

IN THE FAMILY JUSTICE COURTS OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

[2026] SGFC 26

Summons No SSP 1013/2025, 1486/2025 & 1626/2025

Between

WCW

... Applicant

And

WCX

... Respondent

Summons No SSP 1593/2025

Between

WCX

... Applicant

And

WCW

... Respondent

JUDGMENT

[Family Law] – [Family Violence] – [Orders for Protection]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE APPLICATIONS	2
APPLICABLE LAW	3
ISSUE OF VIDEO EVIDENCE	5
THE MOTHER’S CASE	6
THE DECISION ON THE MOTHER’S CASE	12
THE ALLEGED KICKING OF THE CHILD	12
THE UMBRELLA INCIDENT – 24 MAY 2025.....	19
THE BAG INCIDENT – 12 JULY 2025	20
18 MAY & 19 JULY 2025 INCIDENTS.....	21
20 JULY INCIDENT	22
31 JULY 2025.....	23
AUGUST AND SEPTEMBER SCHOOL INCIDENTS	24
ALLEGED GENERAL HARASSMENT INCIDENTS	25
PREVIOUS INCIDENTS	28
THE FATHER’S CASE	29
THE DECISION ON THE FATHER’S CASE	41
COSTS	47
CONCLUDING REMARKS	48

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.

WCW
v
WCX and anor matter

[2026] SGFC 26

Family Court — Summons No. SSPs1013/2025, 1486/2025, 1593/2025 &
1626/2025

District Judge Amy Tung
29 January 2026

26 February 2026

Judgment reserved

District Judge Amy Tung:

1 The Parties before me are the Mother and Father of an only son (referred to as the ‘Child’). He will be turning 10 this year. Unfortunately, even well after the divorce proceedings had concluded in 2022, the Parties continued to be embroiled in bitter disputes, in particular over access of the Father to the Child.

2 Under the ancillary matters order granted on 26 January 2022 (the ‘AM Order’), the Father is to have regular unsupervised access to the Child from Saturdays 9 p.m. to Mondays 9 a.m. He is also to have access on Thursdays after school (or 5 p.m. when there is no school) to 8 p.m. If the Child is required to be fetched to and from school when he is residing with or having access with

one parent, then the respective parent is to be responsible for ensuring that the Child attends and is picked up from school.

3 For the purpose of the AM hearing, the Mother had insisted on supervised access, citing the Child’s unwillingness to be with the Father. The District Judge who heard the AMs took the view that the Child’s unwillingness to be with the Father did not represent the entirety of his experience with the Father. The District Judge further stated that it was natural to expect that there would sometimes be hesitancy to be with the Father, especially when the Child was constantly being shifted between different homes every week.

4 The Mother’s position has not changed much three years down the road. She maintained that the Child is unwilling to be with the Father and that he should not be forced to go for access with the Father if he is unwilling or uncomfortable to do so. Her perspective on this issue forms the basis of one of her arguments that the Child was harassed and distressed by the Father, particularly when the Father turned up in school or insisted on having video calls with the Child. The Mother went so far as to allege that the Father was trespassing onto the school compounds. I shall return to this in due course. For now, it is sufficient to set this as the background to the proceedings at hand.

The applications

5 The Parties filed the following applications in chronological order:

- (a) SSP 1013/2025: The Mother’s application against the Father for a personal protection order (“PPO”) for herself and on behalf of the Child;

- (b) SSP 1486/2025: The Mother’s application against the Father for a stay away order and a no contact order for herself and on behalf of the Child;
- (c) SSP 1593/2025: The Father’s application against the Mother for a PPO for himself and on behalf of the Child. He is also applying for a mandatory treatment order against the Mother in the same application; and
- (d) SSP 1626/2025: The Mother’s application for a counselling order and a mandatory treatment order to be granted against the Father.

6 The Parties also have cross-applications to vary the AM Order in respect of care and control of and access to the Child. These would be heard after the SSP applications have been determined.

Applicable law

7 Before dealing with the issue of video evidence and going into each of the Parties’ cases, I shall set out the law in brief governing these SSP applications; that being the law in place after the new amendments under the Women’s Charter (Family Violence and Other Matters) (Amendment) Act 2023 came into effect on 2 January 2025.

8 Section 60A of the Women’s Charter 1961 (the “WC”) states:

- (1) The court may, on an application, make a protection order to restrain *X* from committing family violence against *Y* if the court is satisfied, on a balance of probabilities, that —
 - (a) *X* has committed or is likely to commit family violence against *Y*; and

- (b) the protection order is necessary for the protection or personal safety of Y.

9 Both limbs of section 60A must be satisfied before the Court will grant a PPO: -

- (a) The person against whom the PPO application is made has *committed or is likely to commit* family violence; and
- (b) It is *necessary for the PPO to be granted* for the protection of the person seeking protection or the person on whose behalf the protection is sought.

10 Under section 58B of the WC, family violence is committed by X against Y if -

- (a) X is a family member of Y; and
- (b) X commits physical, sexual, or emotional or psychological abuse against Y.

11 “Physical abuse” includes conduct or behaviour that —

- (a) causes, or threatens to cause, personal injury or physical pain to a person; or
- (b) threatens a person with the death or injury of the person; and also
- (c) includes wrongfully confining or restraining a person against the person’s will; but
- (d) does not include any force lawfully used —

- (i) in self-defence; or
- (ii) by way of correction towards a child below 18 years of age.

- 12 “Emotional or psychological abuse” means conduct or behaviour that —
- (a) torments, intimidates, harasses or distresses a person; or
 - (b) causes or may reasonably be expected to cause mental harm to a person, including thoughts of suicide or inflicting self-harm.

13 The standard of proof to be applied is one of the civil standard in the PPO proceedings. Nevertheless, the High Court in the case of *UNQ v UNR* [2020] SGHCF 21 had emphasized (at [28]) that it is important to recognise that the protection conferred by a PPO carries with it criminal sanctions and that in light of the criminal consequences that follow a breach of a PPO, ordering one is not a decision a court would take lightly.

Issue of video evidence

14 Both Parties sought to rely on video evidence, especially the Father. He sought to admit over 50 video recordings in these proceedings. The Mother objected to the admission of these video recordings in these proceedings in one of her emails to the Court, claiming that they were unauthorised as well as the fact that the Father had not produced any certified transcripts in relation to some of them. She repeated her objection at the trial that while all of her transcripts were certified, most of the transcripts produced by the Father were not certified.

15 According to the Father, throughout the lengthy divorce proceedings, the Mother had made many repeated and unfounded allegations against him. She also had the tendency to distort even the smallest details. These had caused him significant anxiety. As a safeguard, he now wears a body-camera whenever he is with the Mother and/or the Child. This was so that he could be protected from the Mother's false allegations; to him, the video recordings provide an objective and contemporaneous record of events, should they later be mischaracterised. I mention this not to condone the Father's actions or to make any findings on the Father's general allegations against the Mother but to provide my understanding as to why the Father may have such a voluminous number of video recordings.

16 The objection of the Mother that the video recordings were "unauthorised" does not preclude the admission of such video recordings. As for her objection that there were no certified transcripts of most of the Father's video recordings, I had subsequently directed that the Father produce certified transcripts of the key events he was relying on both in support of his own application and in his defence of the Mother's applications. Only the certified transcripts are relied upon in the Court's determination of the applications in this case.

