IN THE FAMILY JUSTICE COURTS OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

[2026] SGYC 9

YOUTH COURT APPEAL
YA-0008-2026-01
CASE NO.: CPO-000086-2023

Between

Child Protector

And

Parent(s) of
WYQ,
YMR
and YNC

GROUNDS OF DECISION

[Children and Young Persons Act] — [Care and Protection Orders]

Version No 1: 20 Nov 2026 (11:06 hrs)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION **1**

BACKGROUND **3**

ISSUES **5**

CHILD PROTECTOR'S POSITION **6**

MOTHER'S POSITION **6**

PRELIMINARY ISSUES **7**

FIRST MAIN ISSUE – WHETHER THE CHILDREN CONTINUE TO BE IN NEED OF CARE AND PROTECTION **9**

SECOND MAIN ISSUE – WHAT ORDERS ARE IN THE BEST INTERESTS AND WELFARE OF THE CHILDREN **12**

CONCLUSION **19**

Version No 1: 20 Nov 2026 (11:06 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.

Child Protector
v
Parent(s) of WYQ, YMR and YNC

[2026] SGYC 9

YOUTH COURT APPEAL
YA-0008-2026-01
Case No.: CPO-000086-2023

District Judge Eugene Tay
11 September 2026, 8 October 2026

20 November 2026

District Judge Eugene Tay

Introduction

1 The present application ("Application") was brought by the Child Protector, Protective Service, Ministry of Social and Family Development ("PSV") for care and protection orders under the Children and Young Persons Act 1993 ("CYPA") for the following children:

(a) WYQ;

(b) YMR; and

(c) YNC

(collectively, "the Children").

2 The Application was heard on 11 September 2026. PSV was represented by State Counsel. The mother of the Children ("the Mother") was self-represented. The father of the Children ("the Father") was not present.

3 On 8 October 2026, the Court passed care and protection orders for the Children, including the following:

(a) WYQ to be placed under statutory supervision of an approved welfare officer ("AWO"), under the care of the Mother, for a period of six months;

(b) YMR to be committed to the care of a place of safety[1], namely, Chen Su Lan Methodist Children's Home ("CLSMCH"), or any other place of safety as may be determined by the Director-General[2] or a protector, for a period of six months;

(c) YNC to be committed to the care of a place of safety, namely, Singapore Boys' Hostel ("SBHL"), or any other place of safety as may be determined by the Director-General of a protector, for a period of six months; and

(d) Other related orders to ensure the safety and well-being of the Children.

(collectively, "the Orders")

4 At the time the Orders were passed, WYQ was about 15 years and 9 months old, and both YMR and YNC were about 13 years and 8 months old.

5 The Mother has appealed against the Orders.

[1] As defined in section 2(1) of the CYPA
[2] Director-General of Social Welfare

Version No 1: 20 Nov 2026 (11:06 hrs)

Background

6 The Application brought by PSV is not an application for fresh care and protection orders for the Children. The case was first brought before the Youth Court on 18 September 2023. The background facts of the case are set out in PSV's affidavit filed on 19 June 2026 ("PSV's Affidavit")[3] as well as PSV's Written Submissions filed on 3 September 2026 ("PSV's Submissions")[4].

7 It should be noted that there are previous care and protection orders passed for the Children, including the following:

(a) 12 months orders passed by District Judge Patrick Tay on 15 May 2024, following a contested hearing ("FJC's 2024 Orders")[5];

(b) The Mother's appeal against the FJC 2024 Orders (as regards WYQ and YMR) was dismissed by the Honourable Justice Choo Han Teck on 3 September 2024 ("2024 Appeal Orders")[6]; and

(c) 12 months orders passed by District Judge Amy Tung on 16 May 2025, after the Mother had consented to orders being passed as recommended by PSV ("FJC's 2025 Orders").

8 At the time the Application was heard on 11 September 2026, WYQ and YNC were both under statutory supervision orders under the care of the Mother, while YMR was committed to the care of CSLMCH.

