



August 29, 2014

To Whom It May Concern:

Company : Sumitomo Heavy Industries, Ltd.
Representative : Shunsuke Betsukawa
President and Chief Executive Officer
Code : 6302
Contact : Tsuneyoshi Sato
General Manager, Corporate
Communications Department
Phone : +81-3-6737-2333

Notice Regarding the Filing of a Lawsuit (Counterclaim)

Sumitomo Heavy Industries, Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as “SHI” or the “Company”) hereby notifies that it has filed a counterclaim against the City of Kyoto (the “City”) in relation to the lawsuit which was filed by the City with the Kyoto District Court on March 20, 2014 regarding the Kyoto City Incinerated Ash Melting Facility (as previously notified on April 14, 2014 via a news release entitled “Notice Regarding a Lawsuit Filed Against the Company”).

1. Historical Background that Led to the Counterclaim

- (1) On March 18, 2005, the Company and the City entered into a construction contract (hereinafter referred to as the “Contract”) relating to the “Plant/Equipment Installation for the Kyoto City Incinerated Ash Melting Facility (Provisional Name) Construction Works”.
- (2) During the construction of the Incinerated Ash Melting Facility, several defects were discovered. At that point, the Company commenced a full-scale inspection of the facility, reviewed different corrective measures based on the results of the inspection, and received approval from the City to carry out such measures. Moreover, in July 2012, the Company and the City agreed to extend the project handover date to August 13, 2013 in order to provide enough time to implement these corrective measures.
- (3) The first trial run was completed in June 2013. At the same time, the works passed the first phase performance verification tests. Through this, the Company was able to confirm that the performance of the facility was satisfactory.
- (4) In the same month, the second trial run was carried out. At this time, it was discovered that un-melted residue (dust) was accumulating at the point where the slag from the melting furnace and un-melted waste is separated.
- (5) The Company submitted a report that analyzed the reasons for this problem as well as outlined corrective measures to the City and requested that it be allowed to implement such measures and re-commence commissioning activities. However, the “Performance Evaluation Committee” which was set up by the City, which comprises of technical staff and experts, concluded that it was not able to verify the effectiveness of such measures and denied the Company’s request.
- (6) While not approving the Company’s request to implement corrective measures and re-commence commissioning activities, in August 2013 the City announced that handover of the project would not be made before the deadline and moved to terminate the contract on the 5th of August (since a full month of operations is required to complete the second trial run, unless such activities commence on the 1st of the month, it would be impossible to handover the project prior to the deadline).
- (7) However, in the Contract there is no stipulation that requires that a “Performance Evaluation Committee” verify the effectiveness of any corrective measure. Of course, as the project principal, the City has the right to make its opinions known on an as needed basis during the performance of the Contract and also establish a “Performance Evaluation Committee” to review any corrective measures proposed by the Company. The Company also worked hard to incorporate the requests and wishes of the City as much as possible during the performance of the contract. Nonetheless, SHI feels strongly that the project handover date should have been extended in line with the time required for the “Performance Evaluation Committee”

to complete their review.

- (8) Moreover, the project handover could have been completed by the deadline, if the simple and easy-to-implement corrective measures proposed by the Company had been carried out.
- (9) In the Contract, there is a stipulation that states that if there are any disputes between the City and the Company regarding the performance of the Contract, a resolution will be sought out via mediation or arbitration through the Committee for the Adjustment of Construction Work Disputes as outlined in the Construction Industry Act. In accordance with this clause, on December 26, 2013, the Company submitted an arbitration request to the Central Committee for the Adjustment of Construction Work Disputes in regards to this dispute. However, the City stood firm on its stance to say that resolution via arbitration is not possible unless the Company abdicate the arbitration claim and responds favorably to its claim for compensation. Further, the City filed the lawsuit against the Company on March 20, 2014 without showing any posture to solve the dispute via arbitration.
- (10) Arbitration by the Central Committee for the Adjustment of Construction Work Disputes was terminated on July 31, 2014 because the City refused to participate in the arbitration.
- (11) The Company attempted to commence the second trial run for the plant that was almost complete, but the City refused to allow it, and the Company was thus prevented from carrying out one of the final steps of the Contract. As such, the Company still retains the right to claim payment for the outstanding balance of the Contract. The Company has filed the counterclaim against the City claiming payment for the outstanding balance of the Contract.

2. Date and Location where the Counterclaim was Filed

- (1) Location of Court where Counterclaim was Filed: Kyoto District Court
- (2) Date that the Counterclaim was Filed: August 29, 2014

3. Defendant of the Counterclaim

- (1) Name: The City of Kyoto
- (2) Address: 488 Kami-Honnoji-Mae-Cho, Oike-agaru, Teramachi-dori, Nakagyo-ku, Kyoto city, Kyoto, Japan
- (3) Name of Representative: Mr.Daisaku Kadokawa, Mayor of the City of Kyoto

4. Amount Claimed in the Counterclaim

The outstanding balance of the Contract in the amount of JPY1,398,637,000 and the proportion of the 3% per annum delinquency charge for the period from December 28, 2013 until the payment is made.

5. Future Outlook

Although there is potential for the Company's financial performance to be affected by the lawsuit, the Company strongly believes that the compensation claim made by the City is baseless because the works passed the first phase of performance verification tests, and the cancellation of the Contract by the City immediately prior to project completion is invalid. Moreover, as the City did not allow for the second trial run to be implemented, the Company was prevented from carrying out the work stipulated in the Contract, which means that the Company still retains the right to claim payment for the outstanding balance of the Contract. It is the Company's intention to make clear the legitimacy of the Company's counterarguments points regarding the lawsuit. Future progress and pertinent information regarding the lawsuit will be made available as and when deemed appropriate.

END

<Reference – Previous Notices Regarding this Topic>

<http://www.shi.co.jp/english/info/2013/6kgpsq0000001jv0-att/6kgpsq0000001jvi.pdf>
<http://www.shi.co.jp/english/info/2013/6kgpsq0000001jy0-att/6kgpsq0000001jyi.pdf>
<http://www.shi.co.jp/english/info/2013/6kgpsq0000001kg0-att/6kgpsq0000001kgi.pdf>
<http://www.shi.co.jp/english/info/2013/6kgpsq0000001ko0-att/6kgpsq0000001koi.pdf>
<http://www.shi.co.jp/english/info/2014/6kgpsq0000001kw0-att/6kgpsq0000001kwi.pdf>