The Mother's case¹

17 The key event which apparently prompted the Mother to file the first of the applications i.e. SSP 1013/2025 on 29 May 2025 was an incident on 24 May 2025 where she alleged that the Father used an umbrella as a weapon against

¹ The Mother filed two statements on 31 August and 30 September 2025. At the trial, the Father objected to her statement filed on 31 August 2025 as it was not served on him. The Mother confirmed that she was only relying on her statement of 30 September 2025.

her and the Child inside the lift (the ‘Umbrella Incident’). According to her, she and the Child suffered from abrasions.

18 Prior to the incident, the Mother alleged that the Child was suffering from anxiety after the Father insisted on taking him to Malaysia during the June holidays. On 16 May 2025, the Child had apparently disclosed to the doctors at the Accident and Emergency (A & E) Department of the KK Women’s and Children’s Hospital (KKH) that the Father had kicked him on the backside. According to the Mother, KKH had filed a police report but she did not have a copy of it. She also claimed that this disclosure had been repeated by the Child to multiple authorities and professionals such as the police, the Protective Service from MSF, the doctors, case workers and social workers.

19 There were other incidents that the Mother is relying on as follows: -

- (a) 12 July 2025 (the “Bag Incident”) –The Mother alleged that she was physically assaulted when the Father aggressively pulled the Child’s bag from her shoulder till she called out for help from the public. The Child was apparently so shocked and terrified by his aggressive behaviour but reluctantly went back with the Father in fear that the Father would harm the Mother again.
- (b) 18 May & 19 July 2025 – The Father was alleged to have forcefully pulled the Child out of the lift during handover, despite the Child’s clear refusal.
- (c) 20 July 2025 – The Father was alleged to have dragged the Child “from the house to the coffeeshop, from the coffeeshop to his car and his car to the hospital”. It was the Mother’s case that the

Child was forced to visit the Father’s aunt at the hospital despite his refusal.

- (d) 31 July 2025 – The Father was alleged together with his sisters to have subjected the Child to intense psychological pressure on the way from his school to the police station in an attempt to coerce him to recant his previous statements to the Investigating Officer (“IO”) that the Father had kicked him.

20 Since 31 July 2025, the Father does not have any further physical access with the Child to date. The Court understands that the school at which the Child is attending is facilitating video call access between the Father and the Child on Thursdays (which used to be the days on which the Father would pick up the Child from school).

21 After the physical access ceased, the Mother claimed that the following new incidents of harassment constituting family violence had occurred: -

- (a) 21 & 23 August 2025 – The Father and his sisters were alleged to have trespassed into the Child’s school compounds, causing the Child to flee in distress.
- (b) 28 August 2025 – A video call was facilitated between Father and the Child during which the Child informed the Father that he did not wish to go for access.
- (c) 4 September 2025 – The Father was alleged to have trespassed into the school and became aggressive, telling the Child “I don’t care, I am coming in no matter what”.

- (d) 18 September 2025 – The Father was alleged to have insisted on entering the school to pass the Child his lunch when the Child informed him that he did not wish to see the Father.
- (e) 20 September 2025 – The Mother facilitated a video call between the Child and the Father during which the Child told the Father “the reason why I don’t want to go back with you because you have been kicking me”. The Father then sent an email to the Mother to inform that the police had closed the case against him and requested for normal access to resume.
- (f) 25 September 2025 – The Father was alleged to have trespassed into the school compounds in an aggressive attempt to forcibly remove the Child from the school. During the video call access with the Child, the Father had apparently become increasingly agitated and made threatening and coercive statements, causing the Child to be extremely frightened. The school had to facilitate a second video call when the Father refused to leave; the Child reluctantly complied but continued to exhibit signs of distress.

(collectively, the “August and September School Incidents”)

22 The Mother also claimed that the Father had harassed and stalked both her and the Child by appearing unannounced at KKH on 27 June 2025 and trespassing at her mother’s flat, her own new residence and the school since 2020, bringing along his 5 sisters and their children despite court orders prohibiting this. According to the Mother, the Father had trespassed at her new residence close to 10 times between January to March 2025. She also alleged that on 1 February 2025, during one of the times the Father trespassed at her new residence, he almost drove to hit an old security guard. The Child was so

terrified and cried in his car because the Father refused to allow him to leave his car for handover to the Mother. On 6 September 2025, the Father was alleged to have turned up at the Child's maternal grandmother's house in the morning without prior notice despite being aware that the Mother and the Child were no longer residing there and that all handovers were to be at her new residence. He also subsequently turned up the Mother's new residence to demand for access.

23 These would be referred collectively as "alleged general harassment incidents".

24 Apart from the above incidents, the Mother also surfaced the following incidents under 3 previous PPO applications which were withdrawn by her:-

- (a) 2017 – The Father was alleged to have injured the Mother's wrist.
- (b) 6 February 2021 – The Father was alleged to have tried to snatch her sling bag from her a few times when he did not want the Mother to keep the health booklet after the Child's review at the Bukit Panjang Polyclinic.
- (c) 18 February 2021 – The Father followed her and the Child to the lift lobby and tried to prevent the lift door from closing when they were already in the lift. He then kicked the lift door and walked off but not before shouting at the Mother.
- (d) 25 April 2021 – When the Parties were at the coffee shop, the Father hit the Mother's hand and her handphone flew off and hit the ceiling. She eventually fell to the floor of the coffee shop while carrying the Child in her arms.

- (e) 30 April 2021 – The Father had injured the Child’s fingers by forcefully opening the window, knowing that the Child was trying to close the window against him. According to the Mother, although the Child was only 5 years old at that time, he was trying to protect his grandmother from the verbal abuse of the Father.
- (f) 2022 – The National University Hospital made a police report against the Father as it was suspected that the Father had slapped the Child. The Child came home claiming that the Father had used a Nerf gun to shoot at him on his face without eye protection.
- (g) 15 February 2024 – The Father was alleged to have invaded the Mother’s privacy by filming the inside of her home from outside her window. He interrogated her during handover, refused to return the Child’s school bag and blocked the lift door.
- (h) 10 April 2024 – The Father was alleged to have harassed and threatened the Mother in public. He shouted aggressively in front of the Child, refused to let the Mother or Child return home by repeatedly pressing open the lift door. The Father also used his umbrella to block the lift door from closing.

(collectively, the “Previous Incidents”)

25 In the Mother’s statement, she had also brought up alleged harassment by the Father’s five sisters and the Father’s denial of her access and non-replacement of her “access days”. In particular, she had introduced a video recording during which one of the Father’s sister had called her a “bad mother”.

All these are not matters which are relevant in this PPO proceeding and hence, they would be disregarded by the Court.

26 It is the Mother's case that the Child has anxiety and stress-induced stomachache and vomiting which is linked to the family violence committed by the Father. He is also at risk of epilepsy. She requested that for the well-being of the Child, the Father should not be allowed to have unsupervised access to the Child.

The decision on the Mother's case

The alleged kicking of the Child

27 The Child had first disclosed to the doctors at KKH when he was brought by his mother to A & E on 16 May 2025 that he had been "kicked on the buttocks either on 10 May 2025 or 15 May 2025". It is the Mother's case that the Father had been kicking the Child during his access in 2025 and that the Child's disclosure had been documented with the police, the medical professionals, the social workers and the Protective Service of MSF.