[3] Pages 5 to 10, paragraphs 6 to 19 of PSV's Affidavit
[4] Pages 4 to 12, paragraph 6 of PSV's Submissions
[5] *Child Protector v WYQ* [2024] SGYC 2, Tab 5 of PSV's Bundle of Authorities
[6] *WYQ v Child Protector* [2024] SGHCF 31, Tab 6 of PSV's Bundle of Authorities

Version No 1: 20 Nov 2026 (11:06 hrs)

9 At the hearing of the Application, PSV applied for further orders for the Children for a period of 6 months[7] ("Orders Sought"), including the following:

(a) WYQ to be placed under statutory supervision of an AWO, under the care of the Mother, for a period of 6 months;

(b) YMR to be committed to the care of a place of safety, namely, CSLMCH, or any other place of safety as may be determined by the Director-General or a protector, for a period of 6 months;

(c) YNC to be committed to the care of a place of safety, namely, SBHL, or any other place of safety as may be determined by the Director-General of a protector, for a period of 6 months

10 The Mother contested the Application and objected to the Orders Sought by PSV. PSV informed that the Father consented to PSV's Application.

11 I heard the Application on 11 September 2026 and reserved my decision.

12 On 8 October 2026[8], I delivered my decision and passed the Orders.

13 On 21 October 2026, the Mother filed her Notice of Appeal.

[7] The full Orders Sought are set out at Annex A of PSV's Submissions.

[8] On 8 October 2026, prior to the Court delivering the decision, the Mother had sent an e-mail to the Court, copied to PSV, containing a document titled "Respondent's Second Supplementary Written Submissions." This was done without the leave of Court, and after the hearing had proceeded on 11 September 2026 (with parties having already presented their submissions, both oral and written). As such, the contents of this latest document submitted by the Mother was not taken into consideration by the Court when deciding the matter.

Version No 1: 20 Nov 2026 (11:06 hrs)

Issues

14 For a start, this is not an application for fresh care and protection orders, as there were previous orders passed for the Children, including the orders set out at [7] above. As such, the present Application is essentially a *review* application, where the correctness and necessity of the earlier orders are not in question *(Child Protector v GCQ & GCR* (HCF/YA 4/2018/1) dated 22 November 2018 (*"GCQ*"), at page 11). When reviewing existing care and protection orders, the test to be applied is whether there exists any change in circumstances to warrant/justify the cancellation/rescission of the previous orders, and in this regard, the Court will have to consider whether the child(ren) are still in need of care and protection under the relevant provisions of the CYPA given the welfare and best interests of the child(ren) as paramount interest and consideration (*BHR (the natural mother of B) v Child Protector* [2014] SGJC 1 at [15]). What the Court needs to consider at a review hearing is "whether the parents are now in a different position such that they are sufficiently fit to have the children returned to them. Considerations relevant to such fitness include whether they have complied with counselling and other interventions, whether there are committed to a safety plan and whether there have been breaches of the safety plans." (*GCQ* at page 11) ("*GCQ* test")[9].

15 As such, for the purpose of the Application, there are two main issues. The first main issue ("First Main Issue") is whether the Children continue to be in need of care and protection under section 5(1) of the CYPA. If the answer to the First Issue is in the affirmative, the second main issue ("Second Main Issue") is what orders are in the best interests and welfare of the Children.

[9] Applied in *Father of XGK v Child Protector* [2025] SGYC 3 (at [31]).

Version No 1: 20 Nov 2026 (11:06 hrs)

Child Protector's Position

16 PSV submitted that the Children continue to be in need of care and protection under section 5(1)(c)(ii) of the CYPA, in that the Mother continues to be unfit or unable or has neglected to exercise proper supervision and control over the Children, and the Children are beyond the Mother's control[10]. PSV applied the *GCQ* test and submitted that the Mother is not in a different position such that she is now sufficiently fit to have all three children returned to her at this point in time, in that there has been no material change in circumstances and the Mother has not progressed to a point that she is sufficiently fit to have all three children returned to her care[11].

