IN THE FAMILY JUSTICE COURTS OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

[2025] SGFC 94

SS No. 1901 of 2024

Between

XRA

And

XRB

JUDGEMENT

Evidence – *Burden of proof – Failure to produce WhatsApp messages which form the basis for an application for personal protection order – Whether application should be allowed – Sections 103(1) and 108 Evidence Act 1893*

Family Law – *Family violence – Orders for protection – Does a person commit "family violence" if he sends a disparaging email about his former-spouse to his case officer at a Family Services Centre – Section 64(d) Women's Charter 1961*

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION **1**

INCIDENT ON 12 MAY 2023 ..... **2**

APPLICANT'S CASE 2

RESPONDENT'S CASE 2

MY DECISION 2

INCIDENT ON 3 JULY 2024 ..... **3**

APPLICANT'S CASE 3

RESPONDENT'S CASE 4

MY DECISION 4

INCIDENT ON 12 JULY 2024 ..... **8**

APPLICANT'S CASE 8

RESPONDENT'S CASE 9

MY DECISION 9

INCIDENT ON 15 JULY 2024 ..... **12**

APPLICANT'S CASE 12

RESPONDENT'S CASE 12

MY DECISION 13

INCIDENT ON 16 JULY 2024 ..... **14**

APPLICANT'S CASE 14

RESPONDENT'S CASE 15

MY DECISION 15

INCIDENT ON 23 JULY 2024 ..... **16**

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

APPLICANT'S CASE 16
RESPONDENT'S CASE 17
MY DECISION 18
OTHER MATTERS 19
CCTV RECORDINGS 19
ALLEGED MOTIVE FOR SEEKING PPO 20
ALLEGED COLLUSION 21
PPO IS NECESSARY 22
CONCLUSION 24

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

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.

XRA
v
XRB

[2025] SGFC 94

Family Court – SS No. 1901 of 2024

District Judge Kow Keng Siong
7 February, 23 May, 1 September 2025

1 September 2025

District Judge Kow Keng Siong:

Introduction

1 The Applicant and the Respondent were divorced in May 2023. In October 2024, the Applicant applied for a personal protection order ("**PPO**") against the Respondent. She relied on six incidents to support her application. These involved the Respondent (a) allegedly creating a scene at her business premises, (b) sending disparaging emails and messages about her to third parties, and (c) posting adverse comments and one-star reviews about her businesses.

2 To succeed, the Applicant must establish on a balance of probabilities two matters: *first*, that the Respondent had committed or is likely to commit

"family violence" within the meaning of s 64 of the Women's Charter 1961 ("**Charter**"). *Second*, that a PPO is necessary for her protection. The central questions in this case are thus (a) whether the Respondent's conduct as described in [1] above amounts to family violence, and (b) whether the risk of recurrence justifies the making of a protection order.

3 After considering the evidence and submissions, I granted the PPO application. These are my reasons.

Incident on 12 May 2023

Applicant's case

4 The first incident occurred on 12 May 2023.[1] That day, the Respondent had allegedly sent the Applicant messages (a) requiring her to remove her name as a co-owner of their matrimonial flat, (b) threatening to tarnish her business and personal reputation, and (c) using expletives and insulting language about her.

Respondent's case

5 The Respondent denied having sent the messages.[2]

My decision

6 The contents of the messages allegedly sent on 12 May 2023 are of critical importance in establishing whether the Respondent had committed

---

1 Complainant's Affidavit dated 10.12.24 at [15] to [19]: see Complainant's Bundle of Affidavits at Tab A.

2 The Respondent's letter to the Court dated 10.12.24 (exhibit R1).

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

family violence against the Applicant. Given this, she ought to have produced these messages in evidence.

7 The Applicant had failed to do so. No explanation was provided to account for this failure.

8 In the circumstances, I find that the Applicant had failed to prove that the Respondent had committed family violence against her on 13 May 2023.

Incident on 3 July 2024

9 I now turn to the next incident. It is not disputed that (a) on 3 July 2024, the Respondent had visited the Applicant's hair salon at Geylang ("**Geylang Salon**") to look for her, and (b) the latter was not at the salon at the material time. The dispute regarding this incident centred on whether the Respondent had committed certain acts alleged against him during the visit.