28 The Mother produced recordings of her conversations with the Child. By way of examples, the transcripts of the recordings² on 15 August, 30 August and 20 September 2025 are reproduced below as her intended proof that the Father had kicked the Child, resulting in his refusal to go for access on those days:-

15 August 2025

² While not all certified transcripts are reproduced in full or partially in this judgment, the Court has reviewed all the recordings with certified transcripts in their entirety.

Mother	That time, last time....Lucky, lucky you told the doctor, right? So other than that leh?
Child	[Clapping sounds] Why...?
Mother	But last year does he do that as well? Early part of the year, does he, does he do that?
Child	[inaudible] dying...
Mother	So it's only recently is it?
Child	Yeah.
Mother	Why? Recently this year only is it?
Child	Yeah...
Mother	He, that he like to kick you?
Child	Yeah....
Mother	And you never tell him you don't like? Did you say?
Child	Tell him
Mother	Then what did he say?
Child	So...
Mother	Huh?
Child	So...
Mother	So did you tell him that it's painful?
Child	Yes I told him.

20 August 2025

Mother	Can you tell mommy what are you scared of?
Child	Cuz he will...hit me
Mother	Huh?
Child	Kick me....
Mother	Oh kick you ah? So you are scared ah?

Child	[muffled squeals]
Mother	But the court order say you need to go for access, Baobei ah?
Child	I don't want
Mother	Huh?
Child	I don't want
Mother	You don't want....Can you tell mommy, is it painful?
Child	[Inaudible]
Mother	That's why?
Child	[squeals while nodding]
Mother	Oh 1-10, how painful is it? Can you tell mama?
Child	9 and a half.
Mother	Oh...you mean he really very – he hit you very hard ah?
Child	9 and a half...After that...
Mother	Oh...okay

20 September 2025

Mother	Can you tell mommy how many times he's been doing this?
Child	This is sister...
Mother	You mean what? You mean he – who? Which sister? He go so many...
Child	Exactly.
Mother	Which sister?
Child	[E]
Mother	Huh?
Child	[Inaudible] [E]

Mother	[E]
Child	[inaudible] most...
Mother	You mean all the...who? You have to say, who?
Child	[inaudible] two of the [inaudible] Uh...the – the biggest one....
Mother	[Full name of Father's eldest sister]
Child	And the smallest one.
Mother	[Full name of Father's youngest sister]
Child	No...actually, the – Uh...number third
Mother	[Full name of Father's third sister]
Child	Yeah
Mother	Why she kick you?
Child	I don't know.
Mother	You mean she also kick you?
Child	Both of them.
Mother	Why?
Child	Don't know
Mother	Why do they want to kick you?
Child	I don't know. Don't ask me.
NA	[no dialogue]
Mother	You mean both? So all the three of them all kick you?
Child	Two of them.
Mother	And [Father's full name]? So is this – that's the reason why you don't want to go?
Child	[Inaudible]
Mother	Huh? Do they do that every time?
Child	Mostly...
Mother	Mostly ah? So that's why....

Child	So...which is like – I think like I get kicked 2 times. Whenever I go, because I always see the sister.
Mother	Whenever you go you got kicked?
Child	Yeah. Most of the time.

29 The Father denied intentionally kicking the Child. On 11 May 2025, the Child had sustained some minor injuries to his back while playing at the playground with his friends. On 12 May 2025, before returning the Child to the Mother, he documented the injury using his body-camera as he knew that the Mother would use this to wrongfully accuse him. On the stand, he acknowledged that as they played Nerf Gun games together or engaged in other sport activities, there could be “accidental kicking”; however, he had never physically abused the Child. The Father produced a video recording of his conversation with the Child on the way to school on 19 May 2025 (Monday morning): -

Father	That time you go with mama to KK hospital, is it? And she asked you to tell the doctor what?
Child	All the bad things about you!
Father	All the bad things about me? What happened? What did I do to you? Huh, for example?
Child	She asked me to say that you kick my buttock
Father	Actually did I do that to you?
Child	No

30 The Mother alleged that the Father had forced the Child to say the above and intentionally recorded the conversation. She asked that the Court should have no regard to this video recording.

31 Having reviewed all the relevant video recordings and the evidence, I am of the view that the Mother has not discharged her burden of proof that the Father had intentionally kicked the Child. Not only had the Child said different things in the presence of either of his parents, but the access had gone on albeit with the usual acrimony and difficulties in the next two months in June and July 2025. More importantly, there were also warm moments between the Father and the Child that were on display after the “disclosure” of the alleged kicking by the Father. These showed that the Child did not have any genuine fear of or was in distress because of the Father.

32 I further note that although the Child allegedly disclosed that the Father had kicked him in May 2025, the scope of his allegations as at September 2025 (by that time, the Father had had no physical access for nearly 2 months) had expanded to include two of the Father’s sisters *also kicking him most of the time* during the Father’s access times, which seem incredulous.

33 Further, after the Father filed a variation application for shared care and control of the Child on 4 August 2025 (which according to the Father, also coincided with the week that he no longer had physical access), the Child had called him on 13 August 2025 while he was in his car. He could not see the Child as the camera was not switched on; the following conversation was recorded by the Father’s body-camera: -

Father	Hullo, who is that?
Child	(Shouting but can’t see him) Take back the court order, if not I will never see you again
Father	Sorry! I cannot hear you!
Child	Take back the Court order, or I will never see you again (in a clear voice)

Father	[Child’s name], you...Just now mama just talked to you before you talked to me this right?
Child	No!
Father	Can you say, can you say the exact words again! [Child’s name] you have to show me your video if not I cannot tell that your mama is not with you. If I cannot see you, I don’t know whether is she with you? [Child’s name] you are a strong boy! I know what between Papa and [Child’s name], how?
Child	(shouting) You created all this mess!

34 When the Mother was questioned on the stand on the above conversation, she denied coaching the Child. She stated that the Child saw her “working hard” at the Court documents, which was why the Child spoke in this manner to the Father. It is hard for the Court to accept what appeared to the Mother’s weak explanation for the Child’s outburst of anger and his blaming the Father for the “mess”, with a demand that he “take back the Court order” and “if not”, the Child would never see the Father again. I find that it is more likely than not that the Mother was angry at having received the variation application and had projected her anger towards the Father in the presence of the Child, which in turn caused the Child to behave in the way that he did. The refusal of the Child to see the Father to date, as alleged to be linked to family violence, must therefore be treated with great circumspection.

35 The Mother had produced drawings and psychological sheets as her proof that the Child viewed the Father negatively as a “bully”. In my opinion, these would need to be viewed with much caution against the Mother’s influence over the Child. While the Father had generally referred to the Mother as “mama” in the presence of the Child, the Mother had often called the Father by his full name or even referred to him as “that man” or “monster” when talking

to the Child about his father. She had continually disparaged him and painted him in a negative light before the Child.

The Umbrella Incident – 24 May 2025

36 It is the Mother’s case that the Father had intentionally opened the Child’s umbrella in the confines of the lift lobby to block her view of the Child, thereby hurting her and the Child in the process. The Father categorically denied this. He contended that the umbrella inadvertently sprang open and that before he could close it, the Mother was violently pulling and pushing at the umbrella.

