

IN THE FAMILY JUSTICE COURTS OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

[2025] SGFC 60

SS No. 912 of 2024

Between

XMZ

And

XNA

JUDGEMENT

***Family Law** – Family violence – Orders for protection – Husband seeking personal protection order against the Wife for the children and himself – Whether the correction exception in s 64 of the Women’s Charter 1961 is applicable*

***Family Law** – Family violence – Orders for protection – Husband seeking personal protection order against the Wife for the children and himself – Whether the Wife’s threat to the Husband that she would kill the children and herself amounts to family violence*

***Family Law** – Family violence – Orders for protection – Husband seeking personal protection order against the Wife for the children and himself – Whether the fact that the Wife loves the children deeply renders personal protection order unnecessary*

***Family Law** – Family violence – Orders for protection – Husband seeking personal protection order against the Wife for the children and himself – Whether the fact that the Husband is being charged for breach of an expedited*

order and voluntarily causing harm against the Wife suggests that he is a violent person and is thus not in need of personal protection order

Family Law – Family violence – Orders for protection – Husband seeking personal protection order against the Wife for the children and himself – Relevance of Wife's personality and power dynamics between the parties to the issue of personal protection order

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
27 JULY 2023 – CANING AND HITTING THE SON	2
PARTIES’ CASE	2
MY DECISION	3
2 APRIL 2024 – THREAT TO KILL THE CHILDREN – REPEATED MESSAGES TO THE HUSBAND	9
PARTIES’ CASE	10
MY DECISION	12
22 APRIL 2024 – HITTING AND CANING THE CHILDREN	17
PARTIES’ CASE	17
MY DECISION	18
2 MAY 2024 – KICKING THE HUSBAND’S LEG	21
PARTIES’ CASE	22
MY DECISION	22
13 AND 14 MAY 2024 – HARASSING THE HUSBAND	23
PARTIES’ CASE	23
MY DECISION	25
SUMMARY – FAMILY VIOLENCE COMMITTED.....	31
WHETHER PPO IS NECESSARY	32
FACT THAT WIFE LOVES THE CHILDREN	32
PROPENSITY TO THREATEN HARM TO SELF AND THE CHILDREN	33
FACT THAT HUSBAND IS FACING CHARGES	36

FACT THAT THE WIFE HAS MOVED OUT OF MATRIMONIAL HOME	38
CONCLUSION	40

This judgment is subject to final editorial corrections approved by the court and/or redaction pursuant to the publisher's duty in compliance with the law, for publication in LawNet and/or the Singapore Law Reports.

XMZ

v

XNA

[2025] SGFC 60

Family Court – SS No. 912 of 2024

District Judge Kow Keng Siong

3 October 2024, 17 and 20 December 2024, 25 March 2025, 21 May 2025

22 May 2025

District Judge Kow Keng Siong:

Introduction

1 This matter involves an application for personal protection order (“**PPO**”) by a Husband against his Wife. The PPO has been sought to protect the following persons:

- (a) The Husband,
- (b) His son (born in October 2016), and
- (c) His daughter (born in January 2018).

2 To succeed in his PPO application, the Husband must satisfy two requirements on a balance of probabilities.

(a) *First*, he must prove that the Wife had committed or is likely to commit “*family violence*” – defined in s 64 of the Women’s Charter (“**Charter**”) – against the children and himself.

(b) *Second*, the Husband must also prove that a PPO is *necessary* to protect the children and himself from the Wife.

3 The Husband had relied on five incidents to support his PPO application. After a trial, I allowed his application. These are my reasons.

27 July 2023 – Caning and hitting the son

4 I begin with the first incident.

Parties’ case

5 According to the Husband, the Wife had inflicted both “physical and emotional harm on the [son] on 27 July 2023” in the following manner.¹

(a) *First*, she had “verbally abused”, hit, and caned the son because of his poor spelling results. The Husband was not at home at the material time. However, he was able to tender a video recording (obtained from a CCTV camera installed at the home) to prove his claim.

(b) *Second*, during the caning, the Wife had injured the son’s left eye and caused it to be bruised and swollen.

¹ Complainant’s Written Submissions dated 03.05.25 at [1] to [17]; Husband’s statement dated 01.07.24 (C1) at page 4; Record of Proceedings for 03.10.24 at page 87 (line 1) to page 92 (line 27).

6 The Wife's case is as follows:²

(a) *First*, she was not at home on 27 July 2023 from 9.00 am to 4.00 pm. At the material time, she was attending a lecture for her nursing course. She adduced an "attendance" table from the course website to support this claim.³

(b) That said, the Wife did not deny that she was the person shown in the video recording. She explained that (i) she was disciplining the son at the material time, (ii) she had used only 10% to 15% of her strength during the caning,⁴ and (iii) her actions did not constitute family violence.

(c) *Finally*, the Wife vehemently denied having injured the son's eye. She adduced a medical report (dated 30 July 2023) which stated that it was the daughter who had accidentally poked the son's eye with a plastic stick while playing with him.⁵

My decision

7 Given the positions taken by the parties, the issues regarding the 27 July incident are as follows:

(a) Did the incident shown in the video recording take place on 27 July 2023?

² Respondent's Skeletal Closing Submissions dated 27.02.25 at [30] and [32]; Wife's affidavit dated 19.08.24 (R1) at [30] and [31].

³ The attendance table is in the Wife's affidavit dated 19.08.24 (R1) at page 100.

⁴ Record of Proceedings for 20.12.24 at page 52 (line 17 to line 29).

⁵ The medical report is at the Wife's affidavit dated 19.08.24 (R1) at page 104.

- (b) Did the Wife’s actions towards the son – as shown in the recording – come within the correction exception of “family violence” (“**correction exception**”)?
- (c) Did the Wife injure the son’s eye?

Incident had occurred on 27 July 2023

8 Regarding first issue, I find that the incident shown in the video recording did take place on 27 July 2023. These are my reasons:

- (a) *First*, the Wife had admitted that she is the person shown in the recording. The *timestamp* in the recording shows the date and time as 27 July 2023 and 3.50 pm respectively. The timestamp contradicts the Wife’s case that she was attending a lecture – and not at home – at the material time.
- (b) The Wife claimed that the Husband had tampered with the recording. I am unable to accept this claim. The recording was made about *10 months before* the Husband decided to apply for the PPO against the Wife.⁶ There is simply no reason why he would want to tamper with the timestamp at the material time.
- (c) *Second*, one day after the incident (i.e., on 28 July 2023), the Husband had sent a WhatsApp message to the Wife. In that message, he had told her that it was “not right” for her to “continuously hit” the son

⁶ The Husband applied for PPO on 15.05.24. For completeness, I note that at the start of the video, the Wife can be seen carrying a sling bag and appears to have just returned home – presumably after having left the lecture.

