

IN THE FAMILY JUSTICE COURTS OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

[2026] SGFC 126

SSP 905 of 2026

Between

YIP

... Applicant

And

YIQ

... Respondent

GROUND OF DECISION

[Family Law — Family Violence — Orders for Protection]

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.

**YIP
v
YIQ**

[2026] SGFC 126

Family Court — SSP 905 of 2026
Magistrate Soh Kian Peng
15 July 2026

9 September 2026

Magistrate Soh Kian Peng:

1 SSP 905 of 2026 (“SSP 905”) was an application brought by the Husband against the Wife. He sought a Personal Protection Order (“PPO”) against the Wife.

2 Central to the Husband’s case was his allegation that the Wife had inflicted emotional or psychological abuse on him by accusing him of having an affair with his sister. In addition to these accusations, the Husband also stated that the Wife had sent him numerous vulgar and degrading text messages over WhatsApp (which included images and videos of him and his sister engaging in sexual activity which had been generated by artificial intelligence).

3 According to the Husband, what had precipitated this entire saga was the fact that he had agreed to contribute \$100,000 towards his father’s medical bills. He informed his Wife that he had he had transferred some \$65,000 to his

sister (with whom his Wife had an acrimonious relationship). This revelation angered the Wife and set in motion the series of events that led to him filing the application in SSP 905.

4 I heard the trial on the 15th of July 2026. After considering the evidence as well as oral arguments from parties, I allowed the Husband's application for a PPO and ordered that the Husband and Wife both attend counselling. In addition, I also called for a Preliminary Assessment Report ("PAR") with a view towards granting a Mandatory Treatment Order ("MTO") against the Wife.

5 These are the reasons for my decision.

6 The statutory regime governing applications for protective orders in the familial context are found in Part 7 of the Women's Charter 1961. Specifically, s 60A(1) of the Women's Charter 1961 makes clear that the Husband must establish, on a balance of probabilities, that Wife had either committed family violence on him, or that she was likely to do so. Further to this, the Husband also has to show that it is necessary for the order to be made for his protection or personal safety.

7 I found that Husband had proven both requirements.

8 For one, Husband had adduced multiple screenshots of the text messages which the Wife had sent him. All told, there were some 90 pages worth of these screenshots which contained, not only the text messages the Wife had sent to the Husband, but also, explicit images and videos of the Husband and his sister engaging in sexual acts.

9 The Wife did not dispute sending these messages to the Husband.¹ As to how she had produced these obscene images and videos of the Husband and his sister, she explained that she had used a free application to do so.²

10 It was abundantly clear to me that the Wife had, by sending these text messages as well as photos and videos to the Husband, inflicted emotional or psychological abuse on him. These were hideously offensive and vile messages. To illustrate the point, reproduced below is but a small excerpt of the text messages which well illustrates what the Husband had received from the Wife over a period of some four months:

If she important fuck n stay with her.

She got lots of money

She got good breast n beautiful fucking chee bye for u to insert
ur rotten cock

Why don't wan to answer³

...

I DIE YOU HAPPY

Happily can fuck ur beloved until die

We will go separate.

U can fuck her peacefully.

Now difficult to fuck.

I HEARD SHE BUY MEDICINE FOR U TO FUCK HER

SO HOW THAT FUCK

SOLID FUCKING

YOU TAKE HOUSE MEDICINE YO FUCK HER

¹ Transcript at p 33.

² Transcript at p 33.

³ Husband's Bundle of Documents at p 7.

NO WONDER HERE FUCKING MEDICINE MISSING
JOW STILL FUCKING HER NOW⁴

11 The impact of these text messages on the Husband was also made clear to me by his demeanour when he gave evidence at the trial. He was evidently tormented and distressed by what the Wife had sent to him. In addition, the Husband also recounted the physical toll he had suffered: his weight had dropped precipitously.⁵

12 Having found that the Wife had indeed committed family violence on the Husband, I was also satisfied that it was necessary to make the order for his protection or personal safety.

13 Our jurisprudence tells us that in considering the necessity of making such orders, the court undertakes a risk-based approach by examining the likelihood of the respondent committing family violence against the person sought to be protected under the order in the future: *XFL v XFM* [2024] SGFC 103 at [19].

14 I considered there to be a high risk of the Wife continuing to inflict family violence on the Husband by sending him such messages. It was not lost on me that the fact that the Wife had stopped sending the Husband such messages since the end of April 2026 coincided with the Husband making the present application in SSP 905 at the start of May 2026 and obtaining an expedited PPO against the Wife.

⁴ Husband's Bundle of Documents at p 8.

⁵ Transcript at p 24.

15 Further to this, one main reason for the conflict between the Wife and the Husband remains unresolved, and that was the poor relationship that the Wife shared with the Husband's sister. To that end, it was hardly possible, nor could there be any such expectation that the Husband cut off any and all contact with his sister so as to avoid conflict with the Wife.

16 As a final point, it was also clear to me that while the Wife may have had her own grievances and frustration with her Husband, she did not have a healthy way of expressing such negative emotions. That much was obvious from the messages which she had sent to him over the course of some four months.

17 In the circumstances, I granted the Husband's application for a PPO. I also ordered that both the Husband and the Wife go for counselling.

18 Further to that, I also called for a PAR with a view towards granting a MTO. I did so because there was some evidence before me – specifically the fact that the Wife had to be admitted to IMH on two separate occasions – which hinted at the possibility of the Wife having a psychiatric condition that was a contributing factor to her behaviour (to borrow the words of s 60F of the Women's Charter 1961).



Soh Kian Peng
Magistrate



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