", if the police could ticket those who happened to be on the same public occasion at the same time for the same purpose, whether they were alone or with other members of the public; and

   (c) he was at that time only asking the police officers whether the mall had been closed off. He requested the police to explain how they could identify the respective purposes of members of the public in the mall and disperse them accordingly. He opined that the police's dispersal action on that day was no different from closing off the mall.

2. The views of Mr LUK Yiu-fai were summarised below:

   (a) he went to New Town Plaza that day just to observe the live situation. He did not understand why the mall had mostly been closed and why the police had already entered the mall for law enforcement action when the mall's security guards had not yet dispersed members of the public;

   (b) a group of people entered the mall at around 10:16 pm. Since he was blind, he could not tell if the rest of the people on site were members of the public or police officers. Later on, Mr LUK requested a woman self-claiming to be a police officer to prove her police identity. During the conversation, a man self-claiming to be a police officer enquired about his purposes for going to the mall. He answered twice that he was there to monitor the police; yet that police officer said the blind could not possibly see and monitor the live situation. Mr LUK said he could sense the surrounding situation with his sense of hearing;

.

(c) Mr LUK found what the self-claimed male police officer said discriminatory. After the police officer accused him of having violated Cap. 599G of the Laws of Hong Kong, he responded by stating the police officer had violated Cap. 487 of the Laws of Hong Kong and asked him which chapter took priority out of the two;

(d) Mr LUK opined that members of the public needed not leave the mall when the police were entering it. The self-claimed female police officer stated that he should be aware of what members of the public were doing in the mall. He replied that he only knew they were singing in the mall, without having any idea what was going on, how he was violating the laws and how much social distance they were keeping among them. He added that the police, without producing any proof, demanded with discriminatory wording that he leave the mall;

(e) until now, the police still did not have any document or method for the visually impaired to verify their identity. To his knowledge, the Hong Kong Blind Union and The Hong Kong Society for the Blind had issued a statement demanding that the police adopt some methods to prove their identity to the visually impaired;

(f) Mr LUK said that the police had not yet given any response. Fortunately, there were 2 District Councillors right behind him at that time listening to his conversation with the police all along;

(g) regarding regular complaints against the police, Mr LUK could only lodge them with the Independent Police Complaints Council (IPCC) or the Complaints Against Police Office. As for the discrimination case mentioned above, a prosecution could supposedly be initiated via the Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC) or even the District Court. Mr LUK hoped that, if he was to lodge a complaint with the EOC, the EOC would be able to handle the case bypassing the entire police-monitoring mechanism; and

(h) he was told by some District Councillors after the incident that on that day he talked to a man believed to be a superintendent / Sha Tin District Commander of the Hong Kong Police Force and a female police officer surnamed LAI self-claiming to be with the Police Public Relations Branch (PPRB). The two police officers promised him that they would follow up on the matter, but so far no representative from the police had honoured their promise to contact him.

3. The views of Mr MUI Chiu-yin were summarised below:

(a) at 8:00 pm on 1 May, police officers issued a fixed penalty notice on "prohibition on group gathering" under Cap. 599G Prevention and Control of Disease (Prohibition on Group Gathering) Regulation to a video journalist and a text journalist of Community U Media who were reporting at Shop No. 328, Floor 1, Phase 3, New Town Plaza, Sha Tin. The "prohibition on group gathering" banned any group gathering of

more than 4 persons at that time;

(b) the 2 journalists stated their identity thrice to the police officers and showed them their press cards as well as their journalistic records. However, the police officers only told them to appeal at court and rejected further questions from them. The journalists noticed that the address filled in by the police officers on the fixed penalty notice did not exist;

(c) the 2 journalists were stopped and searched by the police again when reporting at New Town Plaza (Sha Tin) and Citylink Plaza at around 5:00 pm on 10 May. Two of the police officers involved in the stopping and searching were the ones who issued them a fixed penalty notice on "prohibition on group gathering" on 1 May:

(i) only the 2 journalists, no third or fourth person, were present when they were ticketed. After the journalists had stated their identity and shown their press cards, the police officers seized their press cards at once;

(ii) the 2 police officers agreed to the saying that they did not have time to look at their press cards;

(iii) the 2 journalists were not wearing reflective vests at that time; and

(iv) the 2 police officers took part in the action of issuing the fixed penalty notice to the 2 journalists.