“yesterday”. In her replies via WhatsApp, the Wife did not deny having hit the child on 27 July 2023. She instead defended her actions.⁷

Wife had committed family violence – Correction exception inapplicable

9 This brings me to the second (and more important) issue. The Wife’s acts of hitting and caning the son would *technically* qualify as family violence. Does such conduct come within the correction exception?

10 On this issue, s 64 of the Charter provides that family violence “does not include any force lawfully used ... by way of correction towards a child below 21 years of age”. In *XKJ v XKK* [2025] SGFC 35 (“*XKJ*”) at [32], I had explained that to successfully invoke the correction exception, a respondent must prove two things.

(a) *First*, the respondent must prove that the use of force was *intended to benefit the child* – i.e., to inculcate in the child the appropriate behaviour and attitude (i) in his/her conduct as a person and (ii) in his/her relationship with others.

(b) *Second*, the respondent must also prove that the use of force is *neither excessive nor unreasonable*.

11 Has the Wife satisfied the *first requirement*? In my view, the answer is *yes*.

(a) As a preliminary point, I note that the Wife had given conflicting reasons for caning the son.

⁷ The exchange of messages can be found in Exhibit C6 at page 1 and page 2.

(i) *One day after* the incident (i.e., on 28 July 2023), the Wife sent the following WhatsApp messages to the Husband to explain why she had used force on the son:⁸

Message sent at 10.57 am – “I hit him Cauz he said that study is boring and crying to do (sic) homework”.

Message sent at 11.02 am – “... I hit him for his direspect (sic) behaviour and everyday crying to do (sic) homework”.

It appears from the above that the Wife had used force on the son for two reasons. *First*, for his poor attitude towards his studies. *Second*, for showing “disrespectful behaviour”.

(ii) During the trial (i.e., about *17 months after* the incident), the Wife gave different reasons for having used force on the son on 23 July 2023. Initially, she testified that it was because he had *lied to her*.⁹ Upon further examination, the Wife testified that it was because the son had *copied during spelling*.¹⁰

(b) I find that each of the Wife’s reasons given on 28 July 2023 and during the trial can provide a basis for punishing the son. Specifically, I am prepared to accept her evidence (i) that the son had been showing a poor attitude towards his studies, (ii) that he done badly in a recent spelling assignment, (iii) that he had copied during spelling, and (iv) that he thus needed to be disciplined.

⁸ The exchange of messages can be found in Exhibit C6 at page 2 and page 3.

⁹ Record of Proceedings for 17.12.24 at page 52 (line 17 to line 26).

¹⁰ Record of Proceedings for 20.12.24 at page 35 (line 7) to page 36 (line 24).

12 Next, has the Wife satisfied the *second requirement* to the correction exception? In my view, the answer is *no*. This is because while she had begun the punishment with an intention to correct the son's attitude and behaviour, the video recording clearly shows that the execution of her punishment was later fuelled by *anger*. It is settled law that the use of force on a child in such circumstances falls outside of the correction exception: see *XKJ* at [32(d)]. Evidence that the Wife had punished the son out of anger include the following:

(a) *First*, at the beginning of the punishment, the Wife had screamed repeatedly, and her demeanour was filled with rage. The son can be seen to be genuinely fearful of her at the material time. Indeed, during the hearing, I observed that the Wife was herself visibly distressed when reviewing the video recording of the punishment.

(b) *Second*, the Wife continued to cane the son even though the latter had apologised for his misbehaviour.¹¹

(c) *Finally*, there was a lull period in the punishment.¹² At about 4.18 pm, the Wife suddenly broke the lull by beginning to cane the son again *for no apparent reason*. Apart from venting the Wife's simmering frustration, the caning does not appear to serve any other function.

No evidence that the Wife had injured the son's eye

13 The remaining issue is whether the Wife had injured the son's eye while caning him.

¹¹ Record of Proceedings for 20.12.24 at page 79 (line 8 to line 11).

¹² the video recording of the "punishment" started at about 3.51 pm and ended at about 4.18 pm. This is based on the timestamps of the video recordings in C4 under the folder "SN 1 "(27-07-23)".

14 Regarding this issue, I note the following.

(a) *First*, there is *no* evidence – either from the video recording¹³ or testimony from the son – to prove that the Wife had caused the injury.

(b) *Second*, there are two *medical reports* which contradict the Husband’s claim that the Wife had injured the son’s eye. The first report is based on a consultation about three days after 27 July 2023. (This report is adduced by the Wife.) The second report is based on a consultation about one week prior to 5 August 2023. (This report is tendered by the Husband.)¹⁴ Both medical reports suggested that the son’s eye injury was caused “accidentally” by a plastic stick.

15 Despite the above, the Husband submitted that the Wife had injured the son’s eye. The sole basis for this submission is that she had failed to deny such an assertion that is implicit in the following message that he had sent to her one day after the caning incident.¹⁵

[The son] don’t (*sic*) deserved to get hit that back (*sic*) like yest, *till hurt his eyes* and etc.

[emphasis and text in square brackets added]

16 I am unable to accept the Husband’s submission.

¹³ Record of Proceedings for 17.12.24 at page 61 (lines 7 to 20).

¹⁴ The second medical report is exhibited in the Husband’s statement dated 01.07.24 (C1) at page 29.

¹⁵ Complainant’s Written Submissions dated 03.05.25 at [8] and [9]; Exhibit C6 at page 3.

(a) I find that the accusation in the message – that the Wife had injured the son’s eye – is indirect and equivocal. Such an accusation could easily have been missed by her.

(b) Indeed, the Wife explained that she did not agree or deny the message because she was more focused at the material time on highlighting to the Husband that he had failed to take any responsibility to guide and discipline the children.¹⁶

(c) Finally, during cross-examination, the Husband had acknowledged that the Wife did not admit to having injured the son’s eye in her replies to the implicit accusation in the message.¹⁷

2 April 2024 – Threat to kill the children – Repeated messages to the Husband

17 I now move on to the next incident. It had occurred on 2 April 2024. The following facts regarding that incident are not disputed:

(a) The Husband had suspected that the Wife was having an affair with X. To gather evidence of this, he had installed a voice recorder at the home without her knowledge.

(b) On 2 April 2024, via phone call over WhatsApp, the Wife had an argument with the Husband regarding the voice recorder.

¹⁶ Record of Proceedings for 20.12.24 at page 48 (line 4 to line 20).