Applicant's case

10 According to "N" (the Applicant's employee who was present during the visit), the Respondent had approached her and asked in a loud and threatening voice for the Applicant. When she replied that the Applicant was not at the salon, he started to swear and shout that the Applicant had been cheating people. Additionally, he stopped people from entering the premises – telling them that the Applicant had owed him a lot of money, cheated a lot of

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

people, and slept with customers.[3] "N" reported the incident to the Applicant, who lodged a police report the next day.[4]

Respondent's case

11 The Respondent denied the allegations. He called "P" to support his case that his visit to the salon was uneventful. According to "P", the Respondent left immediately upon being informed that the Applicant was not there.

My decision

12 The Applicant's case regarding the 3 July incident rested solely on "N"'s evidence. I find that "N"'s evidence is more likely than not to be true.

(a) *First*, it is inconceivable that "N" would – *on her own initiative* – fabricate false evidence against the Respondent.

(b) *Second*, it is also not plausible that the Applicant had instigated "N" to give false evidence for the purpose of supporting her PPO application. Based on "N"'s account, the Applicant had lodged a contemporaneous police report on 4 July 2024 (i.e., about three months before the application).[5] Given that this report was made well before the application was filed – it is highly unlikely that the report was part of the Applicant's elaborate plan to fix-up the Respondent. This is

---

3 AN's Affidavit dated 10.12.24 at [7] to [8]: see Complainant's Bundle of Affidavits at Tab C.

4 Complainant's Affidavit dated 10.12.24 at [20]: see Complainant's Bundle of Affidavits at Tab A.

5 Complainant's Affidavit dated 10.12.24 at page 13 and 14: see Complainant's Bundle of Affidavits at Tab A.

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

especially so when the Applicant did not mention either the 3 July incident or the police report in her PPO application.

(c) *Third*, the Respondent's own evidence shows that he had a motive to confront the Applicant on 3 July 2024 – she had refused to return him $20,000 about two weeks earlier.[6] "N"'s evidence that he had accused the Applicant of cheating him is thus consistent with his contemporaneous financial dispute the Applicant.

(d) *Fourth*, "N"'s evidence – that the Respondent had maligned the Applicant's character at the salon – is also corroborated by his messages to the Applicant's business partner "W" sent just five days later (on 8 July 2024).[7] In those messages, he had[8] –

(i) Described the Applicant as a "FAKE VIRGIN",

(ii) Accused her of having committed adultery, cheated his money, and refused to pay her creditors,

(iii) Stated his intention to warned others about the Applicant,

(iv) Admitted that he had gone to her salon to ask for money.

The close temporal proximity between the 3 July incident and the Respondent's 8 July email strengthens the credibility of "N"'s account.

---

6 Respondent's letter to the Court dated 10.12.24 and his evidence in court.

7 The messages were sent just five days after the 3 July incident. They bore the date "*Mon*, 8 Jul". (emphasis added) This date coincides with 8 July *2024* – a *Monday.* For completeness, 8 July *2023* was a Saturday.

8 These messages are exhibited in Complainant's Affidavit dated 10.12.24 at pages 17 to 19: see Complainant's Bundle of Affidavits at Tab A

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

(e) *Fifth*, "N"'s description of the Respondent as being aggressive during the 3 July incident is consistent with how he had conducted himself during the trial. At times, he was unnecessarily difficult and combative when he cross-examined the Applicant's witnesses and engaged with her counsel (Mr Raymund). For instance –

(i) He had refused to answer a valid answer concerning the truthfulness of his claim that the Applicant was promiscuous.[9]

(ii) When it was suggested to him that he had made a threat to the Applicant in his email dated 12 July 2024 (see [16] below), the Respondent retorted *"... when I say, "I wish to kill you", does that mean I will kill you?"*[10]

(f) *Finally*, I decline to give weight to "P"'s evidence.

(i) There is serious doubt as to how she had prepared her affidavit (exhibit R12). According to her, she prepared the affidavit in the Vietnamese language and then had it translated into English. This is contradicted by the Respondent, who testified that *he* had prepared the affidavit in *English*, and then had it translated into the Vietnamese language for "P".[11]

(ii) Based on the Respondent's evidence in (i) above, it appears that the contents of "P"'s affidavit were not based on her own independent recollection of the events. Indeed, "P" testified

---

9 Record of Proceedings for 23.05.25 at page 19 (line 26) to page 20 (line 11).

10 Record of Proceedings for 23.05.25 at page 24 (line 7 to line 14).

11 Complainant's Submissions dated 27.06.25 at [34] to [37]; Record of Proceedings for 23.05.25 at page 65 (line 6 to line 18).