(d) at 7:35 pm, the police accused journalistic work and those clad in yellow vests of obstructing public officers in the execution of duty. Deeming those people's action to be non-observers', the police pepper-sprayed the journalists;

(e) he deduced that the police's action was to fulfill the task of expeditious crowd dispersal entrusted by their superiors or the Government with disregard for the laws;

(f) most of the police officers failed to judge with a sensible mind and made unanalysed decision under pressure;

(g) police officers appeared hostile towards journalists, disregarding the fact that they were present on site out of job necessity and questioning their motives;

(h) the footage from Community U Media showed that those wearing journalist vests did not do anything more than journalistic work. Community U Media did not understand why the police accused those clad in yellow vests of obstructing them in the execution of duty; and

(i) Community U Media opined that the police trampled on the journalistic rights of media organisations and used the epidemic as a pretext to suppress press freedom with disregard for the exemptions in the regulations.

4. Mr CHOW Tsz-kin said that the police always entered shopping malls to pepper-spray and disperse journalists in a bid to obstruct journalistic work. He was disappointed about the police not sending any representative to the meeting.

5. Mr LUK Wai-ho said what the police had done over the past few days was terribly disrespectful to the press. Besides, he agreed with Mr CHOW Tsz-kin.

6. The views of Ms LAM Chi-wai were summarised below:

(a) on 1 May 2020, she was only responding to an online rally calling for a peaceful assembly at New Town Plaza. A bunch of riot police officers arrived soon after the assembly started, carrying out dispersal action regardless of the purposes of the people there. She went to the mall not just for the peaceful assembly, but also for the restaurants, so she did not understand why the police prohibited her from doing that;

(b) she said that there were also a bunch of police officers storming into members of the public in yesterday's incident that startled people. Police officers frantically pepper-sprayed the people there and wielded batons at them. Seeing a member of the public being subdued by a plainclothes police officer, a friend of hers went forward trying to film it but got suddenly pepper-sprayed directly in the face by that police officer and consequently received injuries, including a small amount of nosebleed; and

(c) people's demands had not yet been realised. Also, the Hong Kong SAR Government and the Chinese Government kept meddling with Hong Kong's rule of law, causing people to lose faith in it. She hoped the issue would be directly addressed.

7. The views of Tommy WONG were summarised below:

(a) at 9:10 pm on 1 May 2020, he was at the YATA-bound corridor on the 3rd floor of New Town Plaza. He only saw journalists reporting news there and no protestor was present, but the police sealed both ends of the corridor all of a sudden and dispersed the journalists. Given the limited space at the corridor, the journalists could only move slowly even though the police were swiftly advancing. Some of the journalists notified the police of the presence of wheelchair-users and asked them to control themselves not to charge, but the police ignored them;

(b) since a number of exits at New Town Plaza had been closed in the evening on 1 May, there remained very few exits for the journalists to leave the site. Since there was only 1 exit with a staircase leading to the podium available for the journalists, he could not leave the scene.

The police's charging posed a danger to the journalists. A police officer came to help him at the end, and let him and another journalist move out of the police's cordon line where they waited for the site to be unlocked to leave; and

(c) he found the police's enforcement action in disregard for public safety and their treatment to journalists unreasonable. He hoped the police would directly address the manners and discipline of police officers during their enforcement action.