37 Both Parties tendered video recordings of this incident.

38 Having watched the video recordings, it would appear to me that the umbrella did spring open and both Parties were then struggling over the umbrella and yelling at each other. The Child appeared amused over the occurrence and was seen tapping at the handle of the umbrella and smiling. I am not able to find that the Father had *intentionally* opened the umbrella to cause hurt to the Mother and the Child. From the Father’s perspective, there was no reason to cause further trouble to himself by doing such an act and jeopardising his access to the Child. The Father also pointed out that by the Mother’s own act of pushing the umbrella, the handle of the umbrella had brushed against the Child’s lips.³

³ The Court had permitted (i) the Mother to tender the video recording and certified transcript of the same incident after the trial and (ii) the Father to provide a written response to these materials.

The Bag Incident – 12 July 2025

39 The Mother submitted a medical memo to show that she had sustained tenderness to the shoulder due to the aggressive act of the Father in pulling the Child’s bag. She stated that she is still receiving follow-up treatment for the shoulder.

40 Both Parties tendered video recordings of this incident.

41 From the video recordings, it was clear that the Father had no intention to hurt the Mother. He was getting angry and frustrated as he was belabouring under the impression that the Mother was trying to be difficult by refusing to handover the Child’s bag to him for access. He said that he would count to 5 to give the Mother notice that he would be taking the bag from her. The Mother also started counting to 3 – “1, 2, 3 count!”. Although the Mother tried to tell the Father that she wanted the Child to take the bag from her, she could not be heard above the Father’s own loud words. In fact, the Court did not hear what she said from the Father’s video recording until she pointed this out at the trial.

42 In response to the Father’s submission that no injuries were documented on the Child at all, the Mother had repeatedly stated that just because there are no injuries does not mean that family violence had not been committed. The converse is also true. The fact that an injury is sustained does not mean that family violence had been committed if there was no intention to cause that injury. I am satisfied that the Father has intended to take the Child’s bag from the Mother, without intending to cause her any injury. I also note that the Mother was not afraid of the Father as she had said “No, thank you very much. I have all the evidence against you” and then laughed at him. In consideration of all

the circumstances, I find that the Father had not committed family violence against the Mother in respect of this incident.

18 May & 19 July 2025 incidents

43 The Mother contended that the Father had forcefully pulled the Child out of the lift during handovers despite the Child’s clear refusal to go for access.

44 The Father does not dispute that the Child might have some resistance towards him at the start of some of these handovers. The Father stated at the trial that one of the points of contention for these handovers is that they should occur at the lift lobby instead of inside the lift; however, when the Child was with the Mother inside the lift, he would often exhibit some reluctance to leave the confines of the lift. The Father would then have to step inside the lift to try and get the Child out of the lift.

45 From the video recording of the 19 July incident, it would appear that the Mother and the Child *remained* in the lift when the lift door opened. The Mother started to question the Father as to when he was going to pay the hospital bill. When the Father stated that “it is a different issue with the handover”, the Mother then asked the Child whether he wanted to go with the Father. The Child kept quiet. Subsequently, when the Mother asked again whether the Child wanted to go, he had said “yes”. The Parties continued to have an exchange of words on the issue of the Mother holding onto the Child’s bag and not handing it over. When the Father walked into the lift, the Child started to resist the Father, notwithstanding he had earlier told the Mother that he wanted “to go [for access]”. As a result of the resistance, the Father tried to hold onto him and bring him out of the lift. The Child then walked away with the Father, as the

Parties continued to quarrel over the Child's bag. The Child then became worried that he had no bag to bring to school the following Monday.

46 The Mother appeared to be upset with the Father over a hospital bill; as a result, the handover was more difficult than usual. I see no reason why the Mother could not have handed the Child's bag over to him, even if she did not want to hand it over to the Father. She could also have put it down on the floor for either the Father or the Child to collect, as requested by the Father. She did neither. Given the context of the incident, I find that there has been no family violence committed by the Father against the Child.

47 The Mother also made a bare allegation against the Father for forcefully pulling the Child out of the lift on 18 May 2025; no proof was tendered in respect of this alleged incident.

20 July incident

48 The Mother contended that the Child was dragged from a coffeeshop to the Father's car, and subsequently from the car to the hospital. She stated that there were witnesses and CCTV footages but neither witnesses nor CCTV footages were presented by her. She herself was also not present with the Child on 20 July 2025.

49 The Father presented evidence that the Child and he were not even at the coffee shop in question. The Father stated that after lunch at Times Vegetarian, they did visit the Child's grandaunt at the hospital. The Child had danced for the grandaunt at the hospital room (which was recorded by the Father). There were no signs of distress, refusal or anguish on the Child's end. After the visit to the hospital, the Father took the Child to a swimming playdate with his friends. The Father added (at [166] of his affidavit):

It should also be noted that [the Child's] grandaunt sadly passed away just a few days later, on 23 July 2025. The visit of 20 July 2025 was therefore not only an important opportunity for [the Child] to see her while she was still alive, but also a deeply meaningful family moment handled by me with care and respect. This visit provided [the Child] with the chance to express compassion and love towards his extended family, while also learning how to cope with grief in a safe and supportive environment.

50 The Mother had no basis for the allegations she made and I find that there was no family violence committed by the Father in respect of this alleged incident.

31 July 2025

51 The Mother contended that the Father had put psychological pressure on the Child while taking him from the school to the police station in an attempt to coerce the Child to recant his previous statements to the IO that the Father had kicked him. She also alleged that the Father had kicked the Child in the car afterwards.

52 The Father denied putting any psychological pressure on the Child to recant his statements and kicking the Child in the car. He stated that he did bring the Child to the police station in response to an appointment made with the IO. At the trial, he explained that he thought it was fair if he could also be given a chance to bring the Child down to the police station, especially given his views that the Mother had filed multiple false police reports against him. He exhibited evidence in the forms of photographs showing him and the Child bonding over badminton and chess that day.

53 The video recording of the Father and the Child at the end of his access on 31 July 2025 showed a giggling and happy child and the Father and Child

hugging each other. After the Father walked the Child to the lift lobby and the lift door opened revealing the Mother, the Child walked in and hugged his Mother. As the Father had earlier asked the Child to give his Mother a hug as well, the Father shouted “Good boy!” to the Child. The Mother was heard saying to the Child as the lift door closed: “Love you! You want him?”.

54 The events of 31 July 2025 as documented by the Father would show that the Child was comfortable and relaxed while with his father. If the events were as the Mother had alleged, with intense psychological pressure exerted on the Child, he would not have such warm and happy moments with the Father. I note that the Mother had not even been with the Child during the alleged incident.

55 Again, the Mother had no basis for the allegations she made and I find that there was no family violence committed by the Father in respect of this alleged incident.

August and September school incidents

56 The Mother had highlighted several dates (in August and September 2025) on which the Father was alleged to have trespassed into the school, causing distress and harassment to the Child.

57 It is significant to note that under the existing AM order, the Father retains the express right to collect the Child from school on Thursdays when school is in session. The Father could not therefore be regarded as having trespassed into the school. Given that no variation to the AM order is currently in effect pending the determination of the cross-applications for variation, the Father remains entitled to exercise his access rights by attending the school premises to collect the Child in accordance with arrangement under the AM

order. The mere fact that the Child may be distressed in his refusal to leave with the Father from the school does not, without more, transform what is otherwise the exercise of the Father's access rights into conduct constituting intentional harassment of the Child.

Alleged general harassment incidents

58 The Mother contended that the Father had trespassed into the grounds of her new residence despite her being very clear that the Father was not welcome. She also alleged that he had harassed her and the Child by turning up at her mother's place.