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

that she had obtained the relevant information from the Respondent.[12]

(iii) "P" had a salary dispute with the Applicant. Although this dispute was eventually settled, the payments were still outstanding at the time of the trial. This unresolved dispute with the Applicant potentially undermined "P"'s neutrality.[13]

(iv) Finally, based on "P"'s evidence, the 3 July incident would have been an uneventful one for her. After all, the Respondent did not create a scene and had left immediately upon being informed that the Applicant was not at the salon. In the circumstances, there was no reason for "P" to pay attention to the Respondent at the salon or to recall what he had said and done at the material time.

13 For the reasons in [12] above, I accept "N"'s evidence. Based on this evidence, the Respondent's conduct on 3 July 2024 – creating a scene, driving away customers, and making disparaging allegations against the Applicant – amounts to family violence. He must have known that such conduct – which appears to be intended to pressure the Applicant into paying him $20,000 – was likely to cause her fear and anguish.

---

12 Complainant's Submissions dated 27.06.25 at [38] to [44]; Record of Proceedings for 23.05.25 at page 65 (line 17 to line 20).

13 Complainant's Submissions dated 27.06.25 at [34] and [45] and [46].

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

Incident on 12 July 2024

Applicant's case

14 I now come to the next incident. This concerns an email that the Respondent had sent to his case officer at a Family Services Centre ("**FSC**") on 12 July 2024 ("**Email**"). The email (which was copied to the Applicant) alleged that the Applicant[14] –

(a) Was the "mother of all scammers",

(b) Was a "very manipulative person",

(c) Had regularly committed adultery with a customer (a "white man") with the ulterior motive of securing a green card,

(d) Had adopted "disgusting, despicable, wicked and scheming" ways to fake her virginity when she met the Respondent,

(e) Had chosen to rent an expensive apartment to stay in instead of paying $300 for a helper to care for their daughter, and

(f) Had forged the Respondent's signature on several contracts.

[14] The email is exhibited in Complainant's Affidavit dated 10.12.24 at pages 27 and 28: see Complainant's Bundle of Affidavits at Tab A.

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

Respondent's case

15 According to the Respondent, he did not do anything wrong by sending the Email to his case officer. Further, he contended that the relevant information was "facts, not fabrications".[15]

My decision

Threshold issue

16 It cannot seriously be disputed that –

(a) The Email would annoy the Applicant given the nature of its contents. The fact that the email had such an effect had been confirmed by the Applicant.

(b) The attacks on her character were repeated in the relatively long email are thus "continual".

(c) The Respondent must have known that the Email was likely to cause anguish to the Applicant when he sent it.

17 Given the above, the Respondent's act of sending the Email can come within limb (d) of the definition of "family violence" in s 64 of Charter. For a discussion of limb (d), see *XFL v XFM* [2024] SGFC 103 at [37].

---

[15] Record of Proceedings for 23.05.25 at page 24 (line 17 to line 30); Respondent's Written Submission dated 05.08.25 at [21].

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

18 The Respondent's contention (see [15] above) raises the following issue – Does the fact that the Email was sent to the Respondent's *case officer* take it out of the definition of family violence? ("**Issue**")

Applicable considerations

19 In my view, the answer to the Issue turns on two factors: *One*, in what context did the Respondent send the Email? *Two*, was the Email motivated by malice or designed to cause anguish? Let me explain.

(a) *In what context did the Respondent send the Email*. Clearly, the context of the communication is important. For instance, candid statements made in good faith during counselling or mediation should not ordinarily be construed as family violence. To hold otherwise will discourage candour during such sessions and frustrate genuine attempts at resolving personal and family issues.

(b) *Was the Email motivated by malice or designed to cause anguish*. Apart from the context, it is also relevant to consider whether the Email was motivated by malice or designed to cause anguish. The law should not allow a person – under the guise of counselling and mediation – to launch malicious attacks on a family member's character or to cause anguish. Considerations that can shed light on whether there are ulterior motives behind a statement include the following: (i) Is the statement unsolicited, (ii) What is its tone, and (iii) Has the statement been forwarded to third parties.