17 PSV also submitted that the Orders Sought are in the Children's best interests[12].

Mother's Position

18 The Mother reiterated that the Orders Sought are not supported by evidence and are not in the best interests of the Children[13]. She submitted, among other things, that the statutory threshold in section 5(1)(c)(ii) of the CYPA is not met, and that the evidence does not establish that she is unfit or unable or that she has neglected to exercise proper supervision and control over the Children[14]. She sought for YMR to be returned to her (as WYQ and YNC are currently under her care). She also contended that state intervention is a "last

[10] Pages 27 to 29, paragraphs 25 to 27 of PSV's Submissions
[11] Pages 23 to 26, paragraph 22 of PSV's Submissions.
[12] Pages 29 to 36, paragraphs 28 to 42 of PSV's Submissions
[13] Page 1, paragraph 4 of Mother's Reply Affidavit filed on 12 August 2026 ("Mother's Reply Affidavit")
[14] Page 5, paragraph 14 of Mother's Reply Affidavit

Version No 1: 20 Nov 2026 (11:06 hrs)

resort" and that (PSV)'s intervention is "disproportionate"[15]. She further alleged that the Father's agreement with PSV's position is not in the Children's best interests, but is tied to his financial interest[16].

19 In the Mother's Supplementary Written Submissions[17], she submitted that PSV's application of the *GCQ* test is "flawed, one-sided, and ignores the fundamental reality that the Children are significantly worse off in the care of (PSV) than they were under her care"[18]. She contended that she "is not the source of harm" and that "the evidence demonstrates that the Children thrived under her care and collapsed only after (PSV) intervention and placement"[19]. She also submitted that "intervention should not be continued where the evidence shows that it has caused, or materially contributed to, deterioration in the Children's welfare"[20].

Preliminary Issues

20 At this point, I should state that the Mother had attempted to re-open and re-litigate matters that would have been before the Court and dealt with when the FJC's 2024 Orders were passed, including by purportedly "reorganising" evidence or producing "new evidence" that she claimed was not previously before the Court[21]. She claimed that "res judicata does not bar (her) new and reorganised evidence"[22].

---

[15] Pages 56 to 57, paragraphs 98 to 99 of Mother's Written Submissions filed on 4 September 2026 ("Mother's Submissions")
[16] Page 54, paragraph 89 of Mother's Submissions.
[17] Filed on 14 September 2026 ("Mother's Supplementary Submissions")
[18] Page 7, paragraph 19 of Mother's Supplementary Submissions
[19] Page 9, paragraph 22 of Mother's Supplementary Submission.
[20] Page 4, paragraph 9 of Mother's Supplementary Submissions
[21] Page 47, paragraphs 84 to 86 of Mother's Submissions, and page 27, paragraphs 34 to 35 of Mother's Supplementary Submissions
[22] Page 34, paragraph 40 of Mother's Supplementary Submissions

Version No 1: 20 Nov 2026 (11:06 hrs)

21 PSV objected (as a preliminary objection) to the Mother's request to "Request for Issurance of Summons to Witness for Natural Father" and her attempt to relitigate previous matters[23]. PSV submitted that the Mother is legally barred by the doctrine of res judicata from challenging all previous matters that had already been placed before and/or dealt with by DJ Tay and Justice Choo[24].

22 Suffice to say I accepted PSV's submission that the Mother is legally bound by the doctrine of res judicata from challenging and relitigating all previous matters that would have been placed before and/or dealt with by previous Courts, including when the FJC's 2024 Orders and the Appeal 2024 were passed after the subject matters were being heard. I found that her attempt to reopen and relitigate matters by purportedly "reorganising" evidence or producing "new evidence" that she claimed was not previously before the Court was impermissible under the doctrine of res judicata and is therefore disallowed. This included her request to cross-examine the Father on incidents that were before the Court and formed part of the factual matrix that gave rise to the FJC's 2024 Orders[25]. As such, in addition to disallowing the Mother to relitigate matters under the doctrine of res judicata, no such request by the Mother to cross-examine the Father on the said incidents would have been granted.