59 In response, the Father stated that there was no reason to be going either to the Mother's residence or the grandmother's residence apart from access. Furthermore, he wanted to pick up and drop off the Child at a safe location within the Mother's condominium premises and disagreed that he should pick up or drop off the Child at the guardhouse.

60 I note that the instances during which the Father was alleged to have harassed the Mother by coming into her condominium premises were on days on which the Father needed to pick up the Child for access or drop him off after access. That being the case, the Father could not, under the law, be regarded to have harassed the Mother or the Child. There was no family violence on the part of the Father, but simply sharp and strong disagreement by the Parties over where the Child should be picked up or dropped off. Furthermore, in order to avoid being in conflict with the Mother, the Father eventually agreed to park his car elsewhere and walk the Child over to the Mother's condominium after access. The Mother herself also acknowledged during the trial that she

eventually asked to switch the handover of the Child for access back to the grandmother’s residence.

61 When it was pointed out to the Mother during the trial that the Father had gone to her or the Child’s grandmother’s residence for access purposes only, the Mother surfaced an incident on 15 February 2024. She alleged that the Father had come up to the grandmother’s flat and stood outside, harassing her and invading on her privacy by filming the inside of the flat with his body-camera. According to her, this was done outside the access times and after the drop-off had occurred. The Mother produced a video recording with the following transcript: -

Father	Ask you what’s your treatment plan...[inaudible] sure, I’m ready [inaudible]
Mother	Thank you very much for coming – I already told you right? I asked you which doctor, you never tell me which doctor, so?
Father	No, I’m asking you the treatment plan
Mother	No, I’m telling you I’m asking you which doctor? Did you bring him to see doctor? No....so tell me which doctor?
Father	Did you bring him to see doctor? You didn’t bring him yourself right?
Mother	Which doctor? [Father’s full name] tell me which doctor?
Father	[Doctor’s full name] I already tell you already
Mother	No, you never say
Father	I said that. You go and check your video
Mother	No? You never say, I already checked
Father	Now I tell you
Mother	Please go and check your message. I got all the evidence, your evidence you already tell me, in the video you already say...!

Father	I didn't message, I replied you [inaudible]
Father	Yah! Already say, already tell you the doctor!
Mother	No, in the video you already say, if you want me to tell you to see the doctor, you are the one who telling me...
Father	Okay, shut up [inaudible]
Child	[Cries out]
Father	[Child's name] ah- mama hit your head ah?
Child	No!
Mother	No..mama, did mama hit your head? No right....?
Child	[inaudible] your elbow....!
Father	[Child's name] pointing to the head
Mother	Yah – mama never hit your head
Father	Mama...[child] just tell this that you hit his head [From distance] you want to talk to me right, come out and talk to me lah! Eh!
Child	You hit my head....You hit my head with your elbow...can you say sorry?
Father	Don't need to call, come!
Mother	No no nowait wait wait! Baobei wait – you are -
Child	Can you say sorry? [inaudible]
Mother	I put it [Father's full name] create acrimony in my house at block 642 [on phone call with the police]

62 Although the Father had dropped off the Child after access at the lift lobby, he had come up to the grandmother's flat. This was, according to the Mother, a form of harassment. However, it was clear from the certified transcript that she had produced that the Father was trying to ask her what the treatment plan for the Child was. The Mother herself had also engaged the

Father on this very issue. During the exchange of words between the Parties, the Mother had accidentally hit the Child's head with her elbow, which caused him to cry out in pain and to ask for an apology from the Mother. The Mother thereafter called the police. From this short exchange, lasting about only one minute before the Mother called for the police, the Court does not find that there was any harassment on the part of the Father, which constituted family violence.

Previous incidents

63 The Mother raised previous incidents under the withdrawn PPO applications in an attempt to show that there is an established pattern of violence and aggression on the part of the Father.

64 Given that the Court has not found that the Father committed family violence in any of the recent alleged incidents in 2025, the Court is hard pressed to rely on any of the previous incidents (in 2017, 2021 and 2022) to ground a case for a PPO in favour of the Mother or the Child. Furthermore, the Mother had been shown not to have any basis for a number of the recent allegations; her perspective of the various incidents was also coloured by her own negative view of the Father.

65 One of the previous incidents relied on by the Mother (which was more recent) was the alleged harassment incident on 15 February 2024; this had been determined by the Court not to constitute family violence: see [61] to [62]. For completeness, I should add that the video recording of the incident on 30 April 2021 showed that the Father was trying to keep open the window while the Child was trying to close it. The Father does not appear to have intentionally hurt the fingers of the Child. As for the 2022 Nerf gun incident, it was the Father's case that the Child was accidentally hit by a shot from a Nerf gun while

they were engaged in the game; the Child himself did not deny that he was hit by a shot from a Nerf gun and told his mother so. The Mother’s allegations during the trial that the doctor suspected that the Child was slapped by the Father had no credible basis or evidence. While the medical memo had the words “non-accidental” handwritten on it, it was not clear who inserted the words. Furthermore, the medical memo had recorded that the Child was playing Nerf gun with the Father at about “6-7 p.m. last night”.

66 Having reviewed the Mother’s case in its entirety, I am dismissing her applications.

The Father’s case

67 The Father contended that in view of the Mother’s escalating hostility since December 2024, repeated breaches of the Court’s access orders and her conduct that had caused emotional and psychological harm to both him and the Child, he found it necessary to file his own application against the Mother. It was not a tit-for-tat manoeuvre.

68 His account of events in the affidavit spans numerous incidents and he invited the Court to view them not in isolation but against the broader backdrop of the Mother’s persistent hostility and obstruction. He claimed that the chronology of events provide evidence in support of his own PPO application while demonstrating the baseless and retaliatory nature of the Mother’s multiple PPO applications.

69 His chronology of events is as follows: -

- (a) 9 March 2023 – When the Father attempted to highlight to the Mother that he had been told by the Child’s student care teacher

that he was experiencing pain in his ankles and knees, the Mother allegedly refused to listen and said to the Child, “This man wants to delay your return on Wednesday during the school holidays”. The Father subsequently received a call from the police later that night informing him that the Mother had lodged a police report, saying that the Father had caned the Child.

- (b) 11 March 2023 – The Mother allegedly refused to handover the Child for the Father’s holiday access and pressed him to accept her version of the schedule to return the Child at 12 noon on 15 March 2023 instead of 8 p.m. that day.
- (c) 15 March 2023 – During her video call access with the Child, the Mother had allegedly repeatedly told the Child “don’t be sad, I will help you fight back everything”. The Father took the view that such words were entirely inappropriate for a 7-year-old and placed him squarely in the middle of the adult conflicts. Subsequently, during the handover, the Mother claimed that the Child’s hands and legs were red, implying that the Father had harmed the Child. The Father called the police and the police came and confirmed that the Child had no injuries. The Mother attempted to block the Father from taking photographs, leading the Father to take the view that she had attempted to fabricate the allegations of injuries.
- (d) 17 March 2023 – The Mother allegedly blocked the Father’s Whatsapp messages for several hours when he tried to arrange for a video call with the Child.