20 To sum-up, the Respondent's act of sending the Email to his case officer can come within the definition of family violence unless the Email –

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

(a) Was sent in a genuine effort to resolve a personal or family issue,

(b) Was not motivated by malice or designed to cause anguish.

Given that the facts in (a) and (b) above are especially within the Respondent's knowledge, he has the burden of proving these facts: s 103(1) and s 108 of the Evidence Act 1893.

Applying the considerations

21 I find that the Respondent had failed to prove the facts in [20(a)] and [20(b)].

(a) *First*, the Email was not made in the context of mediation or counselling – but was a request to change the Respondent's case officer. The Respondent made this request because he had felt that the case officer was biased against him.

(b) *Second*, the Email was laced with vitriol and personal attacks against the Applicant.

(c) *Finally*, the Respondent ended the Email with the ominous statement, "*From now onwards, I will not hesitate to tell anyone about [the Applicant]*". This reveals an intention to disseminate further disparaging remarks to other persons.

22 In these circumstances, the Email falls squarely within limb (d) of "family violence": continual harassment likely to cause anguish.

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

Incident on 15 July 2024

23 The next incident occurred on 15 July 2024. On that day, the Respondent had gone to the Geylang and Jalan Besar salons looking for the Applicant. She was not present as she overseas at the material time.

Applicant's case

24 "T" was working at the Geylang Salon when the Respondent (a) approached her, (b) called her the Applicant's dog, and (c) aggressively accused the Applicant of having slept with her customers and owed him a lot of money. When he began to threaten "T", she called for the Police. He left before they arrived at the scene. According to "T", the incident caused her to be fearful as she was concerned that the Respondent might return to the premises and threaten her again. In fact, she was so stressed by the experience that she could not sleep.

25 At about 6.00 pm, the Respondent approached "N" at the Jalan Besar Salon. He pointed his finger at her and said loudly that he was looking for the Applicant. She told him that the Applicant was not at the premises. At the material time, "N" was worried for her safety as there was no one else in the salon. The Respondent later stepped outside and stopped persons from entering the salon. He left shortly thereafter.

Respondent's case

26 The Respondent denied the allegations by "T" and "N". He admitted to having gone to the Jalan Besar Salon sometime in mid-July 2024 with the

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

intention of "reminding" the Applicant about the loan. She was however not around.[16]

27 The Respondent called "P" – who was present in the Geylang Salon at the material time – to testify about the incident. According to her, there were no customer at the area where the Respondent was standing, and the workers were chatting with one another. Before leaving, he asked "T" whether she wanted to lodge a police report about his visit. When the latter said no, he left. The Respondent was in the salon for less than five minutes.

My decision

28 I find the evidence of "T" and "N" to be more credible and reliable that that of the Respondent and "P".

(a) Based on the Respondent's account of the visits, they were uneventful. To accept his account, I must find that the Applicant had instigated *two* of her employees to falsely testify that he had visited *two* salons on the same day to create disturbances. I do not find this to be likely. If the Applicant had wanted to fabricate false evidence against the Respondent, it would have been far easier for her to come up with a simpler narrative – e.g., that he had created a scene at just one of the salons.

(b) Further, the following lend credibility to the evidence by "T" and "N".

16 The Respondent's Letter to the Court dated 10.12.24 (exhibit R1) at page 1.

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

(i) They gave consistent evidence that the Respondent (1) had entered their salons *at different times of the same day*, (2) had demanded to see the Applicant, and (3) was *aggressive*.

(ii) Their evidence that the Respondent was upset and had accused the Applicant of cheating is consistent with the undisputed fact that there was a financial dispute between the two of them (involving $20,000) at the material time.

(iii) Their evidence that the Respondent had created a scene at the salons and made disparaging remarks about the Applicant is also consistent with (1) the events that had happened earlier when he visited the Geylang Salon (on 3 July 2024) and (2) the contents of his email to his case officer (on 12 July 2024): see [12(c)] and [14].

(c) I declined to give weight to "P"'s evidence given that her neutrality had been called into question: see [12(f)] above.