8. The views of Mr LAU Wing-hong were summarised below:

(a) he opined that the incident that took place in New Town Plaza in May was a deliberate attempt of the police and Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK) to sabotage the mall's economic activities and people's daily lives;

(b) at around 9:30 pm on 1 May, the police sealed both ends of the corridor on the 3rd floor connecting New Town Plaza Phases 1 and 3, enclosing a bunch of journalists and several District Councillors. At the end, the police arranged for the people on site, including wheelchair users, to leave via a narrow exit, leading to dangerous moments during their departure;

(c) the journalists could no longer film what was happening in the mall after following the police's arrangement to leave the site;

(d) according the Police General Orders, the police were required to leave enough room for journalistic work during law enforcement action. He therefore opined that it was necessary for the police to explain why they forbade journalists to stay in the mall for news coverage on that day;

(e) he was aware that SHK issued warning letters to members of the public who posted slogans or notices on pillars inside New Town Plaza to deter them from doing so. He wished to know on what basis they issued the warning letters and what legal consequences were imposed on the warned; and

(f) he pointed out that police brutality was even more flagrant yesterday. After 2 plainclothes police officers had arrested 1 black-clad protestor, nearly 30 police officers of the Police Tactical Unit came in to profusely pepper-sprayed. Afterwards, blood stains suspected to be from members of the public on site were spotted on the ground.

9. The views of Mr YUNG Ming-chau, Michael were summarised below:

(a) he asked Mr TSANG Kin-fung whether the police officers gave verbal advice before issuing him fixed penalty notices on "prohibition on group gathering";

(b) he asked if Mr LUK Yiu-fai would keep a written record and find witnesses for future legal action in accordance with the Disability Discrimination Ordinance;

(c) he asked Mr MUI Chiu-yin if officers from the PPRB had coordinated when the police dispersed journalists by reason of obstructing public officers in the execution of duty;

(d) he asked Ms LAM Chi-wai whether the police gave any warning before pepper-spraying her, and whether her purposes of going to New Town Plaza included consumption of goods and services; and

(e) he asked Mr LAU Wing-hong whether the police's instructions for the people on site about leaving the mall were reasonable, and whether they gave the shoppers any chance to disperse. Besides, he asked if he could present photos concerning the relevant locations to the Sha Tin District Council (STDC).

10. Mr TSANG Kin-fung said that he was surrounded by riot police when questioning them their rationale for entering the mall. The warning the police gave him was not about the "prohibition on group gathering", but about disorderly conduct, so he was not allowed to leave. He said he was given a fixed penalty notice on "prohibition on group gathering" after several police officers had cornered him.

11. The views of Mr LUK Yiu-fai were summarised below:

(a) Mr LUK said he told the on-site police officers that he was exercising the rights of civilian oversight, but was questioned how the blind could monitor their work. He replied that he knew the police had entered the mall and he had an overall idea of the situation, but was then accused by police officers of feigning blindness; and

(b) the police fell into the habit of pepper-spraying without prior warning.

12. Mr MUI Chiu-yin said he knew PPRB officers were present on 1 May. He revealed his press identity to the police, but was issued a fixed penalty notice on "prohibition on group gathering" in front of Shop no. 328 on the 3rd floor at New Town Plaza Phase 1. However, when clashes were taking place or the police were issuing the notices, he did not see any PPRB officer within his sight.

13. Ms LAM Chi-wai said the police pepper-sprayed her without prior warning. She wanted to visit the restaurants there apart from attending the assembly, but the shops had been temporarily closed.

14. The views of Mr LAU Wing-hong were summarised below:

(a) at around 9:30 pm, he and some other journalists were dispersed and shoved to a location off Shop no. 366 at New Town Plaza Phase 1. He estimated that there were no less than 30 journalists on site. On one

end, the police officers instructed people to leave towards Phase 1; on the other end, towards Phase 3. The police officers on both ends charged and urged journalists to leave, but the door was not big enough for journalists carrying work equipment to swiftly get through. After negotiation, the police allowed them to leave towards Phase 3; and

(b) 1 plainclothes police officer pepper-sprayed right outside Heytea without showing his/her police warrant card. When the police were using force, there was at least 1 person clad in a reflective vest on site, and someone was injured.