¹⁷ Record of Proceedings for 17.12.24 at page 108 (line 8 to line 10).

(c) At or around 7.01 pm that day, the Wife sent a message to the Husband stating, “im going to kill myself with my kids” (“**Threat over WhatsApp**”).¹⁸

(d) Shortly after receiving the message, the Husband reached home. The Wife held a knife and threatened to cut herself (“**Threat at Home**”). She wanted the Husband to disclose his evidence of the alleged affair. After a tense moment, the situation was defused. The Husband had a voice recording of the Threat at Home.¹⁹

Parties’ case

18 The parties disagreed about the circumstances of the Threat over WhatsApp and the Threat at Home.

(a) According to the Husband –

(i) The Wife had made both threats to compel him to produce his evidence of the alleged affair.

(ii) The Threat at Home was made in the presence of the children and had caused them to be alarmed.²⁰

¹⁸ The message is contained in Exhibit C7 at page 7.

¹⁹ A transcript of the recording is contained in the Husband’s statement dated 01.07.24 at page 41 to page 46; Record of Proceeding for 03.10.24 at page 63 (line 22) to page 65 (line 16).

²⁰ Complainant’s Written Submissions dated 03.05.25 at [41] to [52]; Husband’s statement dated 01.07.24 at page 6.

(b) According to the Wife²¹ –

(i) She had made the Threat over WhatsApp under the *pressure of the Husband’s accusations* of her having an affair. Specifically, he had kept “pushing and bullying her” to admit to the affair. During a WhatsApp phone call that day, he had even asked her to “go and die”.

(ii) As for the Threat at Home, the Wife agreed that her intention was to compel the Husband to produce the recording. When making this threat, the children were *not* present.

(iii) It is the Wife’s case that a threat to commit suicide did not constitute “family violence”.²² This is because she did not cause hurt to the Husband and the children at the material time. She did not wilfully or knowingly place them in fear of hurt. In any event, she did not intend to carry out the threats. If the Husband had played the recording, she would not have made the threats.

19 Given the parties’ position, the factual issues for determination are as follows.

(a) *First*, did the Wife send the Threat over WhatsApp under pressure from the Husband?

²¹ Respondent’s Skeletal Closing Submissions dated 27.02.25 at [42] and [43]; Wife’s affidavit dated 19.08.24 (R1) at [15] to [17]; Record of Proceedings for 17.12.24 at page 75 (line 3 to line 18), page 81 (line 2 to line 23), page 82 (line 21 to line 24).

²² Respondent’s Skeletal Closing Submissions dated 27.02.25 at [42] and [43]; Wife’s affidavit dated 19.08.24 (R1) at [15] to [17].

(b) *Second*, were the children present when the Threat at Home was made?

(c) *Finally*, did the Wife commit family violence by making the threats?

My decision

Wife did not send the Threat over WhatsApp under pressure

20 Regarding the first issue, I am unable to the Wife’s claim that she was pressured into sending the Threat over WhatsApp because the Husband had (a) “bullied” her to admit to the affair and (b) asked her to “go and die”.

21 The records show the following communication between the parties shortly *before* the Threat over WhatsApp was sent:²³

	Time	From	Message/Calls
(1)	6.39 pm (50 s)	Wife	Voice call
(2)	6.40 pm (37 s)		
(3)	6.52 pm (5 min)		
(4)	6.57 pm	Wife	Missed video call
(5)	6.58 pm		
(6)	6.59 pm		
(7)	6.59 pm		
(8)	7.00 pm	Wife	“u going to answer or not”
(9)	7.01 pm	Wife	Missed video call
(10)	7.01 pm	Wife	“idiot”

²³ The messages can be found in exhibit C7; Record of Proceedings for 17.12.24 at page 72 (line 19 to line 32), page 74 (line 1 to line 27).

	Time	From	Message/Calls
(11)	7.01 pm	Husband	"I am going to the police station"
(12)	7.01 pm	Wife	"go"
(13)			"im going to kill myself with my kids"
(14)			"for your stupidyt"
(15)	7.02 pm	Wife	Missed video call
(16)	7.05 pm		
(17)	7.07 pm	Wife	"idiot"
(18)			"u decided for us to die right"
(19)			"great"

The above records disprove the Wife's claim that she was "undergoing emotional distress and [had] expressed feelings of helplessness" at the material time.²⁴ Let me explain.

(a) *First*, the records in [21(1)] to [21(9)] above show that the Wife had *initiated* multiple communication with the Husband in the 20 min period before sending the Threat over WhatsApp. If the Husband had been verbally abusive and harassing her, why did she initiate such communication?

(b) *Second*, the messages reveal that the Wife was in fact *angry* with the Husband at the material time:

(i) About one minute before sending the Threat over WhatsApp, she had called the Husband "idiot": see [21(1)]

²⁴ Respondent's Written Submissions in Reply dated 16.05.25 at [20].

above. At the trial, she explained that she had sent the message because he had talked “nonsense” at the material time.²⁵

(ii) Shortly after being called “idiot”, the Husband texted that he was going to the police station: see [21(11)]. In response to this text, the Wife sent the Threat over WhatsApp. It bears highlighting that she then followed up with a message *explaining* that she had sent the threat *because of* his “stupidity”: [21(14)]. The Wife did not make any reference to the Husband’s alleged “pressure” as being the trigger for sending the threat.

(c) *Third*, the Wife made it very clear during the trial that she had sent the Threat over WhatsApp and the message at [21(18)] above *to get the Husband’s attention* – as he was not answering her calls at the material time. She had simply wanted him to play the recording and had no intention to carry out the threat.²⁶ This shows that the Wife was in fact the one who was exerting pressure at the material time.

Children were present when the Threat at Home was made

22 I find that the children were present when the Wife made the Threat at Home. This is evident from the recording of the incident.²⁷ In that recording, the following could be heard.

²⁵ Wife’s evidence during cross-examination on 21.03.25.

²⁶ Record of Proceeding for 17.12.24 at page 109 (line 13) to page 110 (line 3); Record of Proceeding for 20.12.24 at page 54 (line 16 to line 23).

²⁷ A transcript of the voice recording is contained in the Husband’s statement dated 01.07.24 at page 41 to page 46.

- (a) The children were crying, shouting “Amma” and “Mama”, and pleading, “amma, no amma”.
- (b) The Husband was desperately trying to de-escalate the situation and to get the children away from the Wife.