23 I now move to the First Main Issue – whether the Children continue to be in need of care and protection.

[23] Pages 13 to 20, paragraphs 7 to 15 of PSV's Submissions
[24] Page 20, paragraph 16 of PSV's Submissions
[25] Refer to the Mother's Letter to Court dated 23 June 2026, at Exhibit FWW-16, pages 23 to 27 of PSV's Reply Affidavit filed on 12 August 2026 ("PSV's Reply Affidavit")

Version No 1: 20 Nov 2026 (11:06 hrs)

First Main Issue – Whether the Children continue to be in need of care and protection

24 For a start, PSV's evidence is that since the FJC's 2025 Orders were passed, the Mother has refused to receive any professional intervention to address the continued concerns about her parenting and supervision of the Children[26], continued to deny the child protection concerns and remained resistant to engagement and intervention[27]. I noted that the Mother did not expressly challenge or refute PSV's aforesaid evidence. Instead, she stated that she "has never agreed with the alleged harm concerns, complaints or grounds from the outset of these proceedings"[28], and further claimed that she "is not mentally unstable but a victim of a coordinated campaign of fabrication, surveillance, and frame-ups" and that the Children are "collateral damage"[29].

25 At the hearing, the Mother verbalised that she did not know how to "partner" with PSV. She also alleged that she had been calling and emailing PSV (as well as schools and MOE [Ministry of Education]), and that PSV did not respond to her many calls and Whatsapp messages.

26 Apart from stating that the Mother has been uncooperative or resistant towards the attempts at engagement and intervention by PSV and other professionals, PSV pointed out that the Mother has also been sending multiple Whatsapp messages and emails to or copying PSV which, although made reference to the Children, were incomprehensible or without context, and it is neither viable nor sustainable for PSV officers to respond to all such messages[30].

---

[26] Page 11, paragraph 21 of PSV's Affidavit
[27] Page 11, paragraph 22 of PSV's Affidavit.
[28] Page 2, paragraph 9 of Mother's Reply Affidavit
[29] Page 42, paragraph 81 of Mother's Reply Affidavit
[30] Pages 11 and 12, paragraph 20 of PSV's Reply Affidavit

Version No 1: 20 Nov 2026 (11:06 hrs)

27 I found PSV's aforesaid point to be fair and reasonable and accepted the same. In addition, it should be noted that just because the Mother may have been sending multiple messages and emails to or copying PSV, it does not mean that she has been cooperative or willing or open to engage with PSV and/or receive intervention to address the child protection concerns.

28 Overall, I did not think that it is the case that the Mother did not know how to partner or cooperate with PSV per se. Rather, it is more likely the case that she was reluctant and unwilling to cooperate in a manner that is collaborative, constructive and ultimately helpful in addressing the child protection and parenting concerns. This raises serious questions as to her current level of insight into the child protection concerns and whether she had taken any significant steps (if at all) to address these concerns.

29 In addition, the Mother's repeated mention of and clear fixation on what she termed as "Wrong Target Operation" and the Children being used as "Flying Monkeys"[31] to stalk and harass her raises concerns and questions over the state of her mental health and wellbeing.

30 Finally, the Mother had claimed during the hearing that "once PSV or the CPO (care and protection order) is removed", the Children "will fall into place." I took this to mean that according to her, once there is no more CPO and no further involvement by PSV, the Children will somehow be fine. Suffice to say I found this contention of hers to be unsubstantiated and lacking genuine basis. Instead, it points to her lack of full understanding and appreciation of the child protection concerns.

[31] In various parts of the Mother's Affidavit and Mother's Reply Affidavit

Version No 1: 20 Nov 2026 (11:06 hrs)

31 For the above reasons, I did not think that the Mother is now sufficiently fit to have all three children returned to and remain in her care at this juncture. I was not satisfied that the Mother possessed sufficient understanding and insight of the child protection concerns or had improved on her parenting ability such that she would be able to exercise proper supervision and control over the Children and met their needs (beyond merely immediate physical needs).