Incident on 16 July 2024

Applicant's case

29 One day after his visit to the salons, the Respondent posted a one-star review about the Applicant's restaurant at Marina One and one of her salons.[17]

(a) In his review about the restaurant, he hinted that its business was not doing well and that its positive reviews could have been faked.

---

17 The review is exhibited in Complainant's Affidavit dated 10.12.24 at pages 30 and 31: see Complainant's Bundle of Affidavits at Tab A.

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

(b) As for his review of the salon, he commented that its owner was in debt and that readers would be signing packages at their own risk.

Respondent's case

30 According to the Respondent –

(a) He had the right to express the comments in his two reviews.

(b) These comments were true as they were based on the following:

(i) He had learnt from his friend that the Applicant had asked her to provide a positive review.[18]

(ii) The Applicant had given discounts to customers.

(iii) She had also used their daughter's Facebook account to generate positive reviews for her businesses.[19]

My decision

31 The Applicant had denied the allegations in [30(b)] above.

32 The Respondent bore the burden of proving the truth of his disparaging reviews. I find that he had failed to discharge this burden.

(a) First, he did not call the alleged friend who supplied the information.

---

18 Record of Proceedings for 07.02.25 at page 69 (line 21) to page 71 (line 20).

19 Respondent's Written Submissions dated 05.08.25 at [23].

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

(b) Second, he did not produce any evidence to show that the Applicant had used her daughter's Facebook account to generate positive reviews for her businesses.

(c) Third, the reviews went beyond a mere commentary on the services provided by the Applicant's business. They attacked her *personal* creditworthiness and were clearly intended to tarnish her reputation. I therefore find that the Respondent committed family violence within s 64(d).

Incident on 23 July 2024

33 I now come to the final incident. This occurred on 23 July 2024. It is common ground that the Respondent had gone to the Geylang Salon at about 9.00 pm.

Applicant's case

34 According to the Applicant –

(a) She immediately called the Police upon seeing him at the salon. This was because of the past incidents when he had created a scene at her salons.

(b) In the presence of the workers and customers, the Respondent (i) pointed his finger at the Applicant, (ii) loudly claimed that he was there to collect $20,000 from her, and (iii) accused her of being a prostitute, being indebted to a lot of people, and having committed adultery while she was still married to him.

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

(c) The Respondent had also harassed the customers as they were leaving the salon – by (i) stopping them outside the premises and (ii) telling them that she slept with customers and cheated money, and not to patronise her salon.

Respondent's case

35 The Respondent denied the Applicant's account of the events. According to him –

(a) There was no customer in the salon at the material time.

(b) He had merely asked the Applicant to return the $20,000 and told her that if she refused to pay, he would hire a lawyer or a debt collector.

(c) To protect himself from false allegations by the Applicant, he had suggested to her that she make a police report. He then waited outside the salon to wait for the Police.

(d) After the Police arrived, the Respondent suggested to them to view the salon's CCTV and to arrest him if he had committed any act of violence.

36 According to "P" –

(a) The Respondent had arrived at the salon at around 9.30 pm. As the salon was closing, there was no customer at the premises.

(b) The Respondent spoke briefly to the Applicant, suggested that the latter call for the Police, and waved at the CCTV. The Applicant then called the Police. The Respondent waited outside the salon.

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

(c) After the Police arrived, they spoke to the Applicant and Respondent separately. The Respondent subsequently left without entering the salon again.

My decision

37 I preferred the Applicant's account of the incident.

(a) It is common ground that the Applicant had called for the Police. Her action is consistent with someone who had acted out of genuine distress and concern for her safety at the material time.

(b) Such distress and concern are supported by the fact that the Respondent had both *motive* to cause her harm (animosity with the Applicant for refusing to return $20,000 and for allegedly deceiving him about her virginity) and *prior history of harassment* (of creating disturbances at her salons and sending disparaging emails and messages against her).

(c) "P"'s testimony did not undermine the Applicant's evidence. This is because "P" was not at the front of the salon and thus unable to witness the interaction between the Applicant and the Respondent at the material time. On "P"'s own evidence, she had gone to a room at the back of the salon and had *shut the door* while the Applicant and the Respondent were at the front of the salon. The room was about 10 m away from the front of premises.[20]

---

[20] Complainant's Submissions dated 27.06.25 at [31] to [33].