Meaning of “family violence”

23 The next issue is whether the Wife’s threats constitute family violence. In this regard, s 64 of the Charter states –

“family violence” means the commission of any of the following acts:

- (a) wilfully or knowingly placing, or attempting to place, a family member in fear of hurt; [**Limb A**]
 - (b) causing hurt to a family member by such act which is known or ought to have been known would result in hurt; [**Limb B**]
 - (c) wrongfully confining or restraining a family member against his or her will; [**Limb C**]
 - (d) causing continual harassment with intent to cause or knowing that it is likely to cause anguish to a family member, [**Limb D**]
- [text in square brackets added]

Family violence under Limb B and Limb C had not been committed

24 Limb B and Limb C are clearly not applicable in the present case.

- (a) In the case of Limb B, “hurt” has been defined under s 64 to mean “*bodily* pain, disease or infirmity. This definition would not cover the *emotional* trauma suffered the Husband and the children because of the threats.

(b) As for Limb C, there is no evidence that the Wife had wrongfully confined or restrained the Husband and children at the material time.

25 This leaves us with Limb A and Limb D to be considered.

Family violence under Limb A had not been committed

26 I start with Limb A. I accept the Wife’s submission that the Threat over WhatsApp and the Threat at Home do *not* fall within Limb A.

(a) The Threat over WhatsApp involves a threat to cause harm to the children. However, there is no evidence to show that the Wife had intended the message to be read by the children, or that she would have known that the message would be read by them. Accordingly, the Wife did not wilfully or knowingly place, or attempt to place, the children in fear of hurt.

(b) Next, the Threat at Home. This involves a threat of *self*-harm by the Wife. She did not directly or indirectly threaten to harm either the Husband or the children. As such, she similarly did not wilfully or knowingly place, or attempt to place, them in fear of hurt.

Family violence under Limb D had been committed

27 In my view, the Wife had committed family violence under Limb D.

(a) *First*, on 2 April 2024, she had sent *two* messages in which she threatened to commit self-harm and to kill the children: see [21(13)] and [21(18)]. After sending these messages, the Wife *repeated* her threat to commit self-harm – this time holding a knife in the presence of the Husband and children at home. Such actions had *traumatised* the

Husband and children. In the audio recording of the Threat at Home, the children could be heard crying. The Husband could also be heard trying to calm the Wife down. She clearly knew that her threats had caused anguish to her family members. During the trial, the Wife admitted that it was wrong for her to have picked up a knife at the material time, and that the children ought to have been protected from such trauma.²⁸

(b) *Second*, earlier in the afternoon of 2 April 2024 (i.e., from 2.26 pm to 7.00 pm), the Wife had also sent to the Husband *multiple messages* demanding that he must (i) settle “the phone contract” and (ii) meet her at a place and time specified by her for this purpose. The Wife had made these demands despite the Husband informing her that he was busy at work and that he could meet her only after work.²⁹ The Wife would have known that her barrage of messages, calls, and demands to the Husband while he was at work are likely to cause anguish to him.

22 April 2024 – Hitting and caning the children

28 I now turn to the next incident. It is not disputed that on 22 April 2024 at about 8.40 pm, the Wife had caned the children. A video recording from a CCTV camera at home of this incident was admitted into evidence. The Husband was not at home at the material time.

Parties’ case

29 The issue regarding the 22 April incident centres on whether the Wife’s use of force on the children comes within the correction exception.

²⁸ Wife’s evidence during cross-examination on 21 March 2025.

²⁹ Exhibit C7 from page 2 to page 6.

(a) According to the Wife, a day before the incident, she had already warned the children against using violence towards each other and their domestic helper. Despite this warning, the son had hit the helper and the daughter on 22 April 2024. The daughter had also fought with the son that day. Accordingly, she had caned the children to discipline them.³⁰

(b) It is the Husband's case that the Wife hit the son because of the daughter's complaint over a minor matter – the son's refusal to share a toy with her. The Wife had caned the daughter when the son complained that the daughter had hit his buttocks. The Husband submitted that the Wife's use of force on the children (i) was unnecessarily severe given that the children merely had a "minor sibling conflict", (ii) was motivated by "frustration and anger", and (iii) was inflicted without concern for the children's welfare and had traumatised them.³¹

My decision

30 Having reviewed the video recording, I find that the Wife had failed to prove that the correction exception applies to the 22 April incident.

Reason for the use of force

31 I am unable to accept the Wife's claim that she had used force on the children because they had been physically violent towards each other and to the helper (in the case of the son).

³⁰ Respondent's Skeletal Closing Submissions dated 27.02.25 at [34] to [37]; Wife's affidavit dated 19.08.24 at [18].

³¹ Complainant's Written Submissions dated 03.05.25 at [18] to [31]; Husband's statement dated 01.07.24 (C1) at page 5; Record of Proceedings for 03.10.24 at page 70 (line 8) to page 71 (line 29); Record of Proceedings for 17.12.24 at page 11 (line 4 to line 25), page 13 (line 7 to line 30), page 115 (line 21 to line 31).

32 *First*, such a claim is not supported by the video recording of the incident. The recording reveals the following.

(a) Before the violence started, the children and the helper were in the living room, while the Wife was in the bedroom.

(b) For more than a minute *before* the Wife started to use force on the children, the latter were apparently doing their own things in the living room. The son did not hit the helper and the daughter. Neither did the daughter fight with the son. There was also no verbal altercation between the children.

(c) The Wife started to use force only after the daughter had gone into the bedroom – apparently to complain to her about the son.³²

(d) After the complaint, the Wife went to the living room and began hitting the son. During this period, the son said something to her. The word “pigu” (meaning buttocks in Chinese) could be heard. The Wife then turned her attention to the daughter and began caning her repeatedly.

33 *Second*, during the trial, the Wife could not recall what was the nature of the daughter’s complaint about the son.³³

³² The incident that the daughter complained about probably took place at the 1.45 min mark in the video recording (C5).

³³ Wife’s evidence in the Record of Proceedings for 20.12.24 at page 13 (line 17) to page 15 (line 32).

34 *Third*, given that the Wife did not see what the son was doing in the living room at the material time (because she was in the bedroom), there is no basis for her to claim that he had hit the domestic helper and the daughter.

35 In my view, the misbehaviour by the children, if any, is relatively minor. The Wife had failed to show why it is necessary to use force to punish them for such misbehaviour.

Manner the force was used

36 Additionally, I find that the Wife’s use of force at the material time had been excessive and unreasonable.

(a) Despite the relatively minor misbehaviour, the Wife had severely punished the children for about 5 mins.

(b) There are several instances when the use of force is *clearly gratuitous*.