32 For completeness, PSV's evidence is that despite being aware of the concerns regarding the Mother's caregiving capacity, the Father has remained unwilling to take on a greater parental role, has been avoidant towards the Mother's parenting concerns, and has urged PSV to manage her behaviours as he considers himself to be a victim of the Mother's verbal aggression[32]. In my view, this points to a lack of fitness and capacity on the Father's part to play any meaningful or significant role to care for and protect the Children. There is also nothing to suggest that he is currently willing or able to take on care of any or all of the Children. In any event, as the Father was not present at the hearing and did not file any affidavit, I will not comment on any of his allegations regarding the Mother.

33 It is noted that there have been some performance and behavioural issues on the part of WYQ and YMR (both in school as well as in CSLMCH) during their respective out-of-home placements[33]. I noted that PSV had accepted that there are "some ups and downs". However, I was not persuaded that overall, the Children are significantly worse off with PSV's involvement, which was what the Mother had alleged. I found that her claim that the Children "thrived under her care and collapsed only after (PSV) intervention and placement"[34] was

[32] Page 20, paragraph 27 of PSV's Affidavit
[33] Summarised at pages 28 and 29, paragraphs 27(a) to (d) of PSV's Submissions.
[34] Page 9, paragraph 22 of Mother's Supplementary Written Submissions

Version No 1: 20 Nov 2026 (11:06 hrs)

overstated and exaggerated. Instead, I accepted PSV's submission made during the hearing that fundamentally, there are still serious concerns regarding the Mother's parenting capacity.

34 For the abovementioned reasons, for the First Main Issue, I accepted PSV's submission that the Children continue to be in need of care and protection under section 5(1)(c)(ii) of the CYPA.

Second Main Issue – What orders are in the best interests and welfare of the Children

35 I move to the Second Main Issue, which is what care and protection orders are in the best interests and welfare of the Children. I will deal with the orders sought for each child in turn.

WYQ

36 For WYQ, PSV assessed that overall, it would be in her best interests to return to the Mother's care, under the statutory supervision of an AWO[35].

37 The Mother objected to PSV's grounds for statutory supervision.

38 I noted there are issues relating to abscondence, truancy and other at-risk behaviours on the part of WYQ[36], which PSV had acknowledged. At the same time, PSV has assessed that it is not desirable to place WYQ out of home (at CSLMCH or otherwise), as she had absconded from CSLMCH (and had stated she will continue to abscond) which led to situations where she did not

[35] Page 23 to 24, paragraph 36 of PSV's Affidavit, and page 30, paragraphs 30 to 31 of PSV's Submissions.
[36] Pages 14 to 16, paragraph 23 of PSV's Affidavit, and pages 5 to 6, paragraph 12(a) to (c) of PSV's Reply Affidavit

Version No 1: 20 Nov 2026 (11:06 hrs)

attend school and engaged in at-risk behaviours[37]. PSV submitted that at the minimum, WYQ's return to the Mother's care will remove the reason for her to skip school altogether to avoid detection when she absconds from CSLMCH[38]. PSV had observed that WYQ's relationship with the Mother has shown some improvements through home leave arrangements[39]. PSV had also stated that there are plans to support WYQ's discharge from CSLMCH with community-based programmes and PSV will also continue to work with her school to provide additional check-ins and support for her as well[40].

39 While there remain concerns over WYQ's behaviour, given the measures PSV has proposed to support her placement in her own home and in the community, I was prepared to accept PSV's submission for WYQ to be placed under a six months statutory supervision order under the care of the Mother, under the supervision of an AWO, instead of continued out-of-home placement in CSLMCH. I decided it would be in WYQ's best interests for her to be under statutory supervision so that she can receive support and other forms of intervention from the relevant professionals to address her truancy and at-risk behaviours, and ensure that her overall well-being is monitored by PSV.

[37] Page 30, paragraph 30 of PSV's Submissions
[38] Page 30, paragraph 31 of PSV's Submissions
[39] Page 23, paragraph 35 of PSV's Affidavit.
[40] Page 31, paragraph 33 of PSV's Submissions

Version No 1: 20 Nov 2026 (11:06 hrs)

YMR

40 For YMR, PSV submitted that out-of-home placement at CSLMCH would be in her best interests[41].

41 The Mother wanted YMR to be immediately returned to her care. She contended that additional six months commitment to the care of a Place of Safety would mean that YMR would have spent a total of three and a half years committed to such care, and is "out of proportion to allegations that are unsupported, unparticularised, and/or contradicted by the available evidence."[42]

42 I firstly noted PSV's evidence that YMR has expressed her wishes with PSV not to be reintegrated with the Mother in the next six months, and wanted a gradual approach to reintegration, with home leave increasing incrementally over time and eventual reintegration back to the Mother sometime in 2027[43]. This aspect of PSV's evidence was not expressly refuted by the Mother.