15. The views of Mr CHAN Pui-ming were summarised below:

(a) he asked if the people given a fixed penalty notice on "prohibition on group gathering" had violated the regulations under Cap.599G of the Laws of Hong Kong;

(b) he asked if the police provided reasonable exit routes for the on-site people to disperse within an ample amount of time, and if they used pepper-spray with prior warning; and

(c) he asked Mr LUK Yiu-fai whether the police had given him the police numbers or call numbers of the police officers in question so far.

16. The views of Tommy WONG were summarised below:

(a) during the police's dispersal action at the corridor on the 3rd floor between New Town Plaza Phases 1 and 3, no explicit instruction was given to the crowd as to which direction they should go and the police only repeatedly ordered them to move forward. More than 30 people were flanked by the police at that moment; and

(b) the police were charging swiftly from both directions, leaving no time for the people on site to leave beforehand and causing chaos.

17. Mr TSANG Kin-fung said that he was surrounded by the police at zero distance. Next to him that night were the police only, not another soul.

18. The views of Mr LUK Yiu-fai were summarised below:

(a) after being verbally insulted by the police on 1 May, he asked a female police officer for the police numbers or call numbers of the police officers concerned, but was given no reply; and

(b) he opined that the police were duty-bound to ensure that no civil rights of members of the public were infringed, and enable members of the public, including the blind, to verify the identity of police officers. Ms LAI from the PPRB already had his telephone number, but he had not received any reply from the police yet.

19. The views of Mr LI Wing-shing, Wilson were summarised below:

(a) he asked Mr TSANG Kin-fung to describe the police's attitude during their law enforcement action and when he was issued 2 fixed penalty notices on "prohibition on group gathering";

(b) he asked Mr LUK Yiu-fai to elaborate on the situation where he was discriminated against by the police, and whether he would consider lodging a complaint with the EOC; and

(c) he asked Ms LAM Chi-wai to elaborate on the police's use of force on her friend, and how Tommy WONG was rudely treated as a wheelchair user.

20. The views of Mr TSANG Kin-fung were summarised below:

(a) he arrived at New Town Plaza at 7:00 pm. The police issued him a fixed penalty notice on "prohibition on group gathering" for the first time at 7:15 pm; about an hour later he was ticketed for the second time. After issuing the first notice, the police separated him from other people, set up a cordon line and pushed away the journalists on site;

(b) before ticketing him for the second time, the police had set up a cordon line in front of Zara and notified the people on site of dispersal action if they refused to leave. He then turned to leave, but was surrounded by the police from the other side. After he had shown his ID card to a police officer, another police officer told him to leave. He told the latter he had not been given back his ID card; but instead of being given a direct reply, he was told he would be arrested if he did not leave; and

(c) he did not sing or chant any slogans in the mall. His purpose there was to ask the police where they got their enforcement power from.

21. Mr LUK Yiu-fai said he used to be an EOC officer and understood what kind of action and language constituted discrimination. He said he was exercising the rights of civilian oversight on 1 May by asking the on-site police officers for their police numbers or call numbers under the police's suggestion. He would consider taking legal action against the police in accordance with the existing regulations and records.

22. Ms LAM Chi-wai said the person pepper-sprayed by the police during their dispersal action was a resident passing by.

23. The views of Mr CHUNG Lai-him, Johnny were summarised below:

(a) he asked Mr LUK Yiu-fai how he, as a person with disabilities, used his senses other than his sight to monitor the police's law enforcement action;

(b) he asked for suggestions to help the blind to identify the police;

(c) he asked if Mr LUK had been rudely treated by the police before he and Mr CHEUNG Hing-wa arrived at New Town Plaza;

(d) he asked if the police's instructions on setting up cordon lines and giving exit directions were clear or not; and

(e) he asked how Ms LAI, the female police officer, and Mr LEUNG, Sha Tin District Commander, followed up on Mr LUK's situation.