(i) The Wife had caned the daughter repeatedly even after the latter (1) had apologised for what she had done, and (2) was screaming and crying in pain from the caning.³⁴

(ii) While the Wife’s initial motivation for the use of force might have been to punish the children for misbehaving, she subsequently used the cane to stop them from screaming out in

³⁴ See Exhibit C5 at the 3.15 min mark.

pain from the caning.³⁵ Clearly, a more effective way to stop the screaming is to simply stop the caning.

(iii) Despite the daughter having complied with the instructions to stop screaming, the Wife continued to cane the child. This caused the daughter to further scream in pain.³⁶ Caning in such circumstances is clearly unnecessary. The Wife’s actions suggest that she was seeking to assert power and control – rather than discipline – over the children through the infliction of pain: *XKJ* at [32(d)(iv)].³⁷

2 May 2024 – Kicking the Husband’s leg

37 I come to the next incident. This took place on 2 May 2024 at about 1.30 am. The incident – which is captured on the CCTV camera recording³⁸ – occurred after the Wife had just returned home from Malaysia. The Husband was sleeping on the floor in the living room at the material time.

³⁵ See for instance Exhibit C5 from the 3.20 min mark where the Wife can be heard repeatedly saying “stop screaming”.

³⁶ See, for instance, Exhibit C5 from the 3.50 min mark, the video in “kids was hit with cane rec2” filed in Exhibit C4 under the folder “SN2 (22-04-24)” from the 0.50 min mark.

³⁷ Complainant’s Written Submissions dated 03.05.25 at [26].

³⁸ The video recording can be found in Exhibit C4 under the folder “SN3 (02-05-2024)”.

Parties' case

38 According to the Husband, the Wife had harassed him (a) by kicking his leg repeatedly for about 90 s and (b) by taking away his sling bag which contained items such as his wallet and phone.³⁹

39 The Wife denied having harboured any intention to harass the Husband at the material time. According to her, she had merely nudged him with her leg as she felt pitiful for him to be sleeping on the floor.⁴⁰

My decision

40 I find that the Wife's actions did not amount to family violence.

(a) *First*, there is no evidence that her actions had caused "hurt" to the Husband. Put in another way, the Husband had failed to prove that he had suffered "bodily pain, disease or infirmity" because of the Wife's actions. Accordingly, Limb A is not engaged.

(b) *Second*, the Husband had also failed to bring his case under Limb D. Specifically, there is no evidence that the Wife had intended to cause, or knew that she was likely to cause, anguish to him at the material time. In the video recording, the Wife can be heard saying repeatedly in a normal tone, "Excuse me", "I need the room", "I am talking to you", and "Hello". The Husband can also be heard in the recording to have said,

³⁹ Complainant's Written Submissions dated 03.05.25 at [53] to [60]; Husband's statement dated 01.07.24 (C1) at page 6; Record of Proceedings for 03.10.24 at page 74 (line 30) to page 76 (line 6).

⁴⁰ Respondent's Skeletal Closing Submissions dated 27.02.25 at [38] to [40]; Wife's affidavit dated 19.08.24 at [20].

“Not now”. If the Wife had intended to cause anguish to him, one would have expected her to be more aggressive and forceful in waking him up – e.g., by shouting harshly at him.

(c) *Finally*, the recording shows that after failing to rouse the Husband to get up, the Wife took his sling bag and left. Soon thereafter, the Husband looked up in her direction, glanced at the position where his bag used to be placed, and then returned to his sleep. In my view, the Husband must have been aware that the Wife had taken his sling bag. Yet, he did not raise any issue with this at the material time. Neither did he seem to be distressed by the Wife’s actions. It is not inconceivable that the Wife had taken the bag to retrieve her room key, and the Husband was fine with this.

13 to 14 May 2024 – Harassing the Husband

41 I come to the final incident. It is common ground that the parties had an altercation in the early hours of 13 and 14 May 2024. The altercation revolved around the Wife’s suspicion that the Husband had hacked into her laptop and her phone (“**hacking issue**”). The parties however gave very different accounts of what had transpired during the altercation.

Parties’ case

42 According to the Husband⁴¹ –

⁴¹ Complainant’s Written Submissions dated 03.05.25 at [61] to [66]; Husband’s statement dated 01.07.25 at page 2 and page 3; Record of Proceedings for 03.10.24 at page 77 (line 22) to page 84 (line 31).

(a) The Wife had verbally abused him during the altercation over the hacking issue. At one point, she suddenly slapped his left cheek, leaving him stunned. The Husband remained calm and did not want to be provoked into committing violence against her. When he attempted to leave the home to avoid further conflict, the Wife blocked his path. In response, the Husband told her to leave him alone, or else he would punch her. (He did not have the intention to carry out this threat at the material time.) Despite the threat, the Wife continued to harass him. The Husband did not retaliate. She eventually stopped the harassment at about 2.00 am and went to her room.

(b) On 14 May 2024 at about 6.00 am, as the Husband was getting ready to leave home for work, the Wife resumed her harassment. She refused to let him go to work until the hacking issue was resolved. She followed him when he left the home. When the lift reached the ground floor, the Husband told her that he was going to the police station. At that point, the Wife took his office bag (which contained his laptop) and went home. The Husband did not want to return home to face further harassment. As such, he reported what had happened to the Police.

43 The Wife denied the Husband’s allegations. According to her⁴² –

(a) During the altercation, the Husband had punched her, kicked her, and pushed her against a cupboard and a wall. He eventually told her that he would discuss the hacking issue the following morning. He then went to sleep.

⁴² Respondent’s Skeletal Closing Submissions dated 27.02.25 at [26] to [28]; Wife’s affidavit dated 19.08.24 (R1) at [25] to [28]; Wife’s affidavit dated 19.08.24 (R2) at [14] to [17]; Record of Proceedings for 20.12.24 at page 5 (line 9 to line 32).

(b) The next day, the parties left home together to talk about the problems in their marriage. When the lift reached the ground floor, the Husband suddenly ran towards the direction of the police station. In the midst of running, he dropped his office bag in the middle of the road and told her –

“I’m *not* mentally stable. Don’t make me do stupid things again. I’m going to call the police now and *act stupid*.”
[emphasis added]

The Wife retrieved the Husband’s office bag and returned home. She later learnt that the Husband had lodged a police report that she had committed violence against him.

My decision

The altercation

44 The Wife submitted that her account of the altercation should be believed for the following reasons.⁴³

- (a) *First*, the Husband did not particularise her verbal abuse towards him during the altercation.
- (b) *Second*, the Wife’s alleged abuse did not put the Husband in fear of hurt as he was able to sleep from 2.00 am to 6.00 am.