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

Other matters

38 For completeness, I wish to address the three points raised by the Respondent in his evidence and submissions.

CCTV recordings

39 It is not disputed that CCTV were installed at the Geylang and Jalan Besar salons. During the trial, the Applicant did not produce the CCTV recordings to support her case that the Respondent had caused a scene at her salons.

40 The Respondent submitted that the Applicant ought to have produced these recordings as they could objectively prove what had transpired at the salons at the material times.[21] Additionally, he submitted that (a) he would not have intentionally created a scene at these premises knowing that this would be recorded by the CCTV, and (b) it was "unbelievable" that the CCTV recordings at two different premises were not retrievable.[22]

41 I accept that the Applicant's failure to produce the relevant CCTV recordings presents a potential weakness in her case regarding the incidents on 3, 15 and 23 July.

42 That said, I find that the absence of these recordings is not fatal to her case. This is because she had explained that the recordings could not be found

---

21 Record of Proceedings for 07.02.25 at page 8 (line 12 to line 22).

22 Respondent's Written Submissions dated 05.08.25 at [19].

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

and that they might no longer be available due to the passage of time.[23] Further, I note that her case is supported by credible witness testimony (from the Applicant, "N" and "T") and corroborated by the Respondent's emails and messages: see [12(d)], [14], and [29] above.

Alleged motive for seeking a PPO

43 The second point concerns the reason for the PPO application. The Respondent contended that the Applicant had made a false PPO application to justify securing the custody, care, and control of their daughter. He believed that she had wanted such arrangements for the child to improve her chances of getting Singapore citizenship. Additionally, he believed that the Applicant had wanted a PPO to deter him from recovering $20,000 from her.[24]

44 I am not persuaded by the Respondent's submissions.

(a) I find them to be highly speculative, unsubstantiated by admissible evidence, and raised belatedly only in closing submissions.

(b) The evidence revealed that the Applicant originally did *not* intend to apply for a PPO. About two months before the application (i.e. on 15 August 2024), her solicitors had issued a cease-and-desist letter to warn the Respondent against committing further acts of family violence.[25] In October 2024, he disregarded this warning by sending a disparaging email about the Applicant to her partner. The PPO

---

23 Record of Proceedings for 07.02.25 at page 36 (line 22) to page 38 (line 3); Complainant's Submissions dated 27.06.25 at [51] to [53].

24 Respondent's Written Submissions dated 05.08.25 at [31] and [35].

25 Complainant's Affidavit dated 10.12.24 at [34]: see Complainant's Bundle of Affidavits at Tab A.

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

application was filed only after this email. If the Respondent did not send this email, the Applicant would not have applied for the PPO.

(c) The PPO application is amply supported by, among others, objective evidence in the form of the Respondent's emails and messages. These contained offensive comments about the Applicant.

Alleged collusion

45 This conveniently brings me to the last point raised by the Respondent. He submitted that the evidence of "N" and "T" are unreliable – contending that they contained "inconsistencies", were "orchestrated", and were given at the bidding of the Applicant (their employer) due to their close relationship with her.[26]

46 I am unable to accept the Respondent's submissions.

(a) I do not find any material inconsistency in "N"'s and "T"'s evidence. The inconsistencies alluded to by the Respondent do not undermine the core of their evidence – i.e., that he had caused disturbances at the salons during the relevant incidents.

(b) The Respondent's submission of collusion among the witnesses relates only to the 3 and 15 July incidents. (For the other incidents, the supporting evidence is based on the Respondent's emails and messages.) For the reasons set out in [12] and [28] above, I find that it is unlikely that the Applicant, "N", and "T" had colluded to give false evidence regarding the Respondent's visits to the salons.

---

[26] Respondent's Written Submissions dated 05.08.25 at [11] to [18]

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

PPO is necessary

47 To re-cap – I have found that on five occasions in July 2024, the Respondent had engaged in conduct that amounted to family violence.

48 The question is whether a PPO is necessary. In my view, it is.

(a) *First,* the Applicant testified that she has been distressed and fearful for her safety and livelihood. This fear is well-founded given the Respondent's repeated harassment.

(b) *Second,* the Respondent had showed no remorse for his conduct.