43 At the hearing, PSV acknowledged some decline in YMR's behaviour more recently as well as her disturbances caused to CSLMCH. At the same time, PSV raised concerns regarding the Mother's parenting capacity, and submitted that the Mother will very likely have difficulty coping with the care of YMR, if YMR is now returned to her care.

44 In my view, while YMR's recent behaviour while residing at CSLMCH is of some concern, for the reasons I had given earlier why the Children continue to be need of care and protection (including the Mother's lack of understanding and insight into child protection concerns as well as questions over her parenting

[41] Page 33, paragraph 37 of PSV's Submissions.
[42] Page 11, paragraphs 25 and 26 of Mother's Supplementary Written Submissions
[43] Page 25, paragraph 39 of PSV's Affidavit.

Version No 1: 20 Nov 2026 (11:06 hrs)

capacity), and also taking into account YMR's views and preferences, I accepted that at least for now, it would be in her best interests to continue in her current placement at CSLMCH. This would allow her time and opportunity to stabilise and receive intervention from professionals to stabilise and improve her behaviour over the next six months. This will also give the Mother time and opportunity to work on strengthening her parenting so that she will be in a better position to eventually care for YMR if and when it is assessed suitable for her to return home.

YNC

45 For YNC, I noted that PSV had initially applied for him to be under statutory supervision under the Mother's care[44], but had since sought an out-of-home placement at SBHL[45]. PSV's concerns for YNC include his persistent school absenteeism, that he may suffer from untreated online or gaming addiction which is affecting his social and academic functioning, well-being and development, as well as not being able to have sight of him, given the Mother's refusal to permit or facilitate any meaningful access by professionals to YNC[46].

46 The Mother opposed to YNC' out-of-home placement as proposed by PSV. While she did not deny that YNC had not been going to school for more than half a year, she attributed the root cause of his school refusal to "being told frightening or false information about the Mother, that the Mother is at risk of death and Jail, and to cooperate with the Father and siblings by staying home to

[44] Page 3, paragraph 4.b of PSV's Affidavit
[45] Page 33, paragraph 38 of PSV's Submissions
[46] Pages 33 and 34, paragraph 39 of PSV's Submissions

Version No 1: 20 Nov 2026 (11:06 hrs)

Monitor and Entrap the Mother with Father's acquired Clone Phone and to frame and entrap the Mother with Misinformation."[47]

47 At the hearing, the Mother claimed that YNC' school refusal could be that of "Wrong Target Operation" and "many Flying Monkeys disturbing him".

48 Ordinarily, a child's absenteeism from school and online or gaming addiction may not by themselves warrant an out-of-home placement. However, in the present case, I was concerned over the reported lack of access to YNC by PSV and personnel from the school for about six months, due to the Mother's refusal to permit or facilitate any meaningful access by professionals. This would exacerbate the existing concerns over absenteeism from school and, potentially, online and/or gaming addiction, due to YNC being unable to receive the necessary assessment and intervention regarding the potential underlying causes of his persistent school refusal, lack of social engagement and any excessive use of digital devices and/or online addiction.

49 Continued persistent absenteeism from school, lack of social engagement and any excessive gaming and/or online addiction would be detrimental to the long-term interests and wellbeing of YNC, especially if he does not receive timely and targeted intervention to address these concerns. I accepted PSV's submission that there is a real risk that maintaining the present arrangement (i.e. with YNC under the care of the Mother, even under statutory supervision) would significantly compromise YNC' wellbeing and development because he would remain unable to access and receive the necessary assessments and intervention[48].