24. The views of Mr LUK Yiu-fai were summarised below:

(a) he was listening to the live news and simultaneously paying heed to the things happening around him. He could generally judge what was going on by the sounds. He said the blind could live a normal life and he could monitor the overall situation by the then environment, his distance with the surrounding people and the live news;

(b) he said monitoring the police's action was relatively dangerous. He chose to stay put because it would be hard for him to dodge if they charged;

(c) he had requested the police to provide the blind with ways to identify them, e.g. printing the warrant cards in braille and providing police numbers, but they had not carried out the measures; and

(d) he had been verbally insulted for being blind on other occasions; he considered that disrespectful and depriving people with disabilities of civil rights. He was not sure whom he was speaking with on that day, but was later told by District Councillors that the interlocutors were police constables and sergeants without call numbers provided. Afterwards, the female police officer surnamed LAI and a superintendent said they would follow up on the case, but no one had contacted him yet.

25. The views of Mr CHENG Chung-hang were summarised below:

(a) he had known Mr LUK Yiu-fai since 2014, and asked if the police unreasonably made threats, accusations and arbitrary arrests because they recognised Mr LUK; and

(b) he found the police's dispersal instructions unclear. He wished to know if the police's dispersal action was just to appeal for the crowd to leave, but without giving them the exit directions; and whether the police were familiar with the environment and the passages at New Town Plaza.

26. Mr TSANG Kin-fung said he was not sure if the police recognised him or considered him a troublemaker that day.

27. Tommy WONG opined that the police provided little assistance for wheelchair users in the course of their dispersal action. Since wheelchair users were bound by more limitations, e.g. staircases and ramps, they should be given a different exit route. He said the police locked down the site without giving exit routes. He hoped they would leave passages for members of the public to leave when they locked down the site.

28. Mr LUK Yiu-fai said the police demanded that members of the public leave immediately during their dispersal action, but he could not tell the direction and the police did not give him any instruction.

29. Mr LUI Kai-wing said the invitees mentioned that the police gave different instructions on the exit routes and only one exit was provided. He suggested inviting representatives of New Town Plaza to attend the next meeting to explain their roles and the situation on that day, e.g. whether the police had coordinated with the mall and arranged for exit routes before taking action.

30. The views of the Vice-Chairman were summarised below:

(a) the police ticketed Mr MUI Chiu-yin. He wished to know how he could get the police numbers, and whether the police ticketed him even though they knew he was a journalist;

(b) it had been known that the police pushed Mr LAU Wing-hong through a door into an emergency passage. He asked if the door was opened by the police or because Mr LAU had no other way to retreat to, and whether the police provided other ways for members of the public to leave;

(c) Mr LUK Yiu-fai said he was surrounded and discriminated against by the police, during which Inspector YIP, Police Community Relations Officer (Sha Tin), arrived at the scene to help. He wished to know if Inspector YIP was aware of the police numbers of the police officers involved and had followed up on the situation; and

(d) he asked the Secretariat to invite SHK and Kai Shing Management Services Limited (Kai Shing) to attend the meeting on the 21st this month.

31. Mr MUI Chiu-yin said the 2 journalists from his press organisation ticketed by the police said they did show their press cards and reporting records to the police. He was stopped during reporting on 10 May and ran into the 2 police officers who ticketed him on 1 May. When he was stopped and searched on 10 May, both parties confirmed in front of the camera that the 2 journalists showed their press cards and stated their press identity to the police on 1 May.

32. Mr LAU Wing-hong said he was not sure who opened that door. The police instructed him to leave via the opened emergency door. Since police officers were charging from both sides and there was no other exit route, he was trapped in that location. At the same time, there was a group of people helping wheelchair users

to leave.

33. Mr LUK Yiu-fai said when he was communicating with a female police, the male police officer standing on the left asked for his purpose of going there and insulted him. He immediately asked the female police officer for the male one's call number and rank, but she did not reply. Later on he learned that the male police officer was of a higher rank than she. Mr LUK called a man during conversation police officer, and learned from a news report that the female police clad in a pink top resting her arm on his shoulders was a police officer surnamed LAI from the Police Community Relations Unit of the Sha Tin District. Mr LUK said he could not locate the contact method of the police officer from the government telephone directory, and no one from the police had contacted him.