- (e) June 2023 holidays – The Mother was allegedly heard coaching the Child over video call to say that he was unhappy staying with the Father and his family.
- (f) 25 May 2023 – The Mother allegedly uttered curse words to him of his elderly and sick mother who was just discharged from the A & E.
- (g) 6 September 2023 – The Mother allegedly cursed the Father’s mother in the Child’s presence and made a booing action with her thumbs down.
- (h) 10 & 30 September 2023 – The Mother allegedly cursed the Father’s mother and family unprovoked.
- (i) 14 September 2023 – According to the Father, the Mother irresponsibly allowed the Child to alight from the school bus alone while she remained on board. The then 7-year-old Child was left stranded, frightened and crying at the bus stop until he sought help from his teacher. The Father also claimed that on the same day he realised that the Mother had given the Child a mobile phone installed with a tracking application to monitor and interfere with his access.
- (j) 23 September 2023 – The Mother had allegedly scolded one of the Father’s sister, Mdm [L] at Choa Chu Kang MRT without provocation, and cursed at the Father’s mother. This confrontation had caused the Child significant fear and embarrassment.
- (k) 15 February 2024 – After the handover at the Mother’s then residence, as the Father was leaving, the Mother repeatedly

called him. He then walked back to the unit to speak with her and this led to an altercation in the Child's presence. The Mother filed a Magistrate's Complaint against the Father for alleged invasion of privacy.

- (l) 28 July 2024 – The Mother allegedly accosted Mdm [L] at a Bukit Batok bread shop unprovoked, making nasty remarks. She also trailed Mdm [L] as the latter was walking to meet the Father and the Child. The Child was allegedly upset by the public hostility, which undermined his sense of security.
- (m) 12 September 2024 – The Child had vomited repeatedly at the Student Care Centre. The staff informed the Mother, but she had allegedly failed to notify the Father despite the seriousness of the matter, causing the Father to be distressed.
- (n) 5 October 2024 – The Child emerged from the lift in tears, saying that the Mother had scolded him multiple times that day and pressured him to say he wanted the Father's access to him reduced. The Mother had allegedly even threatened to abandon the Child. When the Father spoke to the Child about this, he was told that the Mother had been scolding and shouting at him regarding reducing access to only 1 day per week. The Child also repeated how the Mother had apparently spoken to him, including "You don't want me right! Then go with that monster!".
- (o) 8 October 2024 – The Child had allegedly shared with the Father that the Mother brought him to see a specialist about his vomiting

but misrepresented to the doctor that his nausea only occurred before the Father's access visits.

- (p) 16 October 2024 – The Father discovered that the Mother was seated in the room during his video call access with the Child. The Child was guarded and anxious, plainly aware that the Mother was listening in. The Father claimed that such intrusion defeats the very purpose of Court-ordered video calls and amounts to emotional abuse, as it deprives the Child of a safe space to interact with the Father.
- (q) 30 November 2024 – While the Father was supposed to have his weekly video access call with the Child, the Mother called to interrogate him about the alleged misuse of her company medical benefits. In the middle of the interrogative conversation, the Father claimed that he could hear the Child screaming in the background. The Father also claimed that the Mother's behaviour amounted to emotional and psychological abuse, as she repeatedly burdened the Child with matters far beyond his age and maturity.
- (r) 9 December 2024 – The Mother refused to hand over the Child's passport and the Father had to call the police twice that day. The unnecessary confrontation, carried out in front of the Child, caused him visible distress and anxiety.
- (s) 24 December 2024 – During the Father's access time, the Mother called the Child to say that she was "sending [Father's full name] to jail as my Christmas present". This caused the Child visible stress and fear. She also alleged in the Child's presence that the Father was having an affair with one of his friend's mother. The

Child was on a camping trip with his friends. The Father claimed that instead of allowing the Child to enjoy the trip and bond with his peers, the Mother chose to burden him with negativity and adult conflicts.

- (t) 28 December 2024 – The Mother subjected the Child to extreme psychological distress during a video call by incessantly interrogating him about his time with the Father and his views of the Father. She repeatedly referred to the Father as the “monster”. The Father claimed that the Mother also guilt tripped the Child by claiming that he does not love her anymore. The Child eventually broke down, screaming at the Mother multiple times to stop and at one point shouted at the top of his lungs “Stop it!”.
- (u) 31 December 2024 – The Child wanted to resist going home to the Mother as he wanted to remain at a chalet BBQ with his friends. The Father managed to coax the Child to go home to his Mother. Shortly after, he heard the Child screaming from upstairs, which led him to call the police to check on his safety.
- (v) 4 January 2025 – The Father was taken aback when the lift doors opened and the Child shouted “Why must I go back?”. After the handover, the Child had apparently explained to the Father that this was done to negate the video evidence of 31 December 2024 when the Child had shown distress at leaving the Father. The Father stated in his affidavit that the manipulation of a young child to parrot statements for the sole purpose of fabricating evidence was both emotionally abusive and harmful to his psychological development.

- (w) 23 January 2025 – The Mother blocked the Father and refused him entry to her new residence, even standing at the condominium barrier with the security staff to prevent him from driving the car in to drop off the Child after access.
- (x) 6 February 2025 – The Father observed that the Child was braving strong and cold winds outside the condominium gate while the Mother ignored his repeated requests for help in carrying his heavy schoolbag. The Child had apparently confided in the Father later that the Mother had made him wait outside the gate on previous occasions as well. The Father claimed that such conduct amounted to a form of neglect and emotional abuse towards the Child.
- (y) 27 February 2025 – The Mother called the Father after he had left with the Child for access and told him to “go and die”. According to the Father, the Mother often called and messaged him immediately before, during and after handovers.
- (z) 19/20 March 2025 – The Mother called at 1230 a.m. demanding for the password to the Child’s school portal. She allegedly stressed the Child by blaming the Father loudly in the background.
- (aa) 19 March 2025 – The Father received a call from the IO to verify yet another police report lodged by the Mother, alleging that he had forced the Child to go home with him. According to the Father, her frequent reports to the police, prompting them to regularly call and interrogate him, has caused him significant anxiety and emotional distress.

- (bb) 23 March 2025 – The Mother allegedly obstructed the Father’s video call access with the Child during the school holidays, claiming that he had taken “extra days” of access. The Mother eventually allowed a single call but terminated it after only 3 seconds. The Mother was alleged to have inflicted unnecessary stress on the Child, leaving him confused, anxious and fearful of expressing his true wishes.
- (cc) 30 March 2025 – The police had once again contacted the Father following another police report that the Mother had made, alleging that the Father had forced the Child to go home with him.
- (dd) April & June 2025 – In April 2025, the Mother had refused to allow the Father to meet with the Child’s occupational therapist. In June 2025, the Mother called the Police when she saw the Father, claiming that both her and the Child had an Expedited Order against him. The Father had to explain to the police that he was there solely to speak with the doctor, and not – as the Mother alleged – to access the Child. According to the Father, the Mother had weaponised medical settings to exclude him, obstruct his ability to support the Child’s treatment and fabricate allegations in order to mislead medical professionals. These acts not only amounted to harassment towards him, but also constitute psychological abuse of the Child, who is exposed to unnecessary conflict and hostility during critical moments of his medical care.
- (ee) 5 April 2025 – The Child had apparently confided in the Father that the Mother was “the one making [him] suffer”. According

to the Father, the fact that the Child expressed this unprompted, in the privacy of their time together, reflected the heavy psychological burden he has been placed under the Mother's behaviour – through constant interrogation, coaching and manipulation.

