



FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
1 SEPTEMBER 2021

**RESPONSE TO THE ONLINE CITIZEN'S ARTICLE ON THE
OUTRAGE OF MODESTY CASE INVOLVING DR YEO SOW NAM**

On 1 September 2021, The Online Citizen (“**TOC**”) posted an article (“**the article**”) on its website relating to the media statement issued by the Attorney-General’s Chambers (“**AGC**”) on 31 August 2021 (“**the media statement**”) involving the proceedings against Dr Yeo Sow Nam (“**Dr Yeo**”) who was represented by Mr Eugene Thuraisingam (“**Mr Thuraisingam**”). The article contains a series of complete falsehoods and makes a variety of unsubstantiated and inflammatory allegations.

2 TOC claims that AGC should have done the “right thing by charging the complainant”. TOC has therefore, without basis, determined the guilt of the complainant. This is highly irresponsible. AGC’s reasons for not charging the complainant have been explained in the media statement. It is unfortunate that TOC has not dealt with those reasons, no doubt because they serve as an inconvenient rebuttal of TOC’s position.

3 TOC further contends that AGC misled the public by stating that Mr Thuraisingam had to withdraw his application to lift the gag order (“**the application**”) because it was AGC which highlighted various provisions of the Women’s Charter and the Criminal Procedure Code to show why the application must fail. This makes no sense. To accuse AGC of being misleading when it correctly and properly opposed the application, and drew Mr Thuraisingam’s attention to the relevant legal provisions, is absurd. TOC conveniently glosses over the fact that this proves it would have been obvious that any such application is bound to fail. If so, why was it filed by Mr Thuraisingam to begin with and what were the motivations for his oral submissions on 16 August 2021 in support of an application he knew full well he had to withdraw?

4 TOC then alleges that “AGC is protecting its own skin” by not charging the complainant with any offence as it may be revealed during any such hearing that only “one round of interview” was done with the complainant and that AGC did so “without any double-checking”. This is categorically false. The article

unsurprisingly provides no evidence to support this assertion, instead conveniently couching it as supposition on the author's part. The making of such serious allegations under the guise of asking "who knows" is disingenuous and dishonest.

5 Underlying the article is the baseless assertion that where a prosecution concludes with an acquittal, whether by virtue of the Prosecution withdrawing charges, or the Court acquitting an accused after a full trial, it evidences wrongdoing on the part of AGC. This mischaracterises AGC's role and the nature of the judicial process. AGC assesses each case it prosecutes very carefully. However, prosecutions can, at times, not result in a conviction for a variety of reasons, including interpretations of the law, a Court concluding that a case has not been proven beyond reasonable doubt, or, as in this case, where the Prosecution withdraws the charge(s) if it is of the view that the legal standards required to pursue the case in Court are no longer met. This is inherent in the nature of the judicial process. Unfortunately, TOC, in pursuing its own agenda, ignores this reality.

* * *

ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S CHAMBERS
STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS DEPARTMENT

For queries, please contact:

Ms Lai Xue Ying
Assistant Director (Media, Public & Corporate Communications)
Tel: 6908 3067
Email: LAI_Xue_Ying@agc.gov.sg

Ms Rachel Wee
Manager (Media, Public & Corporate Communications)
Tel: 6908 9086
Email: Rachel_WEE@agc.gov.sg