34. The views of Mr CHOW Hiu-laam, Felix were summarised below:

(a) he wished to learn from Tommy WONG about the time gap between the police's dispersal action and the point when the police officer helped him leave, and how the police officer helped him leave;

(b) he asked Mr MUI Chiu-yin how he could confirm the police officer he met on 10 May was the same one who ticketed him on 1 May. He also asked if the police officer personally admitted that he was the one who ticketed him that day; and

(c) he asked Mr LAU Wing-hong to confirm the time gap between the police's dispersal action and the point when they helped Tommy WONG leave, and whether the handling method was appropriate.

35. Tommy WONG said he filmed what was happening during dispersal when he was preceded by journalists and followed by the police. He said it took about 10 minutes between the police's charging action and their assistance. Afterwards, a police officer asked where he was heading and let him get out of the cordoned off area to somewhere safe. He said the police allowed another journalist from White Night Media to accompany him on the way out.

36. Mr MUI Chiu-yin said the journalist stopped on 10 May was the same person ticketed on 1 May. That journalist immediately said on camera that he ran into the same police officer, and that police officer confirmed he was the one who ticketed the 2 journalists on 1 May. Mr MUI said he would appeal against the situation that took place on that day, and demanded that the contents on the call card of the police officer on 10 May be documented.

37. The views of Mr LAU Wing-hong were summarised below:

(a) he said the door was very narrow because it was an emergency exit for temporary use instead of a glass door; and

(b) the people on site noticed that Tommy WONG could not leave via that door, so they told the police a wheelchair user needed assistance, but the police ignored them. At the end, it was the journalists and the District

Councillors on site who protected Tommy WONG. Since he was swiftly pushed out of the door, he did not witness the assistance the police offered to Tommy WONG.

38. The views of Mr MAK Tsz-kin were summarised below:

(a) he did not understand the police's criteria for taking enforcement action against violation of the "prohibition on group gathering" on 1 May and 10 May;

(b) both journalists and the blind were prosecuted and discriminated against by the police on 1 May. He demanded that the police apologise to Tommy WONG and Mr LUK Yiu-fai before attending the meeting;

(c) he asked the police to explain in writing the criteria and grounds for their enforcement action taken against those in breach of the "prohibition on group gathering"; and

(d) he proposed requesting SHK and Kai Shing to attend the next meeting.

39. The views of Mr CHAN Billy Shiu-yeung were summarised below:

(a) he said there was a 3-step process for the police to issue a fixed penalty notice on "prohibition on group gathering": advice, warning and issuing the notice. He asked Mr TSANG Kin-fung to clarify whether the police followed those steps that day;

(b) he said there were District Councillors on site monitoring the situation, and opined that there were police officers out of control. Given the chaos there, he only heard the police asking people to leave. He asked Mr LAU Wing-hong whether the police instructed members of the public to leave via other routes; and

(c) he asked the Chairman and the Secretariat to invite the government departments concerned when arranging for similar meetings, so that members of the public could voice their opinions directly.

40. The views of Ms WONG Man-huen were summarised below:

(a) she witnessed at the atrium of New Town Plaza on 1 May that Mr TSANG Kin-fung was dragged aside after being surrounded by a bunch of riot police officers. When she was about to go up and ask why, the police immediately set up an orange cordon line to expand the cordoned off area and pushed her back. They even pepper-sprayed 3 times without prior warning. Afterwards, she asked Mr TSANG why he was surrounded and dragged aside by the police, and questioned why the police expanded the cordoned off area; and

(b) she opined that journalists would wear their press cards and the police should have time to check. Regarding this, she asked the people concerned to provide more details about how they were treated by the police so as to put questions to the police.

41. The views of Mr TSANG Kin-fung were summarised below:

(a) it was terribly noisy at that time and a number of police officers were talking to him simultaneously. The police first accused him of disorderly conduct, then surrounded him without prior warning, dragged him aside and ticketed him, and dispersed the on-site journalists; and

(b) the situation of the second time was similar. Police officers surrounded him right away, dragged him aside and ticketed him.