[47] Page 44, paragraph 75 of Mother's Submissions
[48] Page 34 and 35, paragraph 40 of PSV's Submissions

Version No 1: 20 Nov 2026 (11:06 hrs)

50 For the above reasons, I concluded that a period of out-of-home placement for YNC would be in his best interests and welfare, as it would (a) break the present impasse where he has not been attending school or seen by professionals due to the Mother's uncooperative behaviour, and (b) place him in an environment (at least temporarily) where PSV can facilitate the necessary assessments and interventions for him.

51 As for the appropriate placement for YNC, I saw no good reason to disagree with PSV's recommendation of SBHL, which is a place of safety and a more structured (yet nurturing) environment. PSV submitted that placement in SBHL will allow YNC to be purposefully engaged in meaningful and constructive routines, learn and have positive and age-appropriate social interactions and be encouraged to attend school regularly (which PSV had pointed out are presently absent from his life), and also facilitate PSV's efforts to bring him for necessary assessments so that necessary and timely interventions can be provided to support his education, psychological and social needs, in his best interests[49]. I agreed with PSV's submission.

52 I should make it clear that I was mindful that any out-of-home placement at this stage might be potentially unsettling or distressing for YNC. Nonetheless, while there might be short-term discomfort and adjustment on the part of YNC, this has to be balanced with his longer-term interests and welfare. In my view, it would not be in YNC's longer-term interests and welfare if he were to be allowed to remain in his current state under the Mother's care, while the identified areas of concern are not assessed or addressed. With sufficient and timely engagement and explanation by PSV, the SBHL personnel and/or the

[49] Page 35 to 36, paragraph 41 of PSV's Submissions.

Version No 1: 20 Nov 2026 (11:06 hrs)

relevant professionals, any adjustment issues on the part of YNC should be able to be addressed and ameliorated, at least to some extent.

Length of orders

53 PSV submitted that a duration of six months for orders sought for the Children are appropriate[50]. In brief, PSV assessed that the six months window is an appropriate timeframe for PSV and other professionals involved in make safety monitoring efforts to ensure the Child are safe and well in the community and to provide the Mother with parenting support[51].

54 Having considered the reasons provided by PSV, I was prepared to accept PSV's submissions on the proposed length of six months for the orders sought for the Children.

Summary

55 To summarise at this juncture, for the aforementioned reasons, I decided to pass orders for a duration of six months, as sought by PSV, for:

(a) WYQ to be placed under statutory supervision of an AWO, under the care of the Mother,

(b) YMR to be committed to the care of a place of safety, CSLMCH or any other place of safety as may be determined by the Director-General or a protector, and

(c) YNC to be committed to the care of a place of safety, SBHL, or any other place of safety as may be determined by the Director-General or a protector.

[50] See pages 36 to 37, paragraph 43 of PSV's Submissions for the full reasons provided by PSV
[51] Page 37, paragraph 44 of PSV's Submissions

Version No 1: 20 Nov 2026 (11:06 hrs)

56 As for the rest of the Orders Sought by PSV, I accepted that they are necessary and appropriate, in the best interests and welfare of the Children, and decided to pass them accordingly.

57 For completeness, I noted the Mother herself had sought certain orders in paragraph 102 of the Mother's Submissions. Given my decision to pass Orders Sought by PSV, the orders sought by the Mother at paragraph 102(i) to (ii) of the Mother's Submissions would consequentially not be granted. As for the rest of the orders sought by the Mother at paragraph 102(iii) to (x) of the Mother's Submissions, suffice to say they are either misconceived and/or lacking genuine merit or basis, and therefore would also not be granted.

Conclusion

58 For the above reasons, I passed the Orders Sought by PSV, as set out at [3] above.

59 At the time of the writing of this judgment, there is no stay (or any application for a stay) of the Orders.

Eugene Tay
District Judge

Ms Elaine Liew / Ms Kimberly Pang, State Counsel
(Attorney-General's Chambers)
for the Child Protector
Ms Audrey De Cruz / Ms Quek Yi Rong
Protection Officers

The natural mother in person

Version No 1: 20 Nov 2026 (11:06 hrs)