

IN THE FAMILY JUSTICE COURTS OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE
[2026] SGFC 139

SSP 833/2026

Between

YKQ

... Applicant

And

YKR

... Respondent

GROUND OF DECISION

[Family Law — Family Violence — Personal Protection Order]

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.

YKQ

v

YKR

[2026] SGFC 139

Family Court — SSP 833 of 2026

Magistrate Soh Kian Peng
29 September 2026

22 October 2026

Magistrate Soh Kian Peng:

1 SSP 833 of 2026 was [T]’s application brought on behalf of two of her grandchildren, [A] and [B]. [Z] is the respondent to the application – [A] is his stepdaughter and [B] is his son.

2 [T] had come to look after [A] and [B] after [Z] and his wife were arrested, and subsequently, jailed for drug consumption. She had brought this application on behalf of [A] and [B] as she was afraid of the threat that [Z] posed to their well-being upon his release.

3 In her application, [T] sought a Personal Protection Order (“PPO”) as well as a No Contact Order (“NCO”) for both [A] and [B]. She also sought a

Stay Away Order (“SAO”) to prevent [Z] from coming within 1 kilometre of the flat at [XXX]. Finally, she also sought a Counselling Order (“CGO”) as well as a Mandatory Treatment Order (“MTO”) against [Z].

4 I heard the trial of the matter on 29 September 2026 and allowed [T]’s application. The reasons I had given for my decision are set out in the paragraphs below.

5 Having heard the testimonies of both [T] and [Z], I was satisfied that the statutory requirements (s 60A(1) of the Women’s Charter 1961) for granting such an order, specifically, the Personal Protection Order (“PPO”) which [T] sought on behalf of [A] and [B] had been made out.

6 First, I found that [Z] was likely to commit family violence against both the children. It was not disputed that he was incarcerated for drug consumption. [Z] was currently serving his sentence. He had told me, in his testimony, that he was no longer taking drugs, nor did he wish to take drugs in the future.

7 While I might have been minded to give [Z] the benefit of the doubt on this point, there was no concrete evidence to show that he had turned over a new leaf, and that he would stay on the straight and narrow. These are still early days for [Z] in his rehabilitation journey.

8 Further to that, in my judgment, if [Z] did indeed relapse, there was a real risk of him inflicting physical abuse on the children. Although [Z] had told me that he was not violent towards the children when he was taking drugs, I did not believe his evidence on this point. [Z] struck me as a less than truthful witness given several inconsistencies in his testimony – for instance, he had

tried to downplay the consequences of his drug consumption on the family (who were forced to sleep rough).

9 In any event, I found that [Z]’s drug consumption (especially considering his explanation of how he had come to take drugs) revealed several concerning points about his character which, in my judgment, made it likely that he would commit family violence on the children.

10 For one, it showed that he has poor impulse control – in other words, [Z] was susceptible to being enslaved to whatever he may desire.

11 Second, his habit of consuming drugs showed a complete and total disregard for those who were entirely dependent on him, specifically, his children.

12 I had heard evidence that [Z]’s drug addiction led to him, as well as his wife and [A] and [B] sleeping rough as they had no place to call home. Further to this, [Z]’s self-interest was perhaps best illustrated by the fact that he continued to cast blame on [T] for driving a wedge between him and his wife. [Z] was completely blind to the fact that [T] had stepped in and shouldered his duty as a parent. Not once during the trial did he acknowledge or show any expression of gratitude to [T] for looking after his children, despite having to shoulder heavy burdens of her own, whilst he was incarcerated.

13 Further to that, [Z] had also told me that he would argue with his wife in front of the children. [Z] had also described to me that he had a somewhat rocky relationship with his wife and that going forwards he intended to save his marriage. While his commitment to the marriage was commendable, it did not detract from the likelihood of him committing further family violence on the

children by arguing with his wife in front of them (see *eg* Illustration (b) to s 58B of the Women's Charter 1961). In fact, I considered this to be a likely scenario. Given what [Z] had told me, it did not appear that he had built a healthy way of resolving disputes with his wife that did not involve arguments in front of the children.

14 As to the necessity of making such orders, the law makes clear that this is done through a risk-based approach where the court examines the likelihood of future family violence being inflicted on the persons sought to be protected under the order.

15 In the present case, there were several red flags which pointed to the necessity of granting the PPO sought.

16 First, the children are very young. At the time of the trial, [A] was 2 years' old and [B] was 3 years' old. They are especially vulnerable because they have, given their tender age, no way of alerting adults around them if there are any incidents of abuse.

17 Second, it was clear to me that [Z] did not have healthy ways of coping with stress – this, to my mind, pointed to an increased risk of further family violence being committed on the children, especially when considered in light of his past history of drug consumption.

18 Third, as I have mentioned above, [Z] was a man motivated by self-interest. His words gave scant assurance that he was committed to placing the interest of his children before his own needs. There was also little to suggest that [Z] had the self-awareness to grasp the impact of his actions on those around

him – in particular, [Z] displayed little to no insight about how his drug habit had adversely impacted his children.

19 I was therefore satisfied that a PPO should be granted for both [A] and [B]. In addition, I also ordered that [Z] attend counselling to ensure that he was kept on the straight and narrow, that he would receive some help to stay off drugs, and more importantly, that he would be equipped with the necessary skills to look after both [A] and [B].

20 Finally, [T]’s applications for the other orders were dismissed. I saw no basis to make such orders given the testimony I had heard.

Soh Kian Peng
Magistrate

The Grandmother ([T]) in person and unrepresented.
The Father ([Z]) in person and unrepresented.