- (ff) 10 April 2025 – The Mother sent an image of a corpse in a coffin with his face digitally altered onto the body. This was not an isolated incident as she had, over time, sent the Father repeated images of corpses, coffins, ghost children, often accompanied by menacing and mocking messages. In total, she had sent the Father more than 1,200 WhatsApp messages of this nature, including messages wishing for “karma” to befall him and his family.
- (gg) 12 April 2025 – The Mother allegedly instructed the Child to shout loudly as if he was scared of the Father, during handover, causing the Child emotional upheaval.
- (hh) 19 April 2025 – The Mother allegedly instructed the Child to shout loudly during handover, while screaming in the background and stalking them to the car. Once in the car, she called repeatedly to harass the Father while he was driving off with the Child. According to the Father, the Mother was well aware that he was driving and chose deliberately to spam call him at that time, to distract him, which was hazardous for both him and the Child.
- (ii) 26 April 2025 – The Mother allegedly repeatedly called and harassed the Father after making the Child say that he wanted to stay with her during the handover.

- (jj) 1 May 2025 – The Mother allegedly insisted that he must drive his car out to pick up the Child at the unsafe condominium driveway exit, despite his car already parked safely within the compound. She also guilt-tripped the Child by calling the Father a “beggar” and telling him to “go stay with [him]”, causing the Child sadness.
- (kk) 3 May 2025 – During the handover, the Child threw his bag on the floor and shouted at the Father. The Mother laughed in response. Later, the Child had apparently told the Father that he had done so at the Mother’s request.
- (ll) 10 May 2025 – During the handover at the grandmother’s residence, the Mother had accompanied the Child down to the lift lobby. According to the Father, the moment the lift door opened, the Child shouted that he did not wish to go with him. The Child was repeatedly glancing at the Mother, which strongly suggested that he was coached or pressured into performing the resistance on camera. During the dispute, the Mother allegedly lunged forward aggressively, coming within less than 5 cm of his face. Out of genuine fear that she might physically harm him – or worse, fabricate an allegation of assault – the Father instinctively stepped backwards several times. According to the Father, the Mother’s conduct created unnecessary confrontation in front of the Child, who was visibly distressed, shivering and deeply unsettled.
- (mm) 12 May 2025 – During the handover, the Mother had allegedly asked the Child whether he wanted to go with the Father, forcing

him to take sides. This triangulation caused the Child immense distress.

- (nn) 17 May 2025 – During the handover at the grandmother’s residence, the Mother had allegedly coached the Child to resist access. When the lift door opened, the Child shouted “I don’t want to go to Malaysia with you!”, referring to a planned trip to Legoland Malaysia during the June school holidays. The Child had apparently confided in the Father later that the Mother had made him say those words.
- (oo) 24 May 2025 – After the Umbrella Incident, the Mother apparently continued her campaign of harassment by repeatedly calling the Father and insisting on speaking with the Child. The Child apparently clutched his stomach and complained of discomfort, refusing to take the call. The Mother subsequently called the police who came over to the Father’s residence at 10.30 p.m. After confirming that the Child was not hurt, the police left. This episode, amongst many others, illustrated how the Mother had resorted to false allegations to obstruct his access to the Child, to the detriment of his emotional well-being and in disregard of his best interests. In addition, she has caused profound mental distress and anxiety, to the point that he felt like he was going to war every time he knows that he will see her for the handover.
- (pp) 30 May 2025 – The Child told the Father that he was looking forward to the planned trip to Legoland. This was in stark contrast to his responses during the earlier handovers in May.

- (qq) 2 June 2025 – The Mother made a series of late-night calls where she repeatedly told the Child that she had applied for a PPO against the Father and instructed him to “run to Ah Ma’s [grandmother’s] house, if needed. She also told the Child to “fight” the Father.
- (rr) 6 June 2025 – During a video call with the Child, the Mother told him that the upcoming Blackpink concert in November 2025 would fall during the Father’s access time and that he would therefore not be able to attend it with her. The Father claimed that this was a deliberate attempt to gaslight the Child into believing that he was deprived of opportunities because of the Father. Such remarks are emotionally manipulative and place the Child under undue psychological stress.
- (ss) 12 June 2025 – The Mother digitally edited the Father’s face and details onto an obituary and sent to him via Whatsapp.
- (tt) 1 July 2025 – The Mother had only informed the Father of the Child’s seizure and hospitalisation late at night, thereby depriving the Father of the opportunity to be by his son’s side during a medical emergency. This was a deeply distressing experience for the Father as a concerned parent.
- (uu) 5 July 2025 – The Mother denied the Father access, called the police and created a scene, claiming that his sister could not be present during the handover. The Child had just been discharged from the hospital on 4 July 2025, and the Mother allegedly put him through another round of stressful and acrimonious handover.

(vv) 17 September 2025 – The Mother wrote the following to the Father in an email: [The Father’s initials] AND HIS ENTIRE FAMILY IS LIVING IN THEIR OWN SELF DENIAL WORLD THAT’S WHY ALL HIS SISTERS AND HIMSELF GOT DIVORCED AND BECOME SUCH A FAILURE”.

(ww) 24 September 2025 – The Mother wrote the following to the Father in an email: [The Father’s initials] is so laughable that he cannot even mgt [Child’s initials] that court order never said the child must see his face. He is so pathetic that [Child’s initials] refused to see him”.

70 It is the Father’s case that the Mother’s actions had caused immense harm to the Child – who now suffers from seizures, situational anxiety and stress-induced stomach upsets – as well as to the Father through ongoing harassment, false allegations, and hostility.

The decision on the Father’s case

71 The Father produced a number of video recordings⁴ which show the Mother’s conduct towards the Child or in the presence of the Child; she was often seen as saying negative things about the Father and also guilt-tripping him about not loving her. The Father contended that the Mother had subjected the Child to emotional and psychological abuse. I reproduce some of the transcripts of the recordings below.

72 On 5 October 2024, the Child had the following conversation with the Father: -

⁴ While not all certified transcripts are reproduced in full or partially in this judgment, the Court has reviewed all the recordings with certified transcripts in their entirety.

Child	She scolded me le (in a very soft tone)
Father	She scold you? Huh?
Child	Yeah
Father	She scolded you four times today?
Child	More than four
Father	And you cried how many times?
Child	(in a very low tone) four times!
Father	Four, One time is about Aunty [name], is it? Or every time is all about Aunty [name]?
Child	Not about Aunty [name]!
Father	So what are they about?
Child	What I just said
Father	About Papa make her stress?
Child	Yes & then like she's shouting at me about the changing that stuffs. Then she said....there there....why there, where no? Eh huh? Then she said: "Give me a reason", then I said "no reason!". Then she said whenever I scold you, then she's like shouting at me.
Father	What you mean by no reason?
Child	No reason, I've no reason!
Father	No reason to do what?
Child	She said I want to change and don't want to change?
Father	Orh...she asked you whether you want to change to...?
Child	Then I said...there, then she say why le?
Father	So she's trying to ask you...
Child	Then she says no reason? Then she says no reason...Huh huh??
Father	You're crying, she's still asking you?

