

**IN THE FAMILY JUSTICE COURTS OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE**  
**[2026] SGFC 140**

SSP 984/2026

Between

YKV

*... Applicant*

And

YKW

*... Respondent*

---

**JUDGMENT**

---

*[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.**

**YKV**

**v**

**YKW**

**[2026] SGFC 140**

Family Court — SSP 984 of 2026

Magistrate Soh Kian Peng  
11 September 2026

22 October 2026

Judgment Reserved

**Magistrate Soh Kian Peng:**

1 SSP 984 of 2026 (“SSP 984”) was the Wife’s application against the Husband. They are an elderly couple. They have been married for 50 years. They had two daughters, [A] and [B].

2 The basis of the Wife’s application in SSP 984 was that of emotional or psychological abuse as well as physical abuse. The gist of her application was that she had suffered continued verbal abuse from her Husband. She also complained that she had, on occasion, suffered physical abuse at his hands as he would hit her on the head during arguments. She sought the following orders:

(a) A Personal Protection Order (“PPO”).

(b) A Domestic Exclusion Order (“DEO”) for the flat at [XXX] address.

(c) A No-Contact Order (“NCO”) prohibiting the Husband from visiting and communicating with her.

(d) A Stay-Away Order (“SAO”) prohibiting the Husband from coming within 1 km of the flat at [XXX].

3 There was, at the trial before me, a dearth of documentary evidence. The only documents filed were a statement made by the Wife as well as several images of police case cards which suggested that police reports had been made. The main source of evidence I had was the testimony of parties, as well as that of their grandson who gave evidence on behalf of the Wife.

4 The law makes it clear that for the Wife to succeed in her application, she must establish, on a balance of probabilities, the following two requirements (s 60A(1) of the Women’s Charter 1961):

(a) First, that the Husband had committed, or was likely to commit, family violence on her.

(b) Second, that it was necessary for these orders to be made for her protection or personal safety.

5 I found that the Husband was indeed likely to commit family violence on the Wife. I had heard evidence from the Wife that the Husband had been physically and verbally abusive towards her throughout their entire 50-year

marriage. In particular, the Wife described the Husband as an angry and aggressive man. She said:<sup>1</sup>

He will curse and swear and scold vulgarities. He will say what he like to you. When he say, you cannot retaliate. When you retaliate, he will curse and swear. And he will disturb you at your working place. That's why I always try, when he become angry, I just keep quiet. I just, "Okay, okay. What you want?" Just "okay". Because he disturb me, it's not enough. He disturb even my working colleagues, everybody. So just because of me, I don't want everybody to get involved. Then just make everybody's day.

6 The Wife also said that the Husband was prone to throwing and smashing objects around the house when he was angry, and that this was common behaviour on his part when he was younger.<sup>2</sup>

7 One other notable incident of physical abuse the Wife described was an incident which took place more than 20 years ago when she was working as a cashier at a supermarket. The Husband had punched her in the eye.<sup>3</sup>

8 Her account was also corroborated by their grandson, [X], who testified on her behalf during the trial. He had witnessed the Husband scolding the Wife vulgarities. He had also once seen the Husband hit the Wife with a walking stick.<sup>4</sup> He told me that the Wife (*ie*, his grandmother) had endured this for the sake of keeping the family together. He described the impact of this abuse – the Wife would just “cry quietly on her own”.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Transcript, p 16, lns 8 – 16.

<sup>2</sup> Transcript at p 26, lns 17 – 20.

<sup>3</sup> Transcript at p 7, lns 15 – 22.

<sup>4</sup> Transcript at p 26, lns 12 – 18.

<sup>5</sup> Transcript at p 26, ln 7.

9 The Husband had, in his testimony, admitted to punching the Wife in the eye (see above at [7]). As to the allegations of verbal abuse, the Husband initially appeared to admit to having verbally abused the Wife throughout their marriage. However, when clarification was sought on his answer, he recanted his position and denied having been “verbally or physically” abusive towards her.<sup>6</sup>

10 In this vein, I would prefer the Wife’s testimony over that of the Husband. For one, her account was corroborated by [X] who had witnessed several instances of such abuse. Further to that, the Husband himself had already admitted to at least one of the allegations levelled against him: that he had punched the Wife in the eye. Finally, it was clear to me, based on the tone and manner in which the Wife had given evidence, that she had indeed endured much over the long years of her marriage. She spoke with the weary air of person whose tolerance had long since run dry.

11 Having found that the Husband was likely to commit family violence on the Wife, I turn now to consider the necessity of granting the orders which she sought. Here, the jurisprudence tells us that the court adopts a risk-based approach towards the assessment of necessity, and that if the court concludes that the respondent was likely to commit family violence on the person sought to be protected under the order, a PPO would be, presumptively, necessary.

12 I do not see anything to rebut the presumption that a PPO is necessary in the present case. I find that a PPO should be granted for the Wife’s personal protection or safety. One major risk factor, in this regard, was certain aspects of the Husband’s personality – in particular, the Husband struck me as a man who

---

<sup>6</sup> Transcript at p 33, lns 25 – 30.

was either incapable or unwilling to consider the impact that his words or actions could have on those closest and dearest to him.