42. The views of Mr LAU Wing-hong were summarised below:

(a) he said the police dispersed a group of people to an emergency exit and instructed them to leave there. There was no other option at that moment, so it did not pose a question of whether the instructions were clear or not; and

(b) those instructed by the police to leave included journalists who were duty-bound to film the situation in the mall. He considered the police obstructing news reporting a huge problem.

43. The views of Mr MUI Chiu-yin were summarised below:

(a) he opined that there were situations where the police did obstruct news reporting. It was necessary for the press to record whether the police had made inappropriate use of force or whether the whole process was in compliance with the laws, not just to protect the arrestees but also the police officers taking enforcement actions;

(b) he said the police would push journalists back indoors, and he considered it obstructing journalists from recording the arresting process;

(c) he pointed out that the motives and action journalists had for news reporting would not pose dangers to the police. He asked rhetorically whether cordon lines should be set up to restrict journalistic work; and

(d) there were 3 journalists including him from his press organisation at the time, respectively responsible for filming, text coverage and live streaming. He was wearing his press card. They stated their press identity to the police thrice, but the police said "tell it to the judge" and did not care how many of them in the group.

44. The views of Mr YIP Wing were summarised below:

(a) he asked Tommy WONG whether the police locked down the elevators and whether the police officers who took him away had a number or call number; and

(b) he hoped the police would improve their attitude towards people with disabilities.

45. The views of Mr LO Yuet-chau were summarised below:

(a) he suggested that Mr LUK Yiu-fai be equipped with a live recording gadget to document slurs cast by police officers. It would come in handy when lodging complaints; and

(b) he promised to question the police at the STDC meeting to be held on 21 May.

46. Mr CHAN Wan-tung suggested inviting the resident representatives concerned to the STDC meeting on 21 May and playing the relevant video clips there for discussion about the law enforcement action taken by the police.

47. The views of Mr LUK Yiu-fai were summarised below:

(a) he opined that the visually impaired were entitled to exercise the rights of civilian oversight and communicate normally with others; and

(b) he asked District Councillors to urge the police to respect everyone by relaying to the top brass that all people were born equal.

48. The views of Tommy WONG were summarised below:

(a) he could not re-enter the cordoned off area after being dispersed by the police, so he could not verify whether the elevators had been locked down and he could not leave either; and

(b) he did not notice the call numbers of the police officers due to the chaos.

49. The views of Mr WAI Hing-cheung were summarised below:

(a) he asked whether the saying that the police treated journalists with an unfriendly attitude was only applicable to the New Town Plaza incident on 1 May or a series of anti-extradition law incidents since last June;

(b) regarding Mr LUK Yiu-fai's repeated mentions of a female sergeant surnamed LAI who promised to follow up but had not been in touch, he asked for his consent so as to have it followed up after the meeting; and

(c) as Mr LUK Wai-ho and Mr CHOW Tsz-kin only expressed their helplessness and discontent when voicing their opinions, he asked how they would want the STDC to follow up.

50. The views of Mr LI Chi-wang, Raymond were summarised below:

(a) he asked the attendees if the "prohibition on group gathering" was suppression of press freedom and personal freedom; and

(b) he asked if the incidents that took place on 8 May and 13 May were the same as that on 1 May, and if there were different levels of suppression.

51. The views of Mr CHIU Chu-pong were summarised below:

(a) he asked the Chairman to invite the 8 members of the public again to the STDC meeting on 21 May for them to have a direct conversation with the police;

(b) he told Mr LUK Yiu-fai that the chief inspector from the Police Community Relations Unit who promised to follow up on the incident that night was named YIP Cheuk-yu (transliteration), and he was willing to provide YIP's contact method; and

(c) he witnessed on site that approximately 50 to 60 police officers surrounded Mr TSANG Kin-fung, which frightened members of the public. He opined that the instructions given by the police were confusing, and pointed out that the police used orange tape to move their enforcement areas forward.