⁴³ Respondent’s Skeletal Closing Submissions dated 27.02.25 at [27].

(c) *Third*, the Husband’s claim that she had slapped his cheek during the altercation is a bare allegation. He had failed to produce any photographs, medical reports, or persons who had seen him after the altercation to corroborate his claim.

(d) On the other hand, the Wife’s evidence that the Husband had punched her is supported by an audio recording. In the recording, he could be heard saying, “I’ll punch your face now. Move”. (**“Husband’s Remarks”**)

45 I am not persuaded by the Wife’s submissions. Let me explain.

(a) The fact that the Husband did not particularise the Wife’s verbal abuse is not fatal to his case. Based on the parties’ case, the altercation was clearly heated – with both sides alleging that family violence had been committed by the other side.

(b) The Wife’s submission that the Husband could sleep after the altercation is also a neutral point. A similar argument can be made against the Wife that she was not in fear of hurt by the Husband at the material time. This is because (i) she had remained at home after he had allegedly assaulted her and (ii) she had chosen to leave the home together with him the next morning.

(c) Regarding the lack of evidence to corroborate the Husband’s account of what had happened during the altercation, again, the same point can be made of the Wife’s claim. Specifically, she had failed to produce photographs, medical reports, or persons who had seen her after the altercation to corroborate her claim that the Husband had kicked her and pushed her against a cupboard and a wall.

46 I accept that the Husband's Remarks can corroborate the Wife's claim that the Husband had punched her. That said, I find this evidence to be far from conclusive.

(a) *First*, the remarks can also support the Husband's evidence that the Wife had *blocked his path* when he attempted to leave the home to avoid further conflict.

(b) *Second*, the Husband's Remarks can be construed to be merely a *warning* of what the Husband might do *if* the Wife did not stop blocking his path.

(c) *Finally*, it is unclear from the recording whether the Husband did eventually punch the Wife.⁴⁴

47 On the last point, I have doubts regarding the Wife's claim that the Husband had assaulted her during the altercation. Based on the Wife's account, the alleged assault would have been extremely violent – she was punched, kicked, and pushed against a cupboard and a wall. Despite this, the Wife did not mention about the assault until recently at the trial. Let me explain.

(a) *First*, it is the Wife's case that she has a habit of texting the Husband's brother (one S) ("**Brother-in-Law**") to help solve her marital issues with the Husband.⁴⁵ Yet, there is no evidence to show that she had texted the Brother-in-Law for help soon after the alleged assault.

⁴⁴ A transcript of the recording can be found in the Wife's affidavit dated 19.08.24 (R1) at page 96.

⁴⁵ Record of Proceedings for 20.12.24 at page 28 (line 25) to page 29 (line 26).

(b) *Second*, the Wife also did not promptly file a police report or PPO application against the Husband for the alleged assault. Instead, she filed her police report and PPO application (SS 1138/2024) only on 20 May 2024 and 18 June 2024 respectively. It bears noting that her report and application was filed *after* – and apparently in response to – the Husband’s PPO application on 15 May 2024.

(c) *Third*, in her police report, the Wife had set out *comprehensively* her complaint against the Husband. In the report, she accused him of having (1) hacked her electronic devices, (2) stolen her identity card, (3) pawn her jewellery without her consent, and (4) *hit her on 26 January 2023*. Significantly, there is no mention in the police report that the Husband had assaulted her on in the early hours of 13 and 14 May 2024.⁴⁶ If the Wife could recall him having allegedly hit her on 26 January 2023 (i.e., an incident that had occurred about 1½ years before the lodging of the police report), why did she fail to mention the alleged assault during the altercation – which is a more violent and a more recent incident?

(d) *Finally*, in her PPO application, the Wife had similarly failed to mention the alleged assault during the altercation.⁴⁷ Instead, she referred to (1) the hacking issue, (2) the incidents stated in her police report (dated 20 May 2024), (3) the Husband having allegedly slapped the son in March 2023, and (4) an alleged spousal abuse on 26 January 2023. Given that the very purpose of the Wife making the PPO application is to protect herself from family violence by the Husband, why did she fail

⁴⁶ The police report is in the Wife’s affidavit dated 19.08.24 (R2) at page 24 to page 26.

⁴⁷ The PPO application is in the Wife’s affidavit dated 19.08.24 (R2) at page 15 to page 23.

(again) to mention in her application about the alleged assault in the early hours of 13 and 14 May 2024?

48 In contrast, I find that the Husband’s account of the altercation to be more coherent and credible. Additionally, his evidence that the Wife was very aggressive at the material time is consistent with her own evidence that she was “particularly distress[ed]” by the hacking issue at the material time as her nursing course assignments and examinations were just around the corner. The Wife had also believed that the Husband was the culprit.⁴⁸ In the circumstances, it is probable that she would have been harsh and confrontational towards the Husband over the hacking issue at the material time.

Events when the parties left the home

49 I now turn to the events when the parties left their home in the morning of 14 May 2024.

50 According to the Wife, the Husband had made two statements at the material time. *First*, that he was “not mentally stable”. *Second*, that he would *pretend* to be “stupid” (presumably, meaning pretend to be mentally *unstable*) in front of the Police.

51 I find the Wife’s evidence regarding such alleged statements to be inherently incredible.

⁴⁸ Wife’s affidavit dated 19.08.24 (R2) at [7] to [19]; Wife’s affidavit dated 19.08.24 (R1) at [22] to [24].

(a) *First*, it appears from the Wife’s evidence that the Husband had *suddenly* behaved in a bizarre manner. This is no evidence to show what had triggered such alleged behaviour.

(b) *Second*, if the Husband was “mentally stable” and rational at the material time, why did he make the alleged statements? Put in another way, what advantage did he seek to gain by declaring his mental state and intentions to the Wife?

(c) Further, it is not disputed that the Husband had left home that morning intending to go to work. In the circumstances, there is no reason for him to suddenly leave his laptop bag in the middle of the road while running to the police station. Without his laptop, how would he be able to work?⁴⁹

(d) *Third*, if the Husband was “*not* mentally stable” at the material time, then I have difficulty accepting that he would still have the presence of mind to declare to the Wife his intention to “act stupid” before the Police.

(e) *Finally*, based on the *Wife’s account*, the Husband *would not have known* that she had kept his laptop bag at the material time. This is because according to her, the Husband had suddenly left the bag in the middle of the road while running away from her. Yet, it is *not disputed* that the Husband knew that his laptop bag was with the Wife at the material time. This is because he had complained to the Police that she had taken his laptop bag. It is also undisputed that the bag was later

⁴⁹

Record of Proceedings for 17.12.24 at page 114 (line 16 to line 27)

found in her possession by the Police. Such undisputed facts do not square with the Wife's account.