13 For one, there was the following incident which took place in the course of the Wife's testimony. She was recounting a dark time in the family's history. This event had occurred some 13 years ago. She said the Husband had driven their youngest daughter to commit suicide because he had chased her out of the house, leaving her with nowhere to turn to. The Wife further recounted that when they were informed to collect her body, the Husband refused to go.<sup>7</sup>

14 As the Wife was recounting this, the Husband had a smile on his face. When I asked what he found amusing about the Wife's testimony, the Husband said that he did not agree with the Wife's account.<sup>8</sup> I had to remind the Husband that while he might have his views on the Wife's testimony, it was only open to him to express it when he took the witness stand.

15 In his testimony, the Husband disavowed any part in the death of their younger daughter. He said:<sup>9</sup>

Court: So earlier when your wife was recounting to me about your youngest daughter's death and you were smiling and you sounded like you have something to say, alright? Now, whatever it is you wish to say, I want to hear it.

Witness: There's no such thing. What can I do with when they wanted to commit suicide? I only just mentioned on the phone and asked her not to return home, not to come back.

Court: Exactly what [did] you say to her?

---

<sup>7</sup> Transcript at p 4, lns 17 – 30.

<sup>8</sup> Transcript at p 4, lns 17 – 30.

<sup>9</sup> Transcript at p 43, lns 19 – 31.

Witness: I say she talked to me loudly, so I was angry. So, I said, "You don't come back". Oh, she did not return home since---when she was 18 years old. Oh, because previously I was Buddhist, she was a Christian. So, she was angry with me. Oh, because she was a---she was with another woman, lesbian.

16 The death of a child is never an easy thing to accept for any parent – and perhaps even more so under such tragic circumstances. I do not think it beyond the realm of reason to expect that any parent who finds themselves in such a situation, would, regardless of their own personal or religious convictions, inevitably scrutinize their own conduct in relation to their child. Given what the Husband had said in his testimony, it appeared that he could not appreciate the potential impact of his words or actions on his youngest daughter.

17 Then there was the fact that the Husband had never once stopped to consider if he had any part to play in the Wife evicting him from the flat. He put the blame entirely on the Wife for refusing to let him back in. It must be noted here that the Wife had (and this is not disputed by the Husband) looked after him for three years (since 2023) when he was desperately ill.<sup>10</sup> She had resigned from her job to do so.

18 It was therefore telling that the Husband never, during the course of his testimony, demonstrated that he had once paused to ask himself why the Wife, who had made tremendous sacrifices to care for him in his time of need, would suddenly want to evict him from the flat that they both called home. The Husband, however, repeatedly emphasised in his testimony, that he was disappointed with the Wife for evicting him from the flat, leaving him without any place to stay. Such was his disappointment with his Wife that he had filed

---

<sup>10</sup> Transcript, p 2, lns 29 – 31.

for divorce. This, to him, was the practical solution as it meant that the flat could be sold, leaving him with funds to purchase a new flat for himself.

19 The Husband's inability to appreciate the impact that his words or actions could have on others, when considered in light of the history of abuse against the Wife, in my judgment, increased the risk of him inflicting family violence on her in the future. It meant that his behaviour towards her was unlikely to change for the better.

20 I therefore allow the Wife's application for a PPO against the Husband.

21 I turn now to consider the Wife's application for additional protective orders (*ie*, the DEO, SAO and NCO).

22 It bears emphasising that the fact that a court has ordered a PPO is not strictly indicative of the need for further protective orders such as a DEO, SAO or a NCO. Such orders protect in different ways, and these further protective orders are indeed more intrusive than a PPO: *XNA v XMZ* [2026] SGFC 119 at [11].

23 In the present case, I was satisfied that the following additional protective orders should be granted in the Wife's favour:

- (a) A DEO excluding the Husband from the Wife's bedroom in the flat at [XXX].
- (b) A NCO prohibiting the Husband from communicating with the Wife.

24 These orders were necessary to ensure the Wife's protection or personal safety by setting a firm boundary between the both of them, especially given the evidence I had heard as to the long history of verbal and physical abuse that the Husband had inflicted on the Wife, and the fact that the Husband had little to no insight on the impact of his behaviour towards the Wife. In this connection, the NCO was necessary to put an end to any verbal abuse.

25 While I note that the Wife had applied for a DEO for the entire property, I was not satisfied that the evidence before me provided a basis to make such an order. The scope of any DEO granted must be calibrated to meet the threat posed by the respondent: *XNA v XMZ* [2026] SGFC 119 at [12] and [13]. In the present case, I was satisfied that limiting the scope of the DEO to the Wife's bedroom was sufficient to ensure her protection and personal safety. There were, after all, no documented instances of the Husband either threatening to kill the Wife, or acting in such a manner which demonstrated that he posed a clear and present danger to her life. Further to this, as I understood it, the Wife's chief complaint was that of verbal abuse which should be adequately addressed by the NCO which I have decided to grant in her favour.

26 Given the orders I had made, I did not see a need to grant the Wife a SAO. Her application for that order is dismissed.

27 Finally, I order that both the Husband and the Wife attend counselling.

Soh Kian Peng  
Magistrate

*YKV v YKW*

[2026] SGFC 140

The Wife in person and unrepresented.  
The Husband in person and unrepresented.

---