52. Mr LUK Yiu-fai said he could not distinguish the police officers that night. The first female police officer had a normal attitude while the other police officer who was impolite was of a higher rank with unknown identity. Thereafter came 2 police officers, one of them was believed to be the one named by the District Councillor just now; another one was a female police officer surnamed LAI who asked for his contact number but had not contacted him, and she did not provide any police number and rank either. Mr LUK hoped that police officers would take the initiative to state their identity and police numbers.

53. Mr WONG Ho-fung asked Mr LAU Wing-hong whether SHK gave a verbal warning or collected personal details prior to issuing a warning letter to members of the public who shopped, passed by, put up posters, sang or stood in groups at New Town Plaza.

54. The views of Mr LO Tak-ming were summarised below:

(a) he said the problem was that the police did not show their warrant cards, so members of the public could not complain or would not get a fair investigation and result after lodging a complaint; and

(b) he opined lodging complaints with the IPCC or via the existing mechanism was rather useless and would not necessarily achieve expected results.

55. Mr MAK Yun-pui, Chris said that when the police saw him holding his phone, they got extremely sensitive or scolded members of the public to disperse. From his observations, the police were emotionally unfit to fulfil their duties and do their job. He asked the guests whether police officers would be affected by their own emotions in their judgement, ways of handling their tasks, their attitude, etc. He also asked whether they were foul-mouthed that day; if yes, what the content was about, and whether they used double standards for enforcement actions.

56. The views of Mr YAU Man-chun were summarised below:

(a) regarding the absence of the police, District Officer (Sha Tin) and Assistant District Officer (Sha Tin) at the meeting, he wished to propose a provisional motion;

(b) he wished to keep following up on the issue at the meeting on 21 May;

(c) he asked the Chairman and the Secretariat to formally invite SHK and District Land Office/Sha Tin to the meeting on 21 May;

(d) according to his observations on 1 May, the riot police were not enforcing the law at New Town Plaza, but messing up the economy of Hong Kong;

(e) he said that singing and shopping by members of the public as well as journalistic work at the mall during the post-epidemic holiday were all affected. Retailers could not keep their shops open after 6:00 pm; and

(f) he hoped an executive summary of this meeting would be available at the meeting next week, and he would discuss the follow-up items with District Councillors later on.

57. The views of Mr LAU Wing-hong were summarised below:

(a) the warning letter of SHK was to prohibit the posting of slogans and stickers as well as the use of such things as speakers and musical instruments within the areas of New Town Plaza;

(b) stickers had been put up on two pillars at New Town Plaza since 1 May. Not until 1 day before this meeting did New Town Plaza issue a warning letter to those who waved flags and posted promotional materials, but it did not look into the matter or enquire about their identity beforehand;

(c) he opined that some police officers were emotionally unstable when taking law enforcement action on 1 May. They shouted at members of the public at the mall or picked on people with disabilities such as Mr LUK; and

(d) he opined that everyone should have been ticketed by the standard of the "prohibition on group gathering", but a number of members of the public who reasoned with the police, e.g. Mr TSANG Kin-fung, were ticketed instead.

58. The views of Ms LAM Chi-wai were summarised below:

(a) she saw some police officers berating her and some other members of the public on the 2nd floor at the mall on 1 May. She asked the police why and regarded their action as insulting; and

(b) she said some police officers caused panic among members of the public by shining lights at them at New Town Plaza a day before the meeting.

59. The views of Mr LUK Yiu-fai were summarised below:

(a) he said he did not swear at the police or damage anything, but the police were likely to swear at members of the public;

(b) he found the police emotionally unstable, and suggested that the clinical psychologists of the police address the problem and study whether they were fit for being armed police officers;

(c) regarding District Councillors' suggestion to him about bringing a video-recording gadget, he said as he was taking out his phone trying to film the police officers who had called him "rubbish", they shoved him out of the way with a series of swear words; and

(d) he opined that police officers should properly manage their emotions before they could take law enforcement action normally.

.