Summary – Family violence committed

52 To sum-up, I find that the Wife had committed family violence against the Husband and the children. Specifically –

- (a) The Wife had repeatedly caned and hit the son on 27 July 2023. Such use of force was excessive and unreasonable and had gone beyond the limits of the correction exception.
- (b) The Wife had also continuously harassed the Husband on 2 April 2024. Initially, the harassment concerned the “phone contract” issue. Later in the evening, she had repeatedly threatened to kill herself and the children. The Wife's actions had caused alarm and anguish to the Husband and the children.
- (c) The Wife had repeatedly hit and caned the children on 22 April 2024. Such actions did not come within the correction exception.
- (d) Finally, the Wife had slapped the Husband's cheek and continuously harassed him regarding the hacking issue in the early hours of 13 and 14 May 2024. On 14 May 2024, she had continued the harassment and had also taken his laptop bag when he was going to work.

Whether PPO is necessary

53 Having found that family violence had been committed, the next issue is whether a PPO is necessary to deter the Wife from committing further violence.

54 On this issue, the Wife made several submissions.

Fact that the Wife loves the children

55 *First*, the Wife submitted that a PPO is not necessary because she deeply loves the children.⁵⁰

56 While I do not doubt the Wife’s love for the children, this fact alone does not mean that a PPO is unnecessary. The key issue is whether “family violence is likely to be committed” by the Wife against the children in the future: s 65(1) of the Charter.

57 In my view, the answer is yes. The Wife had made it clear during the trial that she did not see anything wrong with her approach to “disciplining” the children. This lack of insight on her part increases the likelihood that she will continue to use excessive and unreasonable force to discipline the children in future. A PPO is needed to remind her to exercise restraint when disciplining them: *XEF v XEG* [2024] SGFC 92 at [21(e)].

⁵⁰ Respondent’s Skeletal Closing Submissions dated 27.02.25 at [47].

Propensity to threaten harm to self and the children

58 *Second*, the Wife had also submitted that the making of the Threat over WhatsApp and the Threat at Home⁵¹ –

... was purely **situational in nature** and would not arise again. The evidence shows that since April 2024, which was more than a year ago, the [Wife] had not ever threatened nor contemplated suicide again. It will be speculative and against the weight of the evidence to find that the [Wife] would react in a similar fashion in future, when her conduct on that occasion was purely one-off in nature.

[emphasis in original text; text in square brackets added]

59 I am unable to agree with the Wife's submission.

60 *First*, the mere fact that she has not made further threats of harming either herself or the children after April 2024 is neither here nor there. One possible reason why the Wife had desisted from making further similar threats is that the Husband had applied for a PPO against her on 15 May 2024.

61 *Second*, there is ample evidence to show that to get attention and what she wants, the Wife has no qualm about (1) making casual references to death, and (2) threatening to cause harm to herself and/or the children. In addition to the threats made on 2 April 2024, the Wife had also made the following threats.

(a) During courtship days, there was an occasion where the Wife was hospitalised following a suicide attempt when the Husband wanted to break up with her.⁵²

⁵¹ Respondent's Skeletal Closing Submissions dated 27.02.25 at [43(vii)].

⁵² Record of Proceedings for 03.10.24 at page 56 (line 23) to page 57 (line 28).

(b) On 28 July 2023, the Wife had sent the following message to the Husband when he pleaded with her that the son did not deserve to be caned for making mistakes in his spelling:⁵³

This is you, u wan us to *die* at the very last minute ...
[emphasis added]

(c) On 22 April 2024 (i.e., just three weeks after the 2 April incident), the Wife had *again* threatened to kill herself and the children.

(i) On that day, the Wife had sent the following messages to the Brother-in-Law.⁵⁴

“I really mean it mama”
“If he [the Husband] never come back tonight. Ask him to come and *collect the 3 bodies at home*”
“That’s why *almost jump* done”
“The [son] hugged me and cried plz plz *Amma I want to survive*”
“*Before I jump down*”
“Yest almost mama”
“Today *I will make sure it happens*”
“*I took out the window* and etc redy (sic)”
[emphasis added]

⁵³ See the exchange of messages in Exhibit C6 at page 3.

⁵⁴ Record of Proceedings for 03.10.24 at page 95 (line 8 to line 18); Husband’s statement filed for the purpose of the mentions on 10.09.24 (C3); Record of Proceedings for 20.12.24 at page 27 (line 10) to page 29 (line 16); Complainant’s Written Submissions dated 03.05.25 at [32] to [40].

(ii) To emphasise that she was serious in executing her threat, the Wife had also forwarded an image from the home (the unit is located on the 12th floor) with the window and grille opened.

(iii) The Wife claimed that she was “undergoing emotional distress” and “expressing feelings of helplessness” at the material time. According to her, such feelings arose because (1) the Husband had installed a video recorder in the helper’s room, and (2) he had not returned home for some time.⁵⁵

(iv) I am unable to accept the Wife’s claim. According to her, she had sent the above messages so that the Brother-in-Law could question the Husband and solve her marital issues.⁵⁶ In other words, she had an ulterior motive for sending the messages. During cross-examination, the Wife reluctantly agreed that regardless of the personal issues a parent was facing, the parent should not make threats with a child’s life to get what he/she wanted.⁵⁷

62 At this juncture, I digress to highlight the following.

(a) The present case is *not* one involving a threat (i) made in the heat of the moment under extreme emotional circumstances, or (ii) linked to

⁵⁵ Record of Proceedings for 20.12.24 at page 28 (line 25) to page 29 (line 26); Respondent’s Written Submissions in Reply dated 16.05.25 at [14]; Complainant’s Written Submissions dated 03.05.25 at [36].

⁵⁶ Record of Proceedings for 20.12.24 at page 28 (line 25) to page 29 (line 26); Complainant’s Written Submissions dated 03.05.25 at [36].

⁵⁷ Wife’s evidence on 21.03.25.

an underlying psychiatric condition. In such cases, the facts may show that the maker of the threat did not intend to cause harm: *TDN v TDM* [2014] SGDC 143 at [26].⁵⁸

(b) Depending on the facts, a PPO may still be an appropriate option to deter the respondent from making similar threats in future even if the respondent is mentally unstable: see e.g., *UMP v UMQ* [2018] SGFC 57 at [23] and [31].

Fact that the Husband is facing charges

63 *Third*, the Wife had also submitted that a PPO is unnecessary to protect the Husband. The basis for this submission is as follows.