(i) He claimed that he was "telling the truth" and correcting the misinformation that the Applicant had spread about him. Such a bare claim is clearly disingenuous. He had failed to produce any evidence to support it. It is also unclear how creating a scene at the Applicant's business premises and sending random and unsolicited emails, messages, and adverse one-star reviews can correct the alleged misinformation about him.[27]

(ii) The Respondent had no qualm about making serious accusations against the Applicant without any basis. For instance, he claimed that she had committed adultery and had refused to return a $100,000-loan she took from a businessman.[28]

---

27 Respondent's Written Submissions dated 5 August 2025.

28 The Respondent's Letter to the Court dated 10.12.24 (exhibit R1) at page 3.

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

However, when asked for his evidence to support these claims, he admitted that he did not have any.[29]

(iii) The Respondent continued to publish offensive statements about the Applicant even after her solicitors had issued him a cease-and-desist letter in August 2024. On 7 October 2024, he sent a lengthy email to the Applicant's partner in which he repeated his accusations that she was a cheat, a "FAKE VIRGIN", and a prostitute. He had also (1) provided details of his sexual intercourse with the Applicant, (2) accused her of cheating government agencies, (3) expressed his intention to "bash up" the partner for engaging in an adulterous relationship with her, and (4) threatened to publish his story about the Applicant as he "wanted people in different industries to see her true colors". (exhibit C2) During cross-examination, the Respondent admitted that his intention of sending the 7 October 2024 email was to shame the Applicant.[30]

(iv) At the time of the trial, the Respondent continued to harbour deep resentment towards the Applicant and an intent to embarrass her. For instance, he repeated his accusations that the Applicant had faked her virginity and was a cheat in his written submissions.[31]

---

29 Record of Proceedings for 23.05.25 at page 28 (line 4 to line 25); page 35 (line 29) to page 36 (line 16).

30 Record of Proceedings for 23.05.25 at page 41 (line 4 to line 30)

31 Written Submission dated 05.08.25 at [24], [32] to [34].

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

(v) As evident from above, the Respondent's conduct was not an isolated lapse but part of an escalating pattern. They are clearly vindictive and reprehensible.

(c) *Third,* there is a real risk of further conflict and harassment if no protective order is in place.

(i) At the time of this decision, the issue of the $20,000 payment – which is the one of the key triggers for the family violence in this case – remains unresolved. The Respondent knew that there were the "legal" means for recovering the $20,000 from the Applicant – either through a lawyer or a licensed debt collector.[32] Despite this knowledge, he turned to pressure tactics to recover the money.

(ii) The parties will also need to interact with each other to facilitate the Applicant's access to their daughter. Based on the evidence at the trial, this is yet another potential source of conflict between the parties.

Conclusion

49 Accordingly, I order that the Respondent is not to use family violence in any form against the Applicant. The PPO shall take immediate effect. Further, I order that the Respondent is to pay costs of $4,000 to the Applicant.

50 Before concluding, I wish to address the following message to the Respondent directly.

---

[32] Written Submission dated 05.08.25 at [25].

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

(a) It is an offence to breach this order. If you intentionally do so, you may be arrested and punished with a fine or imprisonment.

(b) You know that lawful means exist to recover debts. Do not take the law into your own hands.

(c) During the trial, you have repeatedly justified your actions by claiming that you were simply telling the truth. The law requires that if you make allegations, you must prove them with admissible evidence. Bare assertions are insufficient and can expose you to liability for harassment, breach of PPO, or defamation.

(d) Your marriage ended more than two years ago. It is time to move on. I urge you to put aside your bitterness and focus on your daughter's welfare.

(e) Sending vulgar emails and messages – e.g., that you visit prostitutes and that the Applicant is one – serves no purpose but to poison the environment in which your daughter is growing up. She will need both parents to provide stability in her life.

(f) Finally, your daughter is now about ten years old. As she enters adolescence, she will need the help and guidance – including how to resolve inter-personal conflicts. I hope that you will contribute positively to her life – including by setting a good example of how reasonable people should behave.

Kow Keng Siong
District Judge

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)

Anthony Ariokiasamy Raymund (M/s LawTrust LLC) for the Applicant;
Respondent in person.

Version No 1: 21 May 2026 (16:53 hrs)