Child	No....after....she shouted at me, then she scolded at me, she talk to me like screaming, then I went to living room to watch my video & cry. And then the 2 nd time its' when I go....why no reason? Hmm hmm? Then the 4 th time when I'm coming, then she says "Go go! You don't want me right? Go to the monster, since you don't want me. That's why I come down crying.
-------	---

73 On 24 December 2024, when the Child was at East Coast Park, the Mother had a call with the Child:-

Father	Can you call mama again? Can you see your mama, papa go out! (*action: [Father] placed a battery operated fan beside [Child] before leaving the tent)
Child	Mama, at the beach
Mother	At the beach? You go camping?
Child	No!
Mother	Put the phone properly, Mama cannot see your face! Is there anyone outside?
Child	No! I mean my friends la!
Mother	Oh! [R]! I told [R]'s father, the mother is having affair with [Father's full name], you know? Is the father there? [Child's name], mama cannot see your face. Is [P] there? Who are you with? [P], [R], the father never there. [Father's full name], [Father's sister's full name], you go and tell [Father's sister's full name] that his brother is going to(inaudible) that mama already submit all the report to the Police, Tell [Father's full name] this is my Christmas present for him, is there anything inside? Is there any camera? (Child drinking from his water bottle and shaking his head) if there's camera, good also, he can record let him listen that he is going to jail soon! (Child shaking his head) do you miss mummy> So you are enjoying yourself? (Child showing his mama a soft toy) You are inside the tent,

	(inaudible) do you enjoy? Are you like the tent instead of the hotel mama bring
--	---

74 On 28 December 2024, the Child was having a conversation with the Mother in the car through a video call:

Mother	So Baobei, Mama start from now, where are you going? Not free talking to mummy, mm. Where are you going? Why are you not free talking to mummy? Mm, it's 9.30 p.m., you are supposed to be at home sleeping. *(kept questioning [Child])
Child	*(shaking his head) No *(answered softly)
Mother	You don't want to tell mummy, where you go is it? You don't love mummy anymore!
....	
.....	
Mother	Then go there do what? So late, eat dinner? The?
Child	*(shaking his head) go buy things
Mother	Go West Mall buy things, buy what?
Child	Bread
Mother	He got money meh? The monster is jobless what? [Father's full name] is jobless now!
Child	He got money *(protesting tone)
Mother	Oh he got money, you telling mummy he got money but he don't want to pay your medical fees! He don't even have thirty or forty dollars to pay for your doctor fees, is it (Child covered his ears with both hands) You don't want to listen to mummy now, is it? You don't love mummy anymore!
.....	
.....	
	[Second video recording for the same day]

Mother	So you don't want what....you don't let Mummy see your face now So when are you coming back? You don't miss Mama ah? When are you coming back?
Child	Tsk (sounding frustrated and annoyed) I went to the playground yesterday..
Mother	And then...But mama not there what...how I know when you... Ooh I know, you want the red-head flying chicken to be your Mother! That's why you talk to her right? You never scold her what!
Child	(Used his hand to hit his forehead twice...feeling helpless)
Mother	No? The red-head flying chicken ⁵ is there I know.... And now mummy cannot see your face....you don't want to talk to mummy You want the red-head flying chicken to be your Mother?!
Child	(Blast out loud in anger) STOP IT!

75 Having reviewed the Father's case in its entirety, while I make the finding that the Mother has indeed triangulated the Child in her intense dislike for the Father and brought him squarely into the conflict of his parents, I am of the view that her conduct does not (as yet) amount to emotional or psychological abuse on the Child. I therefore dismiss the Father's application for a PPO on behalf of the Child.

⁵ When queried by the Court, the Mother informed that "red-head flying chicken" refers to the Father's eldest sister.

76 As for the Father’s application for a PPO for himself, I am minded to grant it. I find that the Mother had inflicted emotional or psychological abuse on the Father through her conduct that harassed and distressed him through the sending of over 1,200 messages with the words “karma” and other distressing images such as the following: -



77 The Mother had also digitally inserted the photo of the Father into an obituary with the date of his birthday as his date of death. She also digitally inserted the photo of the Father onto a corpse in a coffin.

78 These digitally altered images (obviously done with intention and effort) and other distressing images were sent to the Father with various phrases such as: -

- (a) “Your ghost child waiting for u”
- (b) “Karma is so true like your mother sudden death and no grandson to send off” followed by “🤔🤔🤔🤔🤔”
- (c) “My dreams is coming true”, “Like what happened to your mother” and “Happen to u soon”
- (d) “In your own coffin car”

79 There were also other mocking messages about the Father’s family being “the best joker family in town”, the Father looking old – “so much older

that the 70 yr old uncle” and about asking “your sister to feed you their milk since u need them everywhere”.

80 The Mother defended her actions by saying that karma is defined as “the belief that your actions in this life affect all your future lives”. She stated that it is a blessing and a reminder (which she shared out of goodwill basis) to the Father of his current actions affecting his future life. The Mother may now try to downplay her actions by suggesting that “karma” is a neutral term but it is obvious from other disturbing images and the tenor of her messages that she meant the Father much ill-will rather than blessings.

81 I am of the view that a counselling order rather than a mandatory treatment order is more appropriate for the Mother in this case and I so order.

82 Given how the Mother had involved the Child in her conflicts with the Father, in consideration of his best interests, I also direct that the ***Mother is not to share the details or outcome of this case with the Child.*** The Mother is reminded that the Child is young and should not be burdened with the conflict of his parents, especially not with the legal disputes which they may have or are currently facing. If she truly has the interests of the Child at heart, she must do at least this much.

Costs

83 The Father has succeeded in his application for a PPO for himself. He informed the Court that he had spent close to \$30,000 in legal fees before deciding to discharge his lawyers to appear on his own at the one-day hearing. The Mother strongly objected to any cost order, saying that she should not be made to fund his litigation.

84 It was the Mother who had made the first application. The Father thereafter filed an application and succeeded in defending all of the Mother's PPO applications while obtaining a PPO for himself.

85 I am of the view that costs should follow the event and that it will be just in the circumstances for the Mother to pay costs of \$5,000 to the Father.

Concluding remarks

86 The Mother's anger, contempt and disdain towards the Father was palpable, even in the Courtroom setting. When the Father held up papers containing the distressing images, the Mother was observed to have smiled and given two thumbs up on the stand. Perhaps, the Mother had been deeply hurt emotionally while in the marriage with the Father. This Court is certainly in no position to judge what had truly transpired between these two people who used to be husband and wife.

87 What is patently clear, however, from the numerous video recordings that were played in the courtroom or reviewed in the Court's own time, is a young child caught in between two people who should be most precious to him. He looked resigned, he looked lost, he looked at blank spaces; he tried to shut out, and he tried to pretend.

88 The Mother does not appear to realise that the anger which had so consumed her had spilled out onto the Child and almost every interaction she had with the Father; every action of the Father is to be dissected and viewed minutely through negative lens. This has led to the acrimony and conflict at most of the handovers. She also texted and called the Father to lash out at him.

89 This must not continue. The Child is in Primary 4 and will be coming into his teenage years sooner than the parents realise. That period sets the foundation for adult life, making it a critical time for growth, learning, exploration and development. I implore the Mother especially to set aside her differences with the Father for the sake of the Child and make the experiences of the Child as fulfilling as possible. There is no need to be worried that the Child will love the Father more or that he has happy times with the Father. It is obvious that the Child loves her much. Every positive experience for the Child whether provided for by the Mother or the Father is a “win” for him. The choices made by his parents today will shape the man he becomes tomorrow, and both parents have the power to ensure those formative experiences are filled with love and peace rather than conflict.

Amy Tung
District Judge

Mother and Father acting in person.