(a) After the trial had ended, the Wife complained to the Police that the Husband had (on 14 May 2025) breached an expedited order (“**EO**”) issued against him. Specifically, he had allegedly used his elbow to press onto the back of her neck area and thus caused her pain.

(b) On 23 April 2025, the Husband was charged in court for (i) breaching the EO, an offence under s 63C of the Charter, and (ii) voluntarily causing hurt, an offence under s 323 read with s 74C of the Penal Code 1871.⁵⁹

64 Arising from the above, the Wife made two submissions.

⁵⁸ Respondent’s Written Submissions in Reply dated 16.05.25 at [17] and [18].

⁵⁹ Respondent’s Further Skeletal Submissions dated 05.05.25 at [9(c)], [9(d)] and [11].

(a) *First*, that I should draw the appropriate “inference” from the fact that the Police and Attorney General’s Chambers (“AGC”) had seen it fit to press charges against the Husband.⁶⁰

(b) *Second*, that the Husband is a “violent person ... and therefore cannot be said to require a personal protection order for himself”.

65 I am unable to agree with the Wife’s submissions.

(a) The Husband’s criminal case has not concluded at the time of this judgement. The fact that he is facing prosecution does not prove that he had committed the acts alleged in his charges. At the risk of stating the obvious, he is innocent until proven guilty.

(b) In any event, whether the Husband is a “violent person” or not is irrelevant to the issue of whether *the Wife* should be deterred from committing family violence against him via a PPO.

(c) In my view, a PPO is necessary. During the trial, it is clear to me that the parties have an acrimonious relationship. The risk of the Wife committing further violence against the Husband is heightened by the fact that they are undergoing divorce. It is likely that they will have conflicts regarding how the marriage is to be dissolved and on matters relating to the children – given their very different parenting styles and attitudes towards the use of corporal punishment: *XFL v XFM* [2024] SGFC 103 at [21].

⁶⁰ Respondent’s Further Skeletal Submissions dated 05.05.25 at [12].

Fact that the Wife had moved out of the matrimonial home

66 *Finally*, the Wife submitted that a PPO is not necessary because the Husband had moved out of the matrimonial home.⁶¹

67 I am not persuaded by this submission. The fact that the parties are no longer residing together does not mean that family violence in the future is unlikely. In the present case, I note that the Wife appears to have a controlling personality and to tend to make inflammatory remarks towards the Husband *over WhatsApp*. This is evident, for instance, in the WhatsApp exchanges between the parties on 28 July 2023. The background to this exchange has already been set out in [5] to [16] above.⁶² To recap –

(a) The Husband told the Wife that her punishment of the son was unduly harsh – considering that it was just spelling. He had requested the Wife not to “overreact”.

(b) Despite the fact that the tone in the Husband’s messages was measured, the Wife responded with a barrage of accusatory statements. This included (i) asserting that the son’s poor performance was “definitely” due to the Husband’s “mistakes” (Message at 10.59 am), (ii) telling him “Don’t be stupid” (Message at 11.11 am), (iii) calling him an “irresponsible father who focus on money alone” (Message at 11.12 am), and (iv) scolding him, “shame on you” (Message at 11.15 am).

⁶¹ Respondent’s Written Submissions in Reply dated 16.05.25 at [40].

⁶² The exchange of messages is at Exhibit C6.

68 Another example of the Wife’s tendency to be controlling and to make inflammatory statements can be seen in the WhatsApp exchange between the parties on 2 April 2024.⁶³

(a) At about 2.17 pm on that day, the Wife declared her decision to get a divorce. At about 2.25 pm, she sent several messages with *exaggerated claims* against the Husband – e.g., claiming that he might “record naked videos of me or our daughter for money”.

(b) Within a minute after sending the above messages, the Wife asked the Husband to settle her “phone contract” issue. The way that she had engaged with him on this issue is very revealing about the *power dynamics* between the parties.

(i) When the Husband replied that he was at a meeting and that he was not free that day, the Wife insisted that the “phone contract” matter must be settled that day. Despite the Husband suggesting that she could check first with the Woodlands and Yishun branches of the service provider and that he would be free to be with her from 7.40 pm, the Wife replied “nope”, “somerset”, “Don’t instruct me to do that and this”, “you have to do – I can pay yr last 2 hours salary”, “need to get this settled”. (Messages from 3.40 pm to 3.41 pm)

(ii) When the Husband highlighted that the “phone contract” matter was not urgent and that he would make the payment on 2 April itself, the Wife made clear that her demands were non-negotiable, stating that, “im not free”, “need to settle it”, “im

⁶³ See the Husband’s exhibit C7; Husband’s statement dated 01.07.24 (C1) at page 39.

planning to move out this weekends (sic)”, “U don’t decide behalf of me whether there is urgency or not”. (Messages from 4.35 pm to 4.39 pm)

(iii) When the Husband sought to negotiate with the Wife the time and place to meet her to settle the “phone contract” (by asking the Wife to meet him at Somerset at 7.20 pm), she demanded, “u fetch me at 5.30 pm”, “at woodlands”. (Message at 4.45 pm) At this juncture, I digress to highlight that the Wife had set the meeting time at 5.30 pm despite the Husband having told her that he would be free only after 7.00 pm.

(iv) The Wife had also chided the Husband thereafter by texting, “Don’t behave like an idiot, can? You are very free to do all the recording and nonsense things”. (Message at 5.31 pm)

69 To sum-up, the Wife’s tendency to be controlling and to make inflammatory statements towards the Husband over WhatsApp increases the likelihood of family violence being committed against him in future. In the circumstances, a PPO can remind her to avoid conduct that can constitute continual harassment against the Husband.

Conclusion

70 For the above reasons, I grant the Husband’s PPO application for the children and himself. Additionally, I order the parties to undergo mandatory counselling.

71 Before concluding, I wish to address one point raised in the Husband’s closing submissions. To protect the children, the Husband had requested that (a)

a domestic exclusion order be issued and (b) the matter be referred to the Child Protection Specialist Centre (“CPSC”).⁶⁴ I do not see the need to accede to these requests.

- (a) *First*, the Husband has failed to prove that the nature of the family violence committed by the Wife is so severe that it is necessary to take the draconian step of excluding her from the matrimonial home.
- (b) *Second*, if the Husband thinks that it is appropriate to refer the matter to the CPSC, he is at liberty to do so himself.

Kow Keng Siong
District Judge

Husband appeared in person;
Clement Yong Hong Kit (M/s Beyond Legal LLC) for the Wife.

⁶⁴ Complainant’s Written Submissions dated 03.05.25 at [77(c)] and